

1-1-2010

A Qualitative Study of The Duke of Edinburgh's Award and Young Offenders in the Secure Estate

Sarah Dubberley

Glyndwr University, s.dubberley@glyndwr.ac.uk

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epubs.glyndwr.ac.uk/siru>

 Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

This is a Ph.D. thesis, copyrighted to the author and Glyndwr University.

Recommended Citation

Dubberley, S. (2010), Young Offenders, Imprisonment and The Duke of Edinburgh's Award. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wales

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Social and Community at Glyndŵr University Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Social Inclusion Research Unit by an authorized administrator of Glyndŵr University Research Online. For more information, please contact d.jepson@glyndwr.ac.uk.

A Qualitative Study of The Duke of
Edinburgh's Award and Young
Offenders in the Secure Estate

Sarah Jessica Dubberley

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Degree awarded by the University
of Wales

Research conducted at Glyndwr
University

February 2010

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who have provided their expertise, support and encouragement during the preparation for, and writing of, this thesis. Firstly, I am ever indebted to my supervisor, Professor Odette Parry, Director of the Social Inclusion Research Unit at Glyndwr University for providing unlimited advice and guidance and for her continued support and enthusiasm of my work throughout the last four years. Thank you also to my second supervisor, Professor Julian Buchanan for his dedicated criminal justice experience. The research would also not have been possible without Professor Andrew Pithouse who was one of the original grant holders of the wider DofE funded study, many thanks for his encouragement and support.

I am also grateful to Sarah Hadley, Youth Justice Project Worker for the DofE, who negotiated and eased access into the secure estate institutions. I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the Youth Justice Board, who acted as gatekeeper to the research, the participating institutions in the secure estate, and the staff who deliver the Duke of Edinburgh's Award. I am eternally grateful to the young people themselves in the secure estate and their willingness to participate in the research. To these organisations and individuals I am thankful.

Finally, I would like to thank the continued support of colleagues, friends and family. To my colleagues I am eternally indebted, for allowing me the time and space to complete the thesis. To my parents for their never ending enthusiasm and encouragement and to my husband Peter, for his overwhelming patience, understanding and ability at keeping me motivated when needed most.

Summary

The thesis describes a qualitative study of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award (DofE) and young offenders in the secure estate. The overall aim of the thesis is to examine young offenders' engagement with the DofE, and implications for their experiences while in the secure estate, and subsequently following their release into the community. The research draws on focus groups with young people in young offenders institutions, secure training centres and secure children's homes in England and Wales (pre and post implementation of the DoE programme), and interviews with secure estate staff delivering the programme. Interviews were also carried out with DofE management and a sample of Youth Offending Team (YOT) staff. In addition, an online questionnaire was distributed to all YOT managers across England and Wales.

The findings of the study indicate that the DofE was popular with participants (both young people and staff) for several reasons. These included the opportunity for young people to engage in activities which were new to them, the hands –on approach to programme delivery, the transference of a range of both technical and more 'indeterminate' social/individual skills, the perceived status of the qualification, and, related to this, perceived potential to facilitate access to more opportunities for young people, post release.

Barriers to implementation were mainly a function of institutional constraints, particularly in relation to risk. Moreover, constraints on the programme delivery, posed by the secure estate, appeared to challenge the Award's claim to inclusiveness (that its accessibility to all). A particular challenge for the DofE was maintaining the reputation of the Award (associated with the positive attributes it is claimed to confer upon recipients) while widening access by implementation to young offenders in the secure estate.

THESIS DECLARATION

Statement 1

I hereby declare that this work has not been accepted in substance for any degree and is not currently being submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed (Candidate)

Date

Statement 2

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed (Candidate)

Date

Statement 3 (a)

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (Candidate)

Date

Statement 4

The research was completed under the guidance of:

..... (Main Supervisor) Glyndŵr University.

In my capacity as main supervisor of the candidate, I certify that the above statements are true to the best of my knowledge.

Signed (Main Supervisor)

Date

Table of Contents

Glossary of terms	1
Chapter One Introduction	2
Chapter Two Literature Review	13
Literature Review strategy	13
The Review	14
Young people offending, and moral panics	15
Children, deviance and media portrayal.....	19
Risk factors and offending behaviour.....	21
Explanations of Youth Offending	23
Cognitive behavioural Approaches	25
Theories of Desistence	27
Social Capital	30
Re-integration.....	38
Government responses to youth offending	41
Youth Justice Board	45
Youth Offending prevention programmes	48
Young people in custody	51
Restorative Justice	56
Introduction to the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award Scheme	59
Chapter Three Research Methods	65
The Study.....	65
My view of the world: Theorists and Theories	67
Symbolic Interactionism and Phenomenological approaches	68
Positivism and beyond.....	74
Qualitative Research	76
PhD Study Design	80
The PhD study and the wider evaluation project.....	82
Sampling	84
Access.....	86
Respondent Recruitment.....	88
Research Tools	90

Focus Groups.....	90
Interviews	92
The Questionnaire Survey	96
Data Analysis	98
Ethics	102
Chapter Four Young People	105
Privilege and commitment	106
Knowledges, skills and experiences	114
The expedition.....	115
Achievement and change.....	121
Damage and Repair	128
Re-integration, involvement and acceptance.....	133
Summary	138
Chapter Five Secure Estate Staff delivering the DofE programme ...	140
Privilege and Access	140
Selection.....	144
Risk.....	146
Structure and Delivery	150
Barriers to Delivery.....	155
Continuity of delivery.....	163
The Learning	165
Summary	175
Chapter Six Youth Offending Teams.....	177
Closed-ended responses.....	178
Structure and Delivery	180
Positioning the programme.....	184
Engagement.....	188
Perceived Programme Benefits	196
Summary	198
Chapter Seven DofE Representatives	200

Inclusiveness.....	200
Branding.....	204
Engagement.....	206
Engagement of young people.....	213
Looking to the future.....	216
Summary.....	220
Chapter Eight Discussion.....	222
Caveats to the study.....	222
A social leveller?	223
Damage and Repair	230
Programme Content and delivery	235
Making Amends.....	238
Organisational constraints	242
Future Research.....	250
Appendix One	252
Appendix Two	254
Appendix Three	273
Bibliography	274

Glossary of terms

ASBO Anti Social Behaviour Order

DofE The Duke of Edinburgh's Award

ISSP Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme

ROTL Release on Temporary Licence

SCH Secure Children's Home

STC Secure Training Centre

YIP Youth Inclusion Programme

YOI Young Offenders Institute

YOT Youth Offending Team

YJB Youth Justice Board

This thesis reports on a qualitative study of delivery and receipt of The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (DofE) to young offenders in the secure estate. The aim of the study was to examine young offenders' perceptions of, and engagement with, the DofE programme, in the secure estate and explore implications of these perceptions for their experiences within the secure estate and following release.

The area of the research was informed by the student's prior experiences and expertise. This comprises her own prior participation in the DofE programme, and her subsequent involvement in volunteering work with the DofE, while working in the probation service. The researcher also lectures on the subject of criminal justice, at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, specialising in youth justice, and has published in the area of young offenders and criminal justice.

There has been much research on youth disorder and offending. While the pattern of youth offending tends to follow that of adult offending (Stevens et al. 2006), specific risk factors have been linked to likelihood of offending behaviour in young people. These include a wide range of factors, many of which are linked to social disadvantage. Increasing public concern in the UK about anti-social behaviour of young people mirrors rising levels of accommodation of young people in the secure estate (of whom there were over 3,000 in 2008). It is only recently that a decline in this trend has been noted, with Howard League figures for 2009 indicating that 2376 young people were incarcerated. Despite the reduction, youth offending and the level of incarcerated young people remain a source of concern in the UK.

Concerns about prison conditions and overcrowding abound, as well as concern about the implications of re-offending behaviour upon release. An important focus has therefore been on the rehabilitation of young offenders and, linked to this, preparation for their release. Some of the research findings on the efficacy of interventions in prison (particularly those using social cognition models), which have been popular in the US,

are inconclusive in the UK. However more broad based or holistic UK interventions (particularly those incorporating education and skills training) are understood to offer some protection against re-offending.

Notwithstanding this, it is widely recognised how upon release from custody young people, as well as adults, face a raft of problems, including issues with accommodation, employment and substance misuse. If these are not resolved while in custody, the chances of re-offending and re-imprisonment increase. Moreover, people who have been in prison before frequently experience the same problems each time they are released.

The study presented here focuses on the important and timely area of young people and youth justice. Since the inception of New Labour in 1997, youth justice has undergone a major overhaul, specifically in 1998 with the introduction of the Crime and Disorder Act. Amongst many aspects of this Act, one major change was the introduction of multi agency Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) and the overarching non-governmental Youth Justice Board (YJB). As a national policy making, and commissioning body, the YJB was set up to provide leadership in youth crime prevention, young offender management in the secure estate, and in aftercare.

The introduction of YOTs saw an increase in youth justice policy and a raft of community interventions available to young people sentenced before a court. However, it is important to note at this point that the re-direction of social spending to fund YOTs has not gone uncriticised by those who argue that YOTs have failed to provide a co-ordinated response to meet the varied social and personal needs of young people (Solomon and Garside 2008).

Community interventions do vary dramatically, but usually according to the seriousness of the crime committed. Based on their claim that an increase in early intervention programmes has helped to reduce offending by children and young people, throughout the last decade the YJB (2008a) has specifically extended its policies in respect of early

intervention. One such intervention is the YJB funded Youth Inclusion Programme known as YIP. YIP offers voluntary, community-based, inclusive activities that seek to divert at risk young people away from criminal activity. However, at the other end of the spectrum, from early intervention to repeat offenders, community interventions are increasingly used as alternatives to custody (YJB 2005). One example is the Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP), introduced in 2001. This programme was hailed by the YJB as the most rigorous community programme available to children and young people who commit crime.

All youth justice interventions (from final warnings, referral orders to supervision orders and intensive supervision and surveillance) include elements of reparation, which are underpinned by the principles of restorative justice. Within Youth Justice, restorative justice aims to bring together young people who offend with victims, giving them an opportunity to make amends for their actions, and to consider the impact of their behaviours on other people and the wider community in general. These principles of restorative justice were championed by the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999, which saw the introduction of referral orders (Liebmann 2009).

Since 2000, the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales has been responsible for the commissioning and purchasing of secure places for children and young people who are remanded or sentenced to custody. The YJB set an original target for the placement of any young person to be accommodated not more than 50 miles away from their home towns. However, this YJB target has been revised to state that any child or young person should be accommodated within any custodial setting which is as close to their local community as possible (YJB 2005). However in practice this target is seldom met. Given that the resettlement of offenders is understood as crucial in enabling young people to desist from reoffending, it is an important issue vis-à-vis custodial sentencing.

Under recent policy developments the YJB have implemented the new Scaled Approach to Youth Justice, which was introduced under the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008. The scaled approach aims to not only identify individual risks

and needs of those children and young people who come in to contact with the Youth Justice System, but subsequently, target interventions according to individual need (YJB 2009a). In November 2009 a new youth community sentencing structure, the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO), which encompassed youth justice community penalties, and replaced nine existing sentences, was launched (YJB 2009b).

Along with the scaled approach to youth justice, the YJB is currently in the process 'wiring-up' its information sharing systems in order to facilitate a more holistic understanding of needs, provision and outcomes at the interface of youth justice and other service systems (YJB, 2008b). This new 'wired up' system aims to promote improved communication across the whole of the youth justice system and improve communication between the secure estate and local YOTs.

The findings of an independent audit of criminal justice under the Labour Government have, however, suggested that the huge investment made in the changes to youth justice, is not matched by the discernable benefits (Solomon and Garside 2008). To reiterate, since the introduction of New Labour, Youth Justice has witnessed an increase in the breadth of community and custodial sentences. This has led to more punitive measures for children and young people who commit criminal behaviour, and has been termed 'popular punitiveness' (Muncie 2009:338). The increase in early intervention policies, highlighted above, for those children and young people who are identified as 'at risk' of offending, has led to the criminalisation of a younger age of children and young people, including those who might previously have been considered as minor offenders (Smith 2003). Here, Goldson and Muncie (2006) criticise the dangers of Government early intervention policies, arguing that such policies encourage child criminalisation.

Indeed, in 2007, Rod Morgan resigned as chair of the YJB because of increasing conflict with the Home Office over its policy agenda relating to children, which he argued increasingly criminalised young people. This point has been taken up by Solomon and Garside (2008) who argue that Labour's 'no more excuses' approach has led to the

increased criminalisation and incarceration of more children and young people than previously. Morgan (2007:5) has been highly critical of the fact that the increase in young people being drawn into the youth justice system, has led to 'cluttering the system'. He specifically criticises the youth justice system for its inflexibility which limits pre court disposals and increases use of formal court processes and prosecutions (Morgan 2007). Moreover, he argues that the increasing rigidity of the youth justice system means practitioners are less able to use discretion when determining outcomes for young people.

With all the concern about the punitive approach associated with youth justice there has been support for a scaling back of resources to justice agencies and a scaling up of resources to the social sector for prevention purposes (Solomon and Garside 2008). Goldson and Muncie (2006) highlight this point, by illustrating a need to rethink youth justice policy and practice and to re-establish diversion of young people away from youth justice system.

In 2008 the Government launched its Youth Crime Action Plan (HM Government 2008), which has challenged the Youth Justice Board, local authorities and their partner agencies to engage more determinedly not only with an agenda to prevent young people from offending and re-offending, but also with the robust management of offenders. The Youth Crime Action Plan introduced a raft of new and enhanced prevention and support measures, to be implemented via new partnerships with Children's Services, with the overall aim to reduce further the incidence of youth crime. While the YJB have a key role to play in implementing the government's Action Plan, they must rely on partner agencies to help deliver such changes.

One organisation which has positioned itself accordingly is the Duke of Edinburgh's Award (DofE). The DofE, was established in 1956 as a registered charity, targeting young people aged between 14 and 25. The DofE programme, which aims to engender among young people, non-competitiveness, self-discipline, self-reliance, a sense of responsibility to others, teamwork, enterprise and perseverance is delivered across

three levels (Bronze, Silver and Gold). Each level encompasses four or five elements (Volunteering, Physical, Skills, Expedition and Residential) depending upon programme level. Importantly, the programme was established as inclusive for all young people. This means young people who have special needs, who are disadvantaged by poverty or at risk of offending, can and do achieve the same Awards as their able bodied or more advantaged peers. For the most part, the DofE relies for programme delivery upon schools and youth organisations, licensed to run the programme as Operating Authorities. It is only recently that the programme has been implemented in (some) secure estate institutions, and by other youth justice agencies.

At the time of the study, there was only anecdotal evidence about the impact of the DofE scheme on young people's experiences and outcomes. In 2007 The DofE commissioned an evaluation of some aspects of the programme delivered in the secure estate and the researcher was part of the team designing and undertaking this work. The evaluation used an attitude to offending instrument to capture changes in attitudes among young people before and after participating in the DofE programme. In order to reach a more in-depth understanding of the key issues, from the perspective of DofE programme participants, the PhD study on which this thesis reports was conceived. The PhD study was agreed with the funders, to run alongside and supplement the original funded study.

The PhD thesis, thus set out to explore gaps in current understanding about the implementation of interventions in the secure estate through the examination about how young people in the secure estate responded to the DofE intervention, how different aspects of the programme and its delivery were perceived by participants (both young people who received and those delivering the programme), aspects of facilitators and barriers to delivery, how the programme sits in the wider context of youth justice provision and the implications of the programme for perceived future opportunities of young people upon release. These issues are especially poignant in the current political/policy climate surrounding young people, youth justice and specific issues of restorative justice, rehabilitation, reoffending and prevention.

The PhD used a qualitative design, theoretically driven by an inductive approach and social interactionism, through which an understanding of the issues important to young people participating in the DofE programme would emerge. A qualitative approach was deemed appropriate because it facilitates understanding of a research issue from the perspective of participants and is particularly useful where little in-depth information is available on the subject of study.

Research methods included focus groups with young people at a sample of secure estate institutions, interviews with staff members delivering the programme in these settings, interviews with DofE representatives and an online questionnaire sent to Youth Offending Team (YOT) managers (which led to some visits to YOT teams). The aspect of the research which was carried out within the secure estate adopted a longitudinal design (which is less common in qualitative studies) in order to capture changes in participant perceptions across exposure to the DofE programme. Researching young people in the secure estate is fraught with difficulties. These range from gaining access, to institutional restraints on the research, to engaging successfully with (often) disaffected respondents. Here the longitudinal aspect of the research was particularly advantageous because (where the same young people participated at different stages of the study), it facilitated the development of familiarity and trust with participants.

A brief description of the chapters contained within this thesis is provided below.

Chapter 2 of the thesis comprises a review of the relevant literature pertaining to young people and deviance, the secure estate, youth justice interventions and the DofE. The chapter opens with a discussion about young people, deviance and moral panics. This leads into a discussion about labelling and the demonization of young people and children.

Following this, perceptions of crime, Government response and criminal justice services, as highlighted in the literature, are discussed. Particular attention is given to

the concept of risk and prevention, with a focus on known risk factors, different models of risk and interventions employed. The chapter highlights the emphasis on desistance, apparent in the literature, examining issues of prevention, reoffending and rehabilitation. The review highlights the relationship, identified by the literature between risk and social capital.

The literature review then turns to a consideration of youth justice policy and practice, including interventions (within and out with custody) and principles of restorative justice (including reparation to the community). The chapter concludes with an introduction to the DofE Award programme.

Chapter 3 of the thesis describes methodology and research strategy. This covers a broad span of issues from ontology and epistemology to data collection and analysis. The chapter opens with a discussion of the philosophical principles underpinning the study, drawing primarily on the sociological traditions of Symbolic Interactionism and Phenomenology. Attention is then given to the different research paradigms, beginning with positivism and, following this, post-positivistic perspectives. The chapter moves on to indicate the methodological approach identified as most appropriate for the study, and outlines some of the guiding principles underpinning qualitative methods.

The PhD study design is then described. In this section of the chapter an outline of the different stages through which the research progressed is presented. This begins with a discussion of sampling and the sampling methods used for the study. The section then focuses on issues of access, gatekeepers and how access was gained to carry out the data collection. The process of respondent recruitment is then discussed. Here identification of respondents and the way in which they were recruited to the study is outlined. Next, the focus moves to the research tools, and discussion is presented of the different data collection methods (focus groups, interviews and questionnaire survey) employed. Following this section, the issue of data analysis is discussed and principles of grounded theory, constant comparative method and thematic analysis, which informed analysis of the research data, are provided.

The methods chapter concludes by consideration of key ethical considerations of informed consent and anonymity, focusing on those issues pertinent to the current study (including issues relating to young people and vulnerable respondent groups). Here is noted that ethical approval for the study was sought and granted by the University Research Ethics committee.

The following four chapters of the thesis are devoted to the presentation of the study findings. The chapters are organised by respondent group. That is the focus groups with young people within the secure estate; interviews with prison staff delivering the DofE; The YOT managers' online survey and interviews with YOT staff, and, finally, interviews with DofE central management staff.

Chapter 4 of the thesis presents the findings from the focus groups with young people who participated in the study. The chapter opens with the participant retrospective preconceptions of the DofE programme and their introduction to the programme in the secure estate. This is followed by perceived status of DofE within the secure estate, and identification of eligibility criteria. The subsequent section of the chapter focuses on young people's engagement with and commitment to the programme. Following this, issues relating to programme learning, content and style of delivery are detailed. This leads to a focus on perceived benefits of the programme to participants. Here, the chapter attends to issues of stigma, spoiled identity and damage control/identity repair. The chapter concludes with issues concerning re-integration into, and acceptance by, the community and prospects for the future of participants.

Chapter 5 of the thesis presents the findings from interviews with secure estate staff delivering the programme. The chapter opens with staff retrospective preconceptions about the DofE and issues of privilege and access. This is followed by a focus on the perceived background experiences of young people in the secure estate participating in the Award and their offending behaviours. The main part of the chapter focuses on selection to the programme, particularly highlighting issues around risk. This is followed

by a section on programme structure/organisation in the secure estate and delivery. Here the chapter turns to organisational constraints on programme delivery highlighted by those delivering the Award. The Chapter then turns to issues around the imperative of programme completion, and, linked to this the importance of continuity of delivery across secure estate institutions, criminal justice services and between the secure estate and the community. Finally, the chapter focuses on the different types of learning offered by the programme and young people's achievements.

Chapter 6 of the thesis presents findings from the online survey of YOT managers and interviews with YOT staff. The chapter opens with the online survey response rate and reason for non-responses. This is followed by a short section highlighting findings from the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires. This is followed by findings derived from the qualitative questionnaire data, focussing upon structure and delivery of the programme. This includes perceived barriers to, and facilitators of, implementation, the positioning of the programme within YOTs (including issues of continuity across criminal justice settings), issues relating to young peoples' engagement with the programme and perceived programme benefits for young people.

Chapter 7 presents the findings from interviews conducted with staff representatives from the DofE central management team. The chapter is organised thematically around three key themes which emerged through the data analysis. The first of these themes, 'inclusiveness', explores programme implementation in the secure estate in the context of the wider DofE imperative to ensure availability of the programme to all young people. The second theme 'branding', discussed in this chapter, examines the dual (and potentially conflicting) imperatives of inclusiveness, and maintenance of the standard and reputation of the DofE. The third theme 'engagement', examines DofE relationships with other organisations and funding bodies, their relationships with organisations within the Youth Justice Sector and engagement of young people in the secure estate with the programme.

Chapter 8 is the final chapter of the thesis, presenting the discussion and conclusions of the study. This chapter discusses main themes from findings chapters, in the context of some key issues emerging from the literature. The chapter opens by discussing some limitations of the study and caveats to the findings.

This is followed by discussion of the extent to which a key imperative of the DofE, as an inclusive intervention, is supported by the study findings. Following this, the discussion focuses on programme content and method of delivery, with particular attention to organisational constraints. The discussion focuses on perceived and potential programme benefits, in the short and long term. Here, discussion focuses on issues of spoiled identities and damage control in the context of DofE provision in the secure estate, and principles of restorative justice. The chapter continues with a short summary of findings relating to the DofE programme in the wider context of youth justice interventions and the challenges which it faces as an inclusive programme targeting all young people, including young offenders, while maintaining recognised credibility of the Award.

The chapter concludes with consideration of some areas of future research, suggested by the findings of the study.

Literature Review strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was used to carry out the literature review which informs this chapter of the thesis. First, a detailed academic literature search of resources available within the University library was undertaken. This search was facilitated by access to the University's information network UNICAT, which is a joint catalogue and a reciprocal borrowing scheme with Bangor University. Where appropriate sources were not available through this system, the library inter-library loan and document supply network was used to access necessary materials. In addition, the SCONUL facility, which enables University members to access or borrow from other UK university libraries, was accessed.

In carrying out the literature review the researcher accessed a variety of online search engines and data bases, including Athens, Regard, Google Scholar, Ingenta, Connect, Swetswise, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS), Sage Journals and Science Direct. Because the electronic databases employ a limited range of keywords, and these vary between databases (often only describing general topic area rather than the researchers' specific interests), some relevant papers may have been overlooked. To address this hand searches were conducted from key reference lists in identified papers, in addition to the electronic searches.

In searching for materials, the inclusion criteria were kept purposely broad. These comprised English language books, papers in edited collections, and journal articles (in English or articles translated into English) which were mainly evidence-based and published in peer reviewed journals. In addition searches were made of research theses and professional journals.

A wide variety of search terms were used on their own and in combination. These included young people and offending, young people and moral panics, young people

and disorder, secure estate, custodial interventions, prison interventions, young people and custody, youth custody, young people in prison, community interventions, early intervention, persistent offenders, resettlement and rehabilitation.

In addition to academic and professional materials, a search was made of the grey literature. This included relevant government policies and publications by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice. The Youth Justice Board (YJB) website was an important resource for all practice related documents, which included custody, resettlement and community work. In addition to the YJB website, other practice related websites which were relevant to the study included the Howard League of Penal Reform, National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) and the National Association of Youth Justice (NAYJ).

Given the breadth of possible literature which might be included in the review, it was important to identify literatures most pertinent to the substantive focus of the study as well as the research approach. As from the outset a qualitative design for the study was selected, it was important that the contents of the literature should be the outcome of a reiterative process and be an ongoing project throughout the study, informed by the research questions and emerging themes from the data.

The Review

A key focus of the study was on young offenders and their experiences with the secure estate. Because of this the starting point for this review was societal perceptions of young' people's offending behaviours and implications of these perceptions for the development of policy and practice taking youth offending. Here it was deemed that an historical account of youth offending and societal responses was appropriate and necessary to understand both wider context of attitudes to youth crime as well as perceptions of these behaviours by young offenders themselves.

Young people offending, and moral panics

Public concern in the UK about anti-social behaviour of young people continues to increase (Liddle 1998; Margo 2008). One focus of this concern has been on young people and imprisonment (Howard League for Penal Reform 1999, 2005, Muncie 1999, 2004, 2009; Children's Rights Alliance 2002, Muncie, Hughes, McLaughlin 2002; Smith 2003). Before turning to this literature it is important to explore the broader social context of offending and understanding about anti-social behaviour among young people.

The offending behaviour of young people has been a particular focus of attention since the early 1970's, when the concept of 'moral panics' was first coined by Stanley Cohen (1972). In his seminal text 'Folk Devils and Moral Panics', Cohen (1972, 2002) argued that moral panics emerge when a defined group of people are perceived as posing a problem for the rest of society. The behaviours, which are identified as deviant, become a focus of media interest, and as a result are widely reported. The media focus on the 'problem' behaviour serves to intensify public concern, increase police involvement, exacerbate media interest and impact further on public concern.

The focus of Cohen's research, which is still pertinent today, was on social reaction to youth disturbances. The youth disturbances which Cohen focussed on began at Clacton in 1964 (Cohen 1972). Media interest in these youth disturbances escalated after 'scuffles' broke out between groups of youths on Easter Sunday. During these scuffles, shop windows were broken and beach huts vandalized. The media outrage following these events, culminated in what has been described as an "orgy of sensationalistic news items" highlighting youth violence (Goode and Ben-Yehuda 1994:22).

In focusing on the youth clashes, the media portrayed two easily recognisable rival gangs: 'mods' and 'rockers'. Whereas mods were portrayed in the media as typically middle class, well dressed teenagers riding motor scooters, rockers were portrayed as

tough working class youths (Goode and Ben- Yehuda 1994). However, despite the media 'sensationalism', Cohen (1972) maintained that there was no evidence of structured gangs. Rather, he suggested, the two groups (mods and rockers), were organised around regional identities. He also argued that the level of serious violence or actual damage to properties and businesses was minimal. Notwithstanding this, media emphasis on antagonism between the two groups, encouraged youths to place themselves in one of the two camps, as either a mod or rocker. The media attention helped to define and reinforce group identities; it also served to heighten rivalry, and provoked more clashes between the different groups, which subsequently led to increased news coverage, more police activity and further public concern. Ultimately, the media amplification served to confirm the validity of the original media reaction. As Cohen (1972:204) argues, moral panics arise:

...not because such developments have an inexorable inner logic, but because our society as presently structured will continue to generate problems for some of its members – like working class adolescents – and then condemn whatever solutions they find.

Wider public concern led to increased police surveillance of both groups, which in turn led to more arrests, thus apparently justifying the concern. Moreover, a media emphasis on the antagonism between the two groups contributed to more clashes on subsequent bank holidays.

In essence, moral panics as illustrated by Cohen (1972) can be understood as media, police and public reactions to an event or a circle of events (Muncie 2001). More recently, Scraton (2009a) has described how moral panics are labelled, portrayed and amplified through media and political discourse and how they are represented as posing a threat to social stability and societal values.

The concept of labelling, developed by Becker (1963), underpins understanding of deviance amplification and moral panics. Becker (1963) argued that deviant behaviour

is behaviour that individuals so label, rather than simply the quality of the behaviour per se. Labelling serves not only to identify perpetrators as deviant but may also exacerbate the frequency of the behaviour among those labelled (Batchelor and Burman 2004). Hence, White and Haines (2004) argue, when an individual becomes labelled within the criminal justice system they are perceived as being criminal and may act upon, and live up to, that criminal label. Likewise, Roger Hopkins Burke (2005) have argued that offenders may internalize the label of criminal which can lead to stable or career criminality. Hence, labelling may prompt societal reaction, which in turn isolates the individual and may lead to further deviance/offending. In other words those labelled may alter their behaviours in accordance with their new identity. Indeed as Rock (2007) suggested, the consequences of labelling affect not only how the individual regards him/herself and his/her position in the world, but also how s/he is treated by others.

More recent moral panics surrounding young people include the so-called 'rat boys' of the 1990s (Pitts 2001). 'Rat boys' were juvenile offenders who were portrayed by the media as responsible for committing the majority of offences across England and Wales. The 'rat boy' was epitomised as a youth who made his "neighbours' lives a misery" Pitts (2001:10) and as an "elusive persistent offender who laughed at the system" (Worrall 1999:30). Around the time of the so-called 'rat boys', there were also several serious incidents involving young people which featured as headlines in national newspapers and led to public concern about youth deviance. These included, for example, the abduction and murder of a 15 year old Manchester girl by her school 'friends' and the stabbing of a 12 year old South London boy by a classmate (Pitts 2001).

Most recently moral panics surrounding young men have focussed on gangs, guns and knife crime. Muncie (2009) argued how stabbing incidents and gang warfare were portrayed by the media as routine, following the shooting of 11 year old Rhys Jones in Liverpool in 2007. Contrary to the conveyed prevalence of such incidents, the level of violent crime of this nature remains low. Hence in England and Wales the number of

young people killed in violent crime has ranged between 44 in 1995 to 20 in 2005/06 (Muncie 2009:35).

Research interest in youth deviance encapsulated in the concept of 'moral panics', gained momentum in the 1970s and , up until the early 1990s focussed exclusively upon young males. It was at this time that media attention turned to young women (Worrall 2002), focusing initially on a small group of girls, who reportedly roamed the streets in gangs, attacking members of the public (Gelsthorpe 2005). The activities of these so called 'girl gangs', emerged as a new focus of media concern, in newspapers, magazines and television reporting, to the extent that coverage of female deviancy at the time began to exceed that of boys (Gelsthorpe 2005). While it is beyond the purpose and scope of the current literature review to examine in depth offending behaviour of young women, it is important to note that they have received a different type of media coverage from young men. That is, media coverage has tended to portray 'deviant' young women as acting out of character, contrary to gender expectations, and as exhibiting behaviour which is more typically associated with young men (Worrall 2002). Indeed, increasing coverage of young women adopting masculine attitudes and behaviour, has been described by Muncer et al. (2001) as fuelling perceptions of the 'ladette' culture, whereby young women are perceived as adopting the "hard drinking, swearing, confrontational style" and culture of their working class male counterparts (Muncer et al. 2001:35). Underpinning media reports on the 'masculinisation' of young women's behaviour is a particular discourse which portrays female offenders as unstable or out of control, and their actions as irrational and emotional (Burman 2004: 38). Suffice to note here that this discourse reflects longstanding gendered attitudes and behaviours prevalent within wider society. Hence, gendered behaviours are linked to dominant ideologies which have portrayed women's natural place as in the home, and their responsibilities revolving around culture of domesticity (Batchelor and Burman 2004). Moreover, because female offending steps outside of gender expectations, female criminality has been described as "a form of gender role pathology" (Muncer et al. 2001:33).

Children, deviance and media portrayal

It has been argued that the increasing tendency to label behaviour of children and young people as deviant has had implications for their 'demonization' (Rock 2007). Scraton (2009b:132) described demonization as a process whereby individuals, groups or communities are ascribed "a public, negative reputation associated with pathological malevolence often popularly represented as evil".

A study by Bradford University in June 1979, in which eight national and two local newspapers were scanned, found that 34% of all reporting about children related to youth crime or disorder (Shape Coalition 2003). Twenty years later a MORI (2005) survey indicated that 71% of items about children in the press were negative and approximately a third focused on young people and crime. These figures were cited in the UK Children's Commissioners report 'The Rights of The Child' (2008).

The so-called 'demonization' of children within the media, has led to an image far removed from the traditional portrayal of childhood innocence. Indeed media representation of what Scraton (2009b: 132) has described as "the crisis in childhood", has conveyed children as possessed by the "Satan bug", and labeled them variously as "rat boys, beasts or animals". Accordingly, Goldson (2002) has argued that children have been constructed as icons of evil, and that fears have been fostered about 'them' and 'us'. This process, Goldson (2002) claimed, is reinforced by the exclusionary language used to describe young people; including terms such as 'yob', 'feral', 'ladette', and 'predatory'. Certainly this was no more apparent than in the James Bulger case in 1993 which according to Scraton (2009b:132) transformed the "atypical" into "the stereotypical" and publically signaled the demise of childhood.

The murder of two year old James Bulger, by two 10 year old boys, was conveyed by the media "as the ultimate expression of a pervasive and deepening wave of moral degeneracy and child lawlessness" (Goldson 2009:42). Media coverage of the incident, which included video recordings of the child being led to his death, threw in to stark

relief the concept of childhood as innocent on the one hand and children as inherently evil on the other. Moreover, as Muncie (2009:7) noted:

In a climate of general anxiety about crime, the exceptional murder of an infant by two boys, barely at the age of criminal responsibility themselves, was viewed as symptomatic of a prevailing youth crime wave, even though they bore no obvious relation to each other.

Hence, the Bulger case signified more than an isolated event. It effectively exacerbated public fears about juvenile crime in particular, and contributed to moral panic about the demonization of young people in general.

Awareness of the negative stereotyping of young people is widespread. The Chief Executive of Barnardos, and ex-head of the Prison Service, for example, accused the media of producing a constant stream of negative images of, for example, young people in 'hoodies' lurking on street corners, and thugs, louts and yobbos running amok in communities (Narey 2007).

This perception of British youth is not confined to the UK, but has been reproduced in America, for example, by Time magazine on 26 March 2008 which reported the most important issue facing Britain as "the scourge of feral youngsters" (Mayer 2008:2). In the UK, these portrayals of youth received little political resistance. When, for example, the Secretary of State for Justice was asked what he might do to reduce the trend of demonizing young people, he responded:

These are not children, they are often large unpleasant thugs
(Hansard, 10 June 2008).

It is perhaps not surprising therefore that young people's perception of their demonization has also been evidenced (Wisniewska et al. 2006). Certainly, the negative

portrayal of young people, and reasons for this, have not gone unchallenged. Indeed, in 2007 an ex-board member of the Youth Justice Board called for an overhaul of the youth justice system, perceiving it as having a 'demonising' effect on vulnerable young people (Allen 2006).

The tendency to label and demonise youth has also been criticised for directing responsibility and blame towards children, for committing offences, rather than towards adults or professional agencies, with whom the young people are involved (Cross et al. 2003). Indeed, this tendency has led Cross et al. (2003) to argue that children should be treated as children, and not be made responsible for consequences which may be beyond their control.

An important aspect of media portrayal of, and public perception about, young people is the responses which it provokes from those state institutions in the business of surveillance, containment and regulation (Scraton 2009a). Before outlining these responses, in a later section of the chapter, the review now turns to an exploration of factors associated with offending behaviour among young people. This is important because, as we shall see, in order to address young people's future offending behaviour an understanding of factors associated with its onset has been posited as necessary. The following section therefore examines issues of risk and desistance related to offending among young people.

Risk factors and offending behaviour

The concept of risk has become increasingly influential (among academics and policy makers) in understanding youth offending and in the development of youth justice interventions (NACRO 2006a; Kemshall 2008a, 2008b; Haines and Case 2008; O'Mahony 2009). In this section, risk factors associated with offending and prevention of offending and re-offending, highlighted in the literature, are explored.

In adults, risk of initial imprisonment has been associated with unemployment. Unemployment levels are high among (particularly male) prisoners prior to their imprisonment (Lewis et al. 2003). Social Inclusion Unit (SEU) statistics have indicated that 62% of adult males, who served short-sentences following drug misuse, had spent more time unemployed than in work during their working lives (Social Exclusion Unit [SEU] 2002). Furthermore, 58% only had experience of casual or short-term jobs. Prior unemployment among prisoners has been linked to a lack of qualifications, with 52% of males and 71% of female adult prisoners having no qualifications (SEU 2002). A lack of qualifications has been associated with past negative school experiences such as truanting, absenteeism and exclusions (Liddle 1998). SEU (2002) statistics indicated that 30% of prisoners regularly truanted from school, and that 85% of those serving short sentences for drugs misuse, had truanted. Moreover, the SEU (2002) reported that 49% of male sentenced prisoners were excluded from school. Prisoners tend to be deficient not only in qualifications, but also basic skills required for 96% of all jobs (SEU 2002). Research indicates that thinking, reading, numeracy and writing skills among prisoners are poor and the reading level of half of all prisoners is equal to or below, Level 1, which is the level expected of an 11-year-old child (Lewis et al. 2003). Children learn basic skills early in life and the consequences of not learning these skills have implications for life chances in adulthood. Hence, poor literacy and numeracy skills have been associated with increased risk of offending (Parsons 2002).

Whilst youth offending rates tend to rise and fall with adult offending rates (Stevens et al. 2006), there are a number of risk factors that are particularly associated with the likelihood of offending behaviour in young people (Liddle 1998). These include: having a parent, siblings or peers who offend (West 1982; Graham and Bowling 1995); poor relations with parents (Boswell 1995; Margo 2008) or unstable living conditions (Liddle 1998); aggressive behaviour in childhood (Farrington 1996); socialising with peers in disadvantaged, high-crime areas with lack of intervention via youth activities (Goodman and Butler 1986); lack of extra-curricular activities or having nothing to do locally (Margo 2008); regular unsupervised socialising with anti-social young people (Goodman and

Butler 1986); spending more time with peers than parents (Margo 2008); and truanting or being expelled from school (Graham and Bowling 1995).

The following section looks at early approaches to, youth offending, in order to explore theoretical development of understanding about young people and their offending behaviours.

Explanations of Youth Offending

The 18th and 19th century saw the emergence of scientifically informed understandings of what were perceived as socially problematic behaviours. At first these comprised a range of physical/biological explanations. It was not until later, that psychological and social explanations of individual behaviour emerged (McGuire 2000). The probation service from its inception in 1907 up until the mid 1970s was particularly influential in informing understandings of offending and offenders (Farrow et al. 2007). Understandings derived from early probation work (1940s to 1970s) with adult offenders, led criminologists during this period to perceive offenders as different from others, and offending as symptomatic of personal characteristics or traits that could be treated (Newburn 2007). As a result, offenders were perceived to be in need of psychological 'treatment', which might provide insight into why they behaved as they did, and subsequently following the appropriate psycho-dynamic casework behaviour change could take place (Newburn 2007).

In the mid 1970s, American criminologist Robert Martinson undertook a review of interventions designed to tackle and reduce offending behaviour (Martinson 1974). The review was based on 231 evaluations of different offending programmes/interventions conducted between 1945 and 1967. These interventions included group therapy, intensive supervision, psychotherapy, educational approaches and medical interventions. The review concluded that no single method or approach effected difference to the level of offending, leading to what became known as the 'nothing works' philosophy (Martinson 1974). Despite challenges to the review findings, during

the subsequent decade, the 'nothing works' philosophy had a significant negative effect on practice. Criminal justice practitioners felt undermined by this 'nothing works' declaration and questioned values, methods, roles and even rehabilitation more generally (Farrow et al. 2007).

At this time, a highly influential body of work was being undertaken in Canada. In 1987 Gendreau and Ross (1987) reported on their meta-analysis of rehabilitative studies (mainly community based in Canada and North America) conducted between 1981 and 1987. They concluded that some approaches were successful in preventing and reducing offending (Gendreau and Ross 1987). While there were wide variations in potential factors affecting future offending behaviour, there were also identifiable features of programmes that appeared to impact on and reduce recidivism. These findings, which became known as 'what works' served to reassure academics, and practitioners alike, that some interventions do work and that targeted offence focussed cognitive-behavioural approaches could if carried out correctly, be successful (Newburn 2007).

The 'what works' philosophy was used by practitioners to challenge the notion of 'nothing works' and rediscover effective ways of working with offenders (Farrow et al. 2007). During the 1990s, principles of effective evidence based practice began to emerge, and these were subsequently employed to guide practice (Stephenson et al. 2007). While adoption of 'what works' became central to probation practice, it was not until the formation of the Youth Justice Board in 2000, that the identification and application of effective practice became integral to youth justice. The YJB commissioned research to all the intervention programmes it developed in order to monitor effectiveness and build up a credible evidence base (Stephenson et al. 2007). Certainly, the Youth Justice Board has sought to ensure that practitioners employ interventions with validated outcomes. The YJB aimed to increase the effectiveness of interventions with young people through the utilisation and development of professional practice underpinned by research evidence.

Cognitive behavioural Approaches

Notwithstanding this, in terms of interventions which tackle offending behaviour committed by young people within custodial and community settings, the evidence base is thin. While there has been substantial evaluation of health initiatives in custody and the community, including mental health evaluation (Tunnard, Ryan and Kurtz 2005), there has been limited research, evaluating offending intervention programmes for young people (Douglas and Plugge 2006; Moony, Stratham and Storey 2007 and WAG 2009).

Systematic reviews of interventions tackling offending behaviour indicate that they have tended to rely on cognitive-behavioural therapy, which are often informed by North American approaches and based upon work carried out with adults. They also tend to comprise self-contained correctional interventions which are more amenable to assessment than wider multi-agency community-based or national level approaches (Maruna and Liddle 2007).

Cognitive-behavioural approaches are based on the theory that the way in which individuals think will in part determine the way in which they will act. It is an approach used by psychologists for the treatment of those with cognitive deficits to challenge attitudes, values and beliefs, thereby assisting individuals to change their thought processes and subsequently their behaviour (McGuire 2000).

The evidence of success, however, is variable (HO 2005). Some cognitive behavioural approaches that include role-play, positive reinforcement and modification of dysfunctional attitudes, values and beliefs have shown positive results for young people (Vennard and Hedderman 1998). However, generally, whereas cognitive-behavioural therapy programmes appear to do well in North American evaluations, in the UK the evidence regarding their effectiveness has been described as limited (Cann et al. 2003;

Falshaw et al. 2003; Harper and Chitty 2005; Hollin 2008). A systematic review of the evidence indicated no difference in re-offending rates of adults or young offenders in England and Wales who underwent Accredited Enhanced Thinking Skills and Reasoning and Rehabilitation programmes, in re-offending rates between those participating in a prison based programme and a comparison group (Cann et al. 2003). Nacro (2006b) reported that completion rates of young people referred to such programmes between 1999 and 2001 (during which time many were Youth Justice Board funded) was less than half, with high re-offending rates (71%). Moreover, the evaluators were unable to determine the independent effectiveness of cognitive behavioural elements of interventions.

However, it is noted that in both international and national research, that those who complete intervention programmes tend to do better than non-starters, non-completers and comparison groups, and that those who start and fail to complete do much worse than the other groups (see for example; Feilzer et al. 2002; Cann et al. 2003, Van Voorhis et al. 2004). Notwithstanding this, there is some evidence that these types of interventions tend to have a short-lived impact on reconviction (Farrington et al. 2002). However, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural programmes due to the limited longitudinal studies and concerns whether the interventions adopted in the UK have appropriately targeted suitable offenders and delivered programmes according to 'what works' principles.

While cognitive behaviour therapies still maintain credibility, explanations of youth offending have broadened to include social factors, and this, as we shall see, has implications for tackling the problem. The following section focuses upon development of understandings about desistance from crime.

Theories of Desistance

While community interventions may be questioned in terms of reducing crime the levels of re-offending following release from custody are high, with approximately two thirds of prisoners reoffending (Wood 2008). Following the release from custody many individuals face difficulties finding accommodation and employment and also struggle with substance misuse problems (GLARG 2000). If these difficulties are not resolved in prison the risk of reoffending and re-imprisonment is increased (Wood 2008). Moreover, those who have been in prison, often experience the same problems upon release that led to their incarceration in the first place.

The discussion about 'what works' regarding the prevention of re-offending, has been more influential than the theories of desistance from offending which has had a more muted impact on criminal justice social work policy and practice (McGuire 1995; McNeill 2002). In comparison to the meta analysis based 'what works' approach that focuses upon the prevention of re-offending, desistance research looks more at how desistance from crime is possible for some ex-offenders, acknowledging the complex nature of individual criminal lives (McNeill 2002).

Desistance to offending has been linked to factors which are largely the obverse of those implicated in the onset of offending. Hence, substance use cessation, receiving education, employment, development of personal relationships, victim awareness and thinking skills all have been highlighted for the potential protection they may offer against the likelihood to reoffending (Graham and Bowling 1995).

Desistance is the process which offenders go through when 'going straight' and avoiding future criminal activity (Maruna et al. 2004). Maruna (2000) identified three theoretical perspectives relating to desistance. These were maturational reform, social

bonding and narrative theories. Developmental and maturational reform theories link age, or life course stage (and related variables such as biological change and social development) with specific criminal behaviours (Maruna 1999). There is a common understanding among both criminologists and practitioners that most young people as they mature, will desist from committing crime. By the age of 25, most of those who have embarked on criminal careers have desisted. However, it is noted that males, whose offending is far more entrenched, typically do not desist until they are much older (Farrington 1997). Male offenders typically cease to offend at about the same time they embark on the processes associated with family formation and (re)enter stable employment (Farrall and Bowling 1999; Laub and Sampson 2001; Farrall 2002). While there is evidence about maturation and changes, there is less understanding about why and how these changes take place (Maruna 1999).

One problem with maturation approaches is that they tend to homogenize offenders. Research, however, attests to differences between offenders and particularly regarding their career commitments to crime (McNeill & Batchelor 2004). For example, offenders designated as a low risk of becoming career criminals are perceived as less appropriate for some types of interventions. For this purpose it is useful to distinguish those young people understood as persistent offenders (McNeill and Batchelor 2004). Most young people are what Millham (1993) describes as 'temporary delinquents'. That is, offending is 'a transitory phenomenon linked to their social development' (Jamieson et al. 1999: 156). For example Graham and Bowling (1995) in their study of 14-25 year olds in England and Wales, found that 55 per cent of males and 31 per cent of females admitted having committed a crime at some time. Two-thirds of the young people in Anderson et al's (1994) study reported that they had committed an offence, compared to 94 per cent of boys and 82 per cent of girls in Jamieson et al's more recent research (1999). It should be noted here, however, most research findings on youth offending are achieved through self-report research studies involving young people.

Reaching a definition of who constitutes a persistent young offender has been a source of much debate (Hagell and Newburn 1994). According to Whyte (2009), in England

and Wales, a persistent young offender is usually one who has been sentenced by a UK criminal court on three or more occasions for one or more recordable offences, and ranging from three months to three years of the last sentencing occasion where the young person is subsequently arrested, or is accused of another offence.

Longitudinal studies of crime in the life course (e.g. Farrington and West 1993) indicate a wide range of adult outcomes for young offenders, with far greater diversity in the ages of desistance than in the ages of onset of criminal behaviour. Hence, Maruna (1999) argues that any theory relying solely on age alone or on a single, normative pattern of development, to explain desistance cannot explain the differences in developmental pathways. Indeed, McNeill and Batchelor (2004:65) have argued that interventions with young people “must be grounded, strategically and practically, in an understanding of the wider social context both of offending and of desistance”.

The social bonding theory identified by Maruna (1999) as a force for desistance highlights the importance of bonding, through, for example, family, employment and education. Here, a lack of social bonds are argued to increase the likelihood of continuance with involvement in criminal activity (Maruna 1999). Notably, the social bonding theory of desistance links to social capital (Farrall 2002 and Gadd and Farrall 2004). Explanations about desistance in the context of social capital assume particular relevance to the study reported here. This is because young people in the secure estate may be understood as a particularly marginalised and excluded group. Moreover in rehabilitation terms it may be argued that in assisting these young people to desist from crime will necessarily involve tackling aspects of their prior experiences associated with disadvantaged lives. Because of this it is to the issue of social capital that the chapter now turns.

Social Capital

Given the wide range of contextual factors which have been linked to offending and reoffending, it is not surprising that social capital has been identified as a useful concept in understanding offending behaviour. Here, it has been argued that social capital, social exclusion and social networks are important factors in risk decision making (Kemshall 2008b). Kemshall (2008b) suggests that the implications of these extend beyond mere social factors, and include issues of power, opportunity and constraint. The association of risk and social capital with young people's offending has been researched in some depth by Boeck et al. (2006) and Kemshall et al. (2008b). Indeed, it has been suggested that the association between risk and social capital derives from the dual premise that social capital promotes "positive outcomes and reduces risk, and that risk decisions are often made in groups/social networks" (Case and Haines 2009: 142). Before turning to some implications of this wider understanding of risk, it is important to briefly outline some of the tenets of social capital.

There are many definitions of social capital, which has led to some confusion with the concept (see Harper 2001). Social capital has been compared to economic capital. While economic capital may be understood as monetary investments with expected future profitable returns, social capital involves advantages conferred by social and community integration and the implications for the future prospects of communities and their members (Ferlander 2007). Social capital can be understood loosely as a range of different resources, bonds and networks available to different individuals and communities (Muncie 2009). Some authors writing on social capital have focussed attention almost exclusively on the community. These authors highlight the importance of individual investment in, and commitment and attachment to, local communities and the key role of social networks both within and outside of the community (Case and Haines 2009). Other writers, including Putman (2000) have highlighted the imperative of

social networks, focusing on connections between individuals/groups, reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. It has been argued that as these connections or networks become embedded they form structural aspects of social capital (Ferlander 2007).

The cornerstones of social capital (norms, networks, trust, and reciprocity) have had a long and distinguished history in sociology, and over the last two decades there has been a renewed interest in these concepts (Leonard 2008). Recently, research has focused on the 'inclusive and exclusive effects' of social capital networks (Leonard 2008: 224). Inclusive social capital networks comprise family, friends and associates, while exclusive social networks refer to the wider social context in which communities reside (Woolcock 2001). It has been argued that levels of social capital in contemporary society have been eroded in respect of both inclusive networks (with the breakdown of family and community) and exclusive networks (signalled by impoverished democracy and social breakdown) (Putnam 2000; Edwards 2003).

It is important to differentiate between three different forms of social capital. These are 'bonding', 'bridging' and 'linking' social capital' (see Harper 2001; Woolcock 2001; Ferlander 2007). Bonding social capital (which links in with Maruna's theory of bonding and desistance) consists of the strong connections among groups of individuals with similar values, interests and backgrounds. As Gadd and Farrall (2004:126) have suggested, social capital may cultivate "informal control through an interlocking network of social bonds". This includes, for example, bonds between individuals, their families and closest friends (Webster 2006). Farrall (2002) has argued that social capital is key in encouraging offenders to desist from criminal activity.

Bonding social capital, which is associated with homogeneous populations, is often associated with poorer communities (Webster 2006; Leonard 2008). However, it has been argued that this form of social capital is narrow, tending to benefit internal members only, which may restrict access to alternative external opportunities (Webster 2006; Leonard 2008). Moreover, it has been suggested that these limited networks may

have implications for young people's outlook in life and their perceptions of self-efficacy (Kemshall 2008b).

Bridging social capital relates to the connections with social groups beyond the individuals immediate circle of family and friends (Webster 2006). While these are understood as weaker, less intense attachments, they may offer more life chances and opportunities than those of the bonding type (Crawford 2007). Linking social capital refers to the connections made by individuals to those beyond their immediate communities, thus linking individuals and communities to sources of power and resources located beyond the neighbourhood (Crawford 2007). These connections have implications for access to education, training and employment opportunities (Webster 2006).

The different forms of social capital all relate to the world of social order in mutually reinforcing, but also competing manners (Crawford 2007). Moreover, the potential gains from these networks may be both advantages and disadvantageous. While social capital may promote the importance of a strong community and operate like social glue in fostering integration, cohesion and order, it may equally support and sustain deviant subcultures. In other words, the 'right sort' of social capital, may be transformed into social capital of the 'wrong sort' (Webster et al. 2006:14).

To reiterate, associations have been posited between risk behaviours and social capital (See Boeck et al. 2006 and Kemshall 2006). Here, social capital is not, however, treated as another risk or resilience factor but as the context in which young people make decisions about risk, and how they navigate in and out of crime pathways (Boeck et al. 2006). It has been assumed that increases in crime since the 1960's are attributable to the breakdown in what are understood as traditional social ties (Crawford 2007). As Stephenson et al. (2007) have noted, however, crime is not equally distributed across communities, with approximately 40 per cent of youth crime taking place in 10 percent of neighbourhoods. It is in these neighbourhoods where social capital, community integration and social order are most in decline. However, this is not a new discovery. In

the late 1990's Hagan and McCarthy's (1998) research on youth crime and homelessness, found that unemployed and disrupted families provided limited social capital for children which had implications for their success in reaching cultural goals. It has been argued that young people who offend are typically constrained within the limitations of bonding social capital, and thus their socio economic opportunities are linked to social networks limited to families and friends (Case and Haines 2009). Moreover, social networks used by recurrent offenders and/or dependent drug users may become disrupted through their regular incarceration (Webster et al. 2006).

It has been generally understood that social exclusion can be addressed through the development of social capital, which will also assist in diminishing crime and anti- social behaviour (Hancock 2006). However, in practice, such understanding seldom provides direction for practitioners on how to build social capital or how social integration can be used to assist young people in desisting from crime (Whyte 2004). Kemshall (2006) has argued that social capital is a resource influencing the negotiation of pathways by young people, into or away from crime. Here, the concepts of risk stagnation and risk navigation have been applied to the different pathways available to young people (Boeck et al. 2006; Kemshall 2006). These two concepts, and associated pathways, were identified in Boeck et al's (2006) study which involved 589 young people from the midlands area. The study recruited young people, from a cross section of society, through schools, youth clubs, Youth Offending Teams (YOTS) and Youth Inclusion Partnerships (YIPS). The study findings indicated that young people from YOTs and YIPs demonstrated an unwillingness and defeatist approach to their lives and to risk. These young people, who attached themselves to the strong bonds associated with their social networks and local community and appeared unable to move away from this lifestyle, were identified as "risk stagnation" (Boeck et al. 2006). For these young people, Boeck et al. (2006) argued leaving their present high risk and crime lifestyles constituted a risk which they were ill equipped to take. The research also identified a contrasting group of young people, who appeared able to access and participate in a diverse and wide range of active social networks within the wider community and beyond. These young people, designated as risk navigators, appeared competent in

navigating risks, managing life transitions, and taking the risks associated with leaving problematic situations (Boeck et al. 2006).

It has been argued that knowledge and (personal and social) skill development are important to enable young people to optimize their access to opportunities (Whyte 2004). Moreover, if young people are competent and able to access more diverse networks and opportunities this, it is suggested, may enable increased holistic skills and future opportunities for change (Kemshall 2006). Re-emphasising the importance of social context in understandings about risk of offending, it has been argued that tools to assess this must thus encompass a broad definition of risk which includes the wider social contexts which young people inhabit (Webster et al. 2006). This broad interpretation of risk factors, which includes protective behaviours, has shifted the focus from a socially exclusive model towards a holistic approach with the “potential to inform socially inclusive, empowering interventions” (Case 2007:101). Hence, recent research in the UK context suggests that a move away from the American model to a holistic, multi-faceted approach (involving for example job training and education) may prove most effective in assisting young offenders to desist from crime (Francis et al. 2008). Indeed, Webster et al. (2006) have questioned the predictability of criminality and the assessment devices which have been by practitioners to assess the risk of further offending. They have suggested more attention should be paid to contextual and neighbourhood influences and have stressed the importance of the socio-economic contexts to which young people are bound, when tackling offending behaviour (Webster et al. 2006)

The types of skills associated which potentially assist young people to acquire social opportunities and forge social bonds have been described as human and/or cultural capital (Harper 2001). Whereas human capital is typically measured against an individual’s skills, qualifications and knowledge, cultural capital is an entity which may be accrued over time through association with cultural experiences. Bourdieu (1984) describes cultural capital as representing the collection of non-economic forces, such as family background, investment and commitment to education and a range of other

resources. Cultural capital, he argues, is not evenly distributed in society, but weighted in favour of the dominant social classes. Dominant (or 'high') culture is reproduced through the medium of 'habitus' which is the structure of dispositions, schemas of classification, rules and expectations which dispose individuals to particular choices and action (Slater 1997). In this way cultural capital, which becomes a marker for social class, regulates and reproduces existing social relations. Moreover, as Leonard (2008:226) argues, "economically privileged individuals have the financial resources to fund the development of cultural capital".

It is arguable that social bonding theories, and indeed social capital, are in many respects deterministic in that they exercise external control over individuals (Farrall and Bowling 1999). However, most social theorists argue that experiences which can lead to desistance from crime can often be partially under the control of the individual. Such as, for example, entering employment or finding a partner (Maruna 1999). Matza (1964) has argued most young offenders are caught somewhere in between the social bonds of adulthood and deviant peer subcultures, without a deep attachment to either. Once adolescence has ended, and adult roles become available, therefore, the majority of young people may move more easily away from their weak association with crime, assuming they are able, and have access to, the social bonds of adulthood.

Trasler (1979) and Sampson and Laub (1993) also described turning points that could redirect a person's life path away from deviancy. As they age, it has been argued, most young men find new sources of achievement and social satisfaction (such jobs, partners, home, children) and consequently become less dependent upon peer-group support (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990). Arguably, those who lack these bonds are more likely to stay involved in criminal behaviour because they are not subject to the same social sanctions. Hence, the stronger the tie to society the more likely a person is to desist from criminal behaviour (Pezzin 1995). However, it has been noted that desistance depends upon not only the existence of social attachments, but also upon on the strength, quality and interdependence of these ties (West 1982). It should also be noted that the sources of achievement identified by Sampson and Laub in 1993 may not

be so relevant in contemporary society where there are arguably fewer such opportunities for young people.

To reiterate, it has been suggested that social bonding theories alone are inadequate to understand desistance because they tend to portray individual behaviour as largely determined by external (social) factors (Farrall and Bowling 1999). As, Farrall and Bowling (1999) have pointed out, a wide range of factors (including rational calculations, emotions, and impulses) may contribute to the process of 'going straight'. They have argued that individuals usually make purposive choices to change (for example to find work or get married). Moreover, if the social bonds forged through these behaviours sustain desistance, they argue that it is necessary to grasp the internal process involved in staying married or continuing to work, in order to understand how individuals can give up crime.

The balance between the importance of social context and the choices which are made by individuals is illustrated well in Graham and Bowling's (1995) study of young people (aged 14-25) and desistance from offending. Here Graham and Bowling (1995) reported gender differences in desistance. That is, whereas there was a clear link between the transition from adolescence to adulthood and desistance among young women, this did not hold true for young men. Not only were young men less likely to achieve independence than young women, those that did leave home, formed partnerships and had children, were no more likely to desist than those that did not. On this finding, Graham and Bowling (1995) speculated that while life offered opportunities for change, the realisation of that happening was contingent, and that males might be less inclined to take advantage of such opportunities, as females. More recent studies have suggested that the changes do occur for young men, but they take longer to have impact (see for example Farrall and Bowling 1999 and Flood-Page et al. 2000). In Graham and Bowling's (1995) study the two factors positively associated with desistance among males in the 16-25 age range were, their perception that their school work was above average, and continuing to live at home. As noted by (McNeil 2002), continuing to live at home may be associated with desistance because of relatively

positive relationships with parents and, linked to this, spending less time with delinquent peers.

The approach to desistance in which the individual is primarily understood as an active agent in the construction of his/her own destiny is narrative theory. Narrative theories of desistance posit that the individual's increased sense of self worth, self identity, motivation to change and a consideration for others will enhance the likelihood of desistance from crime (Maruna 2000). From a narrative perspective of desistance, individuals integrate their pasts, presents and perceived futures as an ongoing and evolving construction, through which personal identity, which sustains and guides behavior is internalized (McAdams 1994; Maruna 1999). This is quite different from more static explanations offered, for example, by the study of personality traits. Indeed, within narrative understandings, individuals are active agents, involved in creating and sustaining their identities in a reflexive way (Giddens 1991). In contrast to developmental theory, where individuals move through sequential life course stages, narrative theorists understand identity as a life-long project. This project is continuously revised and restructured in light of new information and experiences (McAdams 1994; Maruna 1999).

Understanding of the individual as an active agent means that narrative theory offers a model of intentional and purposeful human behaviour. From this perspective, when individuals desist from crime, they act as agents of change in accordance with their own pre-existing and emerging ambitions (Toch 1987; Adams 1997). Hence individuals must restructure their understandings of self in order to successfully desist from crime. As Maruna (1999) points out, electing to give up crime is vastly different, and more proactive, than mere desistance from crime. He argues that individuals can choose not to take part in particular activities (like starting a fight or having a cigarette), but this not necessarily a permanent change. They might start fighting or resume smoking again, almost immediately. Maruna (1999) argues that abstinence from crime involves more than making a choice. Like many smokers who routinely quit smoking, offenders may decide to 'go straight' (for quite rational reasons) many times during the course of their

criminal career, but then re-offend. They may decide to abstain for rational reasons but may return to offending for perceived contextual or situational reasons (Shover 1993; Maruna 1999). Because of this, exploring individual narratives can assist our understanding of the arguably less 'rational' decisions which young people make.

Given the focus of the study presented here was on perceptions of an intervention within the secure estate, the literature on reintegration was deemed particularly pertinent to this review.

Re-integration

To reiterate, the literature indicates that repeat offenders typically face a variety of social problems, including addiction, mental health problems, lack of skills and poor employment records (Kemshall 2008b). Thus interventions addressing these multiple needs are arguably most likely to be effective in overcoming the multiple disadvantages in young offenders' lives and assist them desisting from lives of criminality. Accordingly, concepts of risk, which gained currency in terms of tackling youth offending have moved from narrow 'socially exclusive' models of risk to inform more holistic, or inclusive, approaches (Case 2007; Haines and Case 2008; O'Mahony 2009). In a review of offender rehabilitation, Andrews et al. (1990) argued that overall the inclusive type of initiatives appeared more successful. While their review was criticized for excluding what the authors deemed to be inappropriate studies (Logan and Gaes 1993), the influential 'Maryland Report' "Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't" concluded that rehabilitation of offenders was most effective where interventions used multiple treatment components and focused on developing skills (social skills, academic and employment skills) as well as using behavioural (including cognitive-behavioural) methods (Lawrence et al. 1998).

Indeed, evidence from a number of studies attests to the importance of approaches focusing on educational ability and skill development. In one study, for example, ex-

prisoners with poor educational attainment, and those who had not taken part in education or training while in prison, were three times more likely to be reconvicted than those who had participated (Clark 2001). Indeed, participation in basic skills has been linked in Canadian research to a 12% reduction in re-offending (Porporino and Robinson 1992). Moreover, educational ability and oral skills have been highlighted as key to understanding what works and what does not regarding offending interventions delivered to young people in both community and custodial settings (Hayward et al. 2004). The benefits associated by participants in custody with initiatives aimed at rehabilitation include increased skills, self confidence, motivation, a work ethic and a sense of responsibility (Hunter and Boyce 2009).

Those factors argued to reduce the impact of interventions include: failure to acknowledge the (positive or negative) influence of young people's significant others, failure to tackle multiple problems presented by persistent and serious young offenders, (including poor mental health and drug and alcohol abuse), and inadequate length or strength of programmes to support young people to make sustainable changes (Hagell and Newburn 1994).

Finally, while assessment of young offenders continues to improve, it is argued that these risk factors can never be wholly predictive of actual behaviours for particular individuals or clusters of young people, nor are proven and customised solutions available 'on the shelf' to be straightforwardly connected (Baker 2007). Moreover, it has been suggested that the focus on social exclusion has done little to boost young offender's sense of social worth, or indeed change their material circumstances. Instead, it has been argued, young people may have been encouraged to understand exclusion as a function of their own deficiencies (Gray 2007).

Desisting from offending behaviour is understood as a complex and lengthy process susceptible to reversals and relapses, and should not be understood as a singular 'event' but rather as an on-going 'zig-zag' progression (Burnett 2004). Hence, tackling offending is understood as a long-term process, and participation in programmes whilst

in custody have been presented as only part of the rehabilitation process (Harper and Chitty 2005). Moreover, evaluation of interventions is difficult because studies often focus on change in the short term and are unable to capture long term effects. In addition, outcome measures against which the success of programmes are measured may not capture adequately unintended benefits (Nichols and Crow 2004). For example, in an evaluation of a custody based intervention which aimed to prepare and support prisoners for employment upon release, participants highlighted benefits of the programme as self confidence, motivation, development of a work ethic and a sense of responsibility as well as increased skills (Hunter and Boyce 2009).

Given the difficulties that prisoners experience both prior to imprisonment and following their release, preparation for and support following release is important for their rehabilitation (Tittley 1999). According to GLARG (2000) few short-term prisoners have adequate preparations made for their release. Moreover, individuals who have been in prison before frequently experience the same problems each time they are released (GLARG 2000). Indeed, access to pre-release courses was found to be patchy and many prisoners were discharged with little idea what was happening to them and no access to support and advice (GLARG 2000) (see also NACRO 2005; Maguire and Raynor 2006). Contact and supervision with Probation Officer, Social Worker or Youth Offending Team Officer is crucial once prisoners have been released from custody and is an important feature in their rehabilitation. Maguire and Raynor (1997) noted that one fifth of prisoners claimed that post-release supervision had some influence in preventing them from re-offending.

In their Liverpool Desistance Study, Maruna et al. (2004) sought understanding of reform processes in which ex prisoners, might engage as they re-integrated back in to the community. The study involved two participant groups: those who were desisting from offending and those who were persisting. Based on the findings of the study, the researchers suggested ex offenders should be encouraged to participate in the community, and that probation workers should draw on and emphasise strengths and talents of their clients, rather than focussing on narrow determinations of risk. Reflecting

on the study findings, McNeill (2004) concludes that practitioners might usefully reflect on the importance of verbal messages which are relayed to those on probation, and the way in which these are delivered.

Findings from an earlier study carried out by Farrall (2002) which explored the progress or lack of progress towards desistance achieved by a group of 199 probationers, goes some way to supporting these findings. Over half of Farrall's sample evidenced progress towards desistance. Farrall found that desistance could be attributed to specific interventions by the probation officer in only a few cases, although help with finding work and mending damaged family relationships appeared particularly important. Desistance seemed to relate more clearly to the probationers' motivations and to the social and personal contexts in which various obstacles to desistance were addressed

The focus of the study which is described in this thesis was primarily on participant perceptions of a specific intervention (the DofE) within the secure estate. In order to understand how this intervention maps on to broader youth offending policy and practice the review turns to consideration of Government responses to the problem of youth offending in the England and Wales. Given that a key theme arising from the study fieldwork was the importance, to participants, of the rehabilitative aspects of the DofE programme, the following section focuses primarily on current policy and practice most associated with rehabilitation of young offenders.

Government responses to youth offending

Despite media and public concern, the high level of fear about youth crime in the UK, particularly violent crime, is disproportionate to the actual risk. The percentage of young offenders reportedly re-offending decreased from 40.2% in 2000 to 38.7% in 2006 (Ministry of Justice 2008a). This statistic is based on results from monitoring of juvenile offenders born in six birth cohorts (1953, 1958, 1963, 1973 and 1978) which indicated a notable decline in offending (resulting in a court conviction or disposal) among the 10-15 age group, particularly in later birth cohorts. The actual number of offences the cohorts

produced (as a conviction at court or out of court disposal) fell from 62,344 to 60,245. This was in spite of an increase in the cohort from 41,176 young people in 2000 to 48,938 in 2006. This suggests that, overall, those who did re-offend, committed fewer offences than previously. Convictions for serious offences (serious violence and sexual offences) by young people, comprised 375 in 2000 and 407 in 2006 (Ministry of Justice 2008a). Given the increased number of offenders in the 2006 cohort this represents, proportionately, a fall of 8.7% in respect of the most serious offences. The Ministry of Justice (2008a:8) reports that these offences were committed typically by individuals who had not previously committed an offence classified as serious (94% in the 2006 cohort). These decreases, according to Soothill et al. (2006), were partly a function of offender management strategies developed over the previous 20 years, which have diverted crimes of less seriousness away from the courts.

This diversion has led to a rise in the number of young people appearing before the courts, whose pattern of offending is prolific and varied, and likely to include violence as well as drug-related offences. Ironically, that cases appearing before the court are now more likely to involve relatively serious offences, has fuelled public perception that crime is worsening (Soothill 2007; Soothill et al. 2007).

Government responses to youth crime were no more evident than during the first half of the 1990s, particularly following the Bulger murder. It was at this time that politicians promised more repressive youth justice policies and offered assurances that “they would reinstall discipline, decency, standards and orders” (Goldson 2009:42). Public concern about crime and young people in the early 1990s was exacerbated because, due to their age, perpetrators could not be imprisoned (Worrall 1999). In response to growing public opinion/pressure, the then Conservative Government, under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, introduced Secure Training Centres for children between the ages of 12 to 14. This Act, which effectively lowered the age at which children and young people could be imprisoned within the UK, provided specifically for those children committing serious offences who were too young to be sent to young offender institutions. With the legalising of imprisonment for the younger age range of

children and young people, there came a noticeable change in the official attitudes towards juvenile offending, described by Brown (1998:7) as a “new era of authoritarian and punitive penal populism”. To reiterate, the increased use of custody and tougher sentences since the 1990’s has fuelled concern about, and fear surrounding, young people’s behaviour (Liddle 1998; Muncie 2001; Margo 2008).

The youth justice environment has undergone continuous change and development since the Crime and Disorder Act in 1998. Here, it is worth reflecting that the youth justice system has moved away from one which was barely regulated with little guidance and no common standards or objectives, to one which is very prescriptive in the way in which it is required to operate. The new centralised, corporate and managerial approach to youth justice, however, is not without its critics. Muncie (2009) observes that current debate surrounding youth justice is not so much about welfare or punishment, but more about developing a cost effective and efficient way of managing children and young people who commit crime.

According to some authors, this approach, which is described as ‘managerialism’, does not sit comfortably with the imperatives of individual need, rehabilitation, and reformation (see for example Muncie 2009). Indeed critics argue that the latter considerations have been supplanted by a focus on risk (classification and assessment) and how to manage resources to best effect (Muncie 2004; Smith 2003).

Perhaps the most contentious Government response to young people and social disorder, which has grabbed media, and thus public attention, was the introduction of the Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO).

ASBOs

Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, as outlined in Section 1 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (Home Office 1998), are described by the Home Office (2010) as court orders which forbid specific threatening or intimidating actions. ASBO’s can be used to ban

individuals from threatening, intimidating or disruptive actions; spending time with a particular group of friends; or visiting specific areas. While ASBOs are civil orders, lasting for a minimum of two years, any breach of an ASBO constitutes a criminal offence which can be tried by the Magistrates or Crown Court.

In the early stages of the development of the ASBO, the use of the order against children and young people was discouraged (Home Office 1998). However, during the consultation process, representations from local authorities argued that children and young people should be included. As a consequence, the final version of the guidance document (Home Office 1999:3, para. 2.1) contained the following amendment:

Applications may routinely be made for the middle and older age groups of juveniles and young people (e.g. 12-17 year olds) as experience has shown that such individuals may commit serious acts of anti-social behaviour without adult encouragement or involvement.

In spite of the early guidance by the Home Office, Morgan and Newburn (2007) argue that the ASBO was clearly designed with juvenile 'anti-social behaviour' in mind. This is suggested by the fact that of 600 ASBOs, awarded across England and Wales in one quarter of 2005, 45 per cent were imposed on juveniles.

Academics and practitioners have raised concerns about ASBOs. They have been criticised for their subjective and all embracing nature, their potential for criminalising non-criminal conduct; the deliberate confusion of civil and criminal law; for allowing evidence from professional witnesses; for a lack of proportionality and for their stigmatising and exclusionary effects (Ashworth et al. 1998). It has also been argued that the length of order is contrary to the developmental needs of young people and their ability to mature and grow out of offending (Pitts 2001).

More fundamentally, since its early inception, the term anti social behaviour has been contested. Squires and Stephen (2005) note how in the White Paper 'No More Excuses', the terms 'anti-social behaviour' and 'crime and disorder' were conflated as aspects of a single range of behaviours, with a clear assertion being made of a 'proven' link between youthful anti-social behaviour and persistent criminality. They argue that, despite political rhetoric to the contrary, 'anti-social behaviour' serves as a convenient term for a group of behaviours against which a streamlined package of enforcement procedures can be used.

The following section examines the introduction to, and role of, the Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board

The government sponsored Youth Justice Board (YJB) in England and Wales has overseen the development of the youth justice system since the inception of New Labour in 1997 and the introduction of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (HM Government 1998). The YJB claims a comprehensive understanding of the strategic and operational aspects of community and custodial management of young offenders. As a national policy making and commissioning body it aims to provide leadership to all Youth Offending Teams across England and Wales in youth crime prevention, young offender management in the secure estate, and in the resettlement and aftercare of young people. The YJB also aims to provide key elements of effective practice that help service providers and partnerships devise suitable local approaches for engaging with vulnerable groups of children and young people, within national frameworks and guidelines (for example, NACRO 2005:29).

Government estimates suggest that around 5% of young people are responsible for over half of youth crime (HM Government 2008:4). The Government's Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP) introduced a raft of new and enhanced early intervention and support measures, via new partnerships with Children's Services, with the overall aim to reduce further incidence of youth crime (HM Government 2008). The YCAP has

challenged the YJB, local authorities and their partner agencies to engage more determinedly not only with a preventive agenda, but also with robust management of offenders (HM Government 2008). While the YJB plays a key role in implementing the government's Action Plan it relies upon a range of partners to deliver the required changes.

The YJB has a unique view of the youth justice system at various operational and strategic levels and is currently 'wiring-up' its information sharing systems in order to facilitate a more holistic understanding of needs, provision and outcomes at the interface of youth justice and other service systems (YJB 2008b). At the time of writing, the YJB are currently in the process of implementing the new Scaled Approach to Youth Justice, referred to previously, which was introduced under the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008. The scaled approach aims to not only identify individual risks and needs of those children and young people who come in to contact with the Youth Justice System, but subsequently, target interventions according to individual need (YJB 2009a). In November 2009, a new youth community sentencing structure which encompasses youth justice community penalties and replaces nine existing sentences was launched (YJB 2009b). This new sentence known as The Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO), initiated major changes to the practice of Youth Justice, combining a variety of requirements (for example substance misuse, mentoring, health) into the one generic sentence. This sentence will put into practice the aim of the scaled approach, by bringing together a tiered approach to a variety of interventions under the one order. Upon completion of assessment YOT workers will have a choice of applying a combination of interventions from the list of requirements above. The YRO, places particular emphasis on reparation and ensuring that 'young people make amends for their behaviour' (YJB 2009b:4). The YJB (2009b) have highlighted the importance of the scaled approach which has been described as representing the biggest development in Youth Justice in over ten years (YJB 2009b).

The YJB, however, is not without its critics. In particular, it has been criticised on the grounds of 'managerialism'. Generally, it has been argued that there is less room in the

system for discretion, that policy is too directive and that the work of agencies (particularly YOTs) is over scrutinised to the extent that targets are over demanding and at times unrealistic (McLaughlin et al. 2001). In particular, it has been suggested that the pace of change demanded by the YJB has not always been realistic, nor has it allowed for new initiatives to adequately 'bed down' before other changes are required (Smith 2003). Hence, the early YOT pilots were not, it is argued, robustly evaluated before being 'rolled out' across England and Wales. Moreover, it has been argued that YOTs have been inadequately funded to realise their objectives (Newburn 1998).

Another criticism queries the independence of the YJB. The YJB was set up as a semi-independent agency to provide leadership in the development of a new youth justice system and to provide authoritative and independent advice with regard to standards, practice, performance and the delivery of services. However, Smith (2003) queries whether the YJB is a 'mouthpiece or mediator'. Here, he points to tensions in relation to commissioning and purchasing of placements in respect of the secure estate. That is, because the YJB both sets the standards and allocates public money for their implementation, compromises their supposed 'independent' position. At the same time YJB potentially has considerable political (as a channel/agent for government and its policy) and operational power (in terms of decisions it could make in respect of funding) (Muncie 2009).

Smith (2003) also argues that despite its role as champion to youth justice, the YJB agenda is sometimes questionable. That is, despite the contention that community penalties can be more effective/desirable than custodial sentences (BBC 2001), the YJB played a significant role in commissioning and purchasing hundreds of new custodial placements created at the beginning of the decade.

When Rod Morgan was chair of the YJB (2004 – 2007), he was increasingly disillusioned by the drive to incarcerate young offenders. While his position suggested that the YJB was, to some extent at least, independent of its government sponsors, ultimately it led to Morgan's resignation (Guardian 2007). Indeed, it has been argued

that Morgan's (anti-incarceration) position was perceived as too critical of government policy, which effectively served to throw into doubt, any claim to the YJB's independence (McCormack 2007).

Youth Offending prevention programmes

Much emphasis has been placed on prevention in youth offending. This emphasis reportedly reflects public opinion, in that in a survey of UK adults 66% of respondents stated a preference for prevention approaches to youth crime (Wood 2008). This was contrasted with what were perceived as 'hard line' approaches to youth offending such as Anti Social Behaviours Order's (discussed previously), the effectiveness of which has been challenged (Youth Justice Board 2006a; Wood 2008).

A range of interventions target children at risk of offending. These include Sure Start programmes and Government parenting orders (Farrington 2007; Gelsthorpe and Burney 2007). These initiatives are, however, aimed at very young children and the long-term benefits are yet to be seen (Margo 2008). Some preventive interventions to help older children include, adventure training, mentoring, literacy programmes and recreational programmes (Loeber and Farrington 1998). However, key components argued to represent 'best practice' within prevention intervention programmes are those which provide continuity of the learning process and provide further opportunities once programmes are complete (Taylor et al. 1999).

Preventive initiatives identified as important, in reducing offending, include interventions that increase; the willingness of young people to maintain local civic norms, access to and engagement in local positive socialising activities, positive relationships with parents and peers and enjoyment of school (Margo 2008). Indeed, these differ little from factors identified two decades previously, when, a combination of skills acquisition, interaction with adult authority figures and constructive pursuits (including sport, drama

or arts-based activities) were highlighted as key to prevention (Goodman and Butler 1986). Certainly, the importance attached to physical activity in prevention programmes is apparent in both earlier and more recent interventions. The Audit Commission (2009) recently highlighted the importance of sport and leisure activities in preventing anti-social behaviour by young people. Programmes such as Fairbridge, Sports Counselling and The Army Cadets all represent preventive programmes which require demanding physical activities (Taylor et al. 1999).

Some intervention approaches are more cognisant than others of the interplay between environmental, family and individual factors within particular localities and cultures. Indeed, such holistic approaches have been urged by the Institute for Public Policy Research, in the report 'Make me a Criminal' which recommended a national early intervention, programme targeting children up to the age of 12. The aim of the recommendation was to influence conduct through the application of a multi-pronged approach, which included parent management training and out-reach intensive education services. The rationale behind this approach was that the interventions, together with high impact and inclusive community-based development programmes, would be more effective than stand alone interventions vis-à-vis crime prevention among young people (see Margo 2008).

The number of community based offending interventions have increased since the inception of New Labour in 1997. Throughout the last decade the YJB has specifically extended its policies in respect of early intervention with children and young people. The YJB (2008a) claim that early intervention programmes have helped to reduce offending by children and young people by 10%. One such intervention is the YJB funded Youth Inclusion Programme known as YIP. YIP is a multi-agency partnership-based programme which offers voluntary community-based activities, with the aim of diverting 'at risk' young people away from crime. A recent YJB (2008a) evaluation claimed that approximately 25,000 children and young people (aged 8-17) have been reached by YIP schemes.

At the other end of the spectrum, interventions target repeat offenders. Here, community interventions are increasingly understood as alternatives to custody, following the YJB pledge to use custody as a method of last resort (YJB 2005).

In 2001, the newly implemented Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP) was claimed, by the YJB, as the most rigorous community programme available to children and young people. The ISSP has been described as “a robust multi-model community programme designed for persistent and serious young offenders in England and Wales” (Moore 2009:197). ISSP operates across all of England and Wales with 81 schemes operating in 157 YOTs. Since the programme started in July 2001, up to the end of March 2007, 24,280 children and young people have been referred to an ISSP. During 2006/07 5,243 young people started an ISSP (YJB 2007). The most intensive supervision (25 hours a week) lasts for the first three months of the programme. Following this, the supervision continues at a reduced intensity (a minimum of five hours per week, and weekend support) for a further three months. On completion of ISSP the young person continues to be supervised for the remaining period of their order.

The YJB (2009c and 2009d) have recently commissioned two studies to examine interventions. One of the studies projects will focus on the effectiveness of interventions and programmes offered to young people across the secure estate (YJB 2009c). This is a longitudinal study which will analyse reconviction rates in order to measure the success or failure of the offending behaviour interventions. The second study (YJB 2009d) will analyse a young person’s progress through the youth justice system, examining the processing of young people from arrest to sentence and supervision within the YOT or custody.

The Government Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP) has challenged the YJB, local authorities and their partner agencies to engage more determinedly not only with a preventive agenda, but also with robust management of offenders (HM Government 2008). While the YCAP includes a raft of enhanced prevention and support measures to be delivered via new partnerships with Children’s Services, to reduce further the overall

incidence of youth crime, it is recognised that those already in custody are likely to be amongst the hardest to reform (HM Government 2008:4).

Young people in custody

Since 2000, the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales has been responsible for the commissioning and purchasing of secure places for children and young people who are remanded or sentenced to custody within the secure estate. The secure estate comprises; Secure Children's Homes (SCH), Secure Training Centres (STC) and Young Offenders Institutes (YOI), which together accommodate young people between 10 and 17 years of age (YJB B307). Secure Children's Homes are run by local authorities and accommodate younger children, assessed as more vulnerable. Overall Secure Children's Homes have a greater staff to young people ratio than any other type of secure estate establishment (YJB B307).

Secure Training Centres were introduced under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and were the first privately managed secure establishments for children and young people within a custodial context. However, it was not until four years later that the first secure training centre opened, with the last opening in 2004 (Muncie and Goldson 2009). At the time of writing, all four of the privately run establishments were based in England. STCs accommodate vulnerable young people, have a lower staff/young person ratio than SCHs and focus on education and rehabilitation (YJB 2009e).

Young Offenders Institutes accommodate approximately 81% of young people in custody and have lower staff ratios than both SCH and STC (YJB B307). While YOI's are run by the prison service, or the private sector, and accommodate young people from the ages of 15 to 21, the YJB commission places for under 18 year olds only (YJB B307). It is important to point out that Juveniles under the age of 18 are housed

separately, within any given YOI, from young offenders aged between 18 and 21 (YJB2009f).

The UK has the highest rates of imprisonment among all Western European countries, including the highest numbers of children and young people incarcerated (Wood 2008). By April 2008, the number of young people in the secure estate had risen to over 3,000, of whom 85% were in Youth Offenders Institutions, and the remaining 15% in secure facilities (YJB, 2008). Nearly all of these young people (93%) were male (YJB, 2008). Moreover, the most prolific offenders started as young offenders, between the ages of 10 and 13 and had longer criminal careers than other criminals, lasting on average 13 years (Margo 2008).

Overall, the number of children and young people under the age of 18 in the secure estate at the end of July 2009 was 2644 (YJB 2009a). Broken down by the establishment, 179 young people were accommodated in Secure Children's Homes, 256 in Secure Training Centres and 2209 in Young Offenders Institutes (YJB 2009f). At the time of writing, there were 169 females in secure accommodation and 2475 males (YJB 2009f). There has been an increase in the sentencing of children under 15 years of age to custody. From 1996 to 2006 the use of custody for this age group increased by 550% (Barnardos 2008). These figures fluctuate on a weekly basis; however at the time of writing these custody figures were lower than the previous year. In June 2008 there was just over 3,000 young people accommodated within the secure estate, with the figures having reached a peak in June 2002 at 3100 (see YJB 2009f).

Several factors influence the increasing numbers of young people in custody. Firstly, the increase in the average length of sentence from magistrates courts. This includes, for example, increases (from seven months in 1996 to 19 months in 2006) in the average length of custodial sentence for specific offences such as fraud and forgery (Howard League 2008).

Secondly, there has been an increase in the sentencing, of those under 15 years of age, to custody. From 1996 to 2006 the use of custody for this age group increased by 550% (Barnardos 2008).

Thirdly, The Criminal Justice Act 2003 introduced indeterminate sentences. These were sentences which specified a minimum sentence rather than specifying a discrete time period. The use of these sentences was much greater than expected by the Home Office (Prison Reform Trust 2009). Indeed, indeterminate sentences more than doubled in number during the period April 2006 to March 2007. The total of those serving all indeterminate sentences rose by 169% in the same period.

Fourthly, 'new routes' into custody were introduced. These 'new' routes effectively meant a relaxation of the criteria used to remand young people to custody. Whereas, previously young people might be remanded to a YOI, the chances of being remanded to a secure children's home were now increased (section 130 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2003). This significantly increased the numbers of children and young people who could be placed in the secure estate. In the year following the introduction of new routes, approximately 601 children under 15 years of age, who previously would not have been placed in custody, were remanded to the secure estate (YJB 2004). Notably, an increased number of young people have entered custody as a result of breaching ISSPs or ASBOs.

The report 'Juveniles in Custody' (HM Inspectorate of Prisons 2004), provided an extensive overview of both the male and female juvenile establishments. It was the first report of its kind to interview children and young people and give specific insights into their perceptions of Prison Custody during the period of 2001-3. The report examined a range of variables, including profile and background information on the young people (and family and educational background); safety of juveniles upon arrival and personal safety within the establishment; respect within the establishment (including food, healthcare, shower accessibility and complaints); purposeful activity, education and work and recreation and settlement within the institution and resettlement upon release.

Another area of concern raised by this first report was that of resettlement. Many of the young people interviewed had been placed within secure establishments far from their homes and 39% reported that it was difficult for family and friends to visit. While the report highlighted important issues in relation to male and female establishments; it provided little in the way of recommendations and/or solutions to identified problems.

Similar reports to 'Juveniles in Custody' (HM Inspectorate of Prisons 2004) have been published every two years, based on a sample of 2,500 young people across the secure estate. At the time of writing, the latest report 'Children and Young People in Custody' (2006 – 2008) (Parker 2009) had just been published. The report highlighted areas of improvements within the custodial setting and those areas where improvement was still deemed necessary. On a positive note it reported that a marginally greater number of young men were accessing education (81% compared with 79% in 2004–2006) and 36% compared with 32% intended to continue their education post release (Parker 2009: 45). However it was also noted that resettlement plans/activities had deteriorated. That is, fewer young men had been contacted by a YOT, social or probation worker and less had had the opportunity to see their individual training plans (Parker 2009). However, the picture was not the same for young women. Of those who took part in the research, 89% said they had been contacted by their YOT or social worker while in custody, which compared to 75% in the previous report. In addition, more young women than in the previous report had seen their training plans (Parker 2009).

The YJB set an original target for the placement of any young person to be accommodated not more than 50 miles away from their home towns. However, this YJB target has subsequently been revised to state that any child or young person should be accommodated within any custodial setting which is as close to their local community as possible (YJB 2005). However this target is seldom met in practice. For example, in 2006 a HM Inspectorate of Prisons report found that 40% of the young people accommodated in Ashfield YOI were located 100 miles away from their homes (HM Inspectorate of Prisons 2006). A further factor, which has affected the housing of young people, is the 'churn'. Due to overcrowding within the establishments, 'churn' is the

practice of moving children and young people between YOIs in order to accommodate new detainees. Lord Ramsbotham (2000) described how those serving a four month detention and training order in 2000, typically spent three weeks at Feltham (London), two weeks at Ashfield (Bristol) and a final three weeks at Hollesley Bay (Suffolk). This he argued prevented the delivery of any structured, effective interventions and would have made family and community contact very difficult.

In considering the resettlement of young people back into the community, Farrant (2009) has argued that approximately 80% of these young people will reoffend within two years of release from custody. The resettlement of offenders is understood as crucial in enabling young people to desist from reoffending. Resettlement is defined by Farrant (2009:296) as “the effective reintegration of a young person back into the community following a custodial sentence”. In 2006 the YJB published ‘Youth Resettlement: A framework for action’ which identified key areas for resettlement upon release from custodial setting, into the community. These areas are: case management and transitions; accommodation; education, training and employment; health; substance misuse; families and finance, benefits and debt (for more detail see YJB 2006b). It is important to note that responsibility for resettlement lies not only with the custodial establishment in which a young person is housed, but also with the local Youth Offending Team (YOT), who are charged to maintain the YJB’s National Standards (Farrant 2009). Farrant (2009) notes that the overall aim of a successful resettlement plan for any child or young person is to provide stability through continued practical and emotional support upon release from custody.

Running through both community and custodial responses to youth offending is the imperative of restorative justice, and it is to this concept that the following section turns.

Restorative Justice

Restorative justice is not a new concept. Indeed, it has been described as “the most ancient and prevalent approach in the world to resolve harm and conflict” (Liebmann 2009:302). Restorative justice has been defined by the YJB (2006c:1) as a procedure which deals with the “aftermath of an offence, which involves victims, offenders and others whose interests have been affected”.

Reparation to victims of crime is central to the concept of restorative justice, which usually takes the form of actions undertaken by offenders to make amends for their criminal behavior. Allen (2009) has defined reparation as compensation by offenders for loss, harm or damage to their victims. Restorative Justice aims both to resolve conflict and repair harm. It encourages the perpetrators of harm, to acknowledge the impact of their behaviours and provide them with an opportunity to make reparation. Equally, it offers victims an opportunity to have the harm or loss which they have experienced, acknowledged (Liebmann 2009).

Restorative Justice may therefore play an important role in assisting to reduce reoffending by children and young people, helping victims overcome their ordeal and, overall, increase the public’s confidence in the justice system (YJB 2006c). Hence, within Youth Justice, restorative justice aims to bring together young people who offend with victims, giving them an opportunity to make amends for their actions, and to consider the impact of their behaviours on other people and the wider community in general. The key aims of restorative justice, here, have been identified as victim satisfaction, engagement with the young person and increasing public confidence in the youth justice system (YJB 2006c). In setting out to repair the hurt or damage experienced by victims of crime, restorative justice is not perceived as a soft option for

offenders, and it has been argued that many find it difficult to face up to the impact of their criminal actions (YJB 2006c).

The Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999 firmly located restorative justice within youth justice in England and Wales. Consequently, the aim of the YJB (2006c) is to make restorative justice part of the sentence plans of young people who offend. These plans involve the community and victims, with the option of direct or indirect restorative action. Hence, all youth justice interventions (including final warnings, referral orders to supervision orders and intensive supervision and surveillance) include elements of reparation and are underpinned by the principles of restorative justice (Liebmann 2009). Referral Orders are the sentences given to children and young people in England and Wales who plead guilty for a first time offence; unless however the offence is serious enough to warrant a custodial sentence (Earle 2009).

The Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 further embedded restorative justice in the youth justice system, by placing it at the forefront of the new scaled approach to youth justice (see section on YJB Policies) and within the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YJB 2009a).

YJB performance statistics in 2007 indicated that 86% of victims of youth crime referred to YOTs were offered the opportunity to participate in restorative processes (YJB 2007). Moreover, of those victims who participated in restorative interventions, 97% indicated satisfaction with the process (YJB 2007). Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that in 2009 HM inspectorates reported disappointment with the level of attention given to restorative justice interventions within YOTs across England and Wales (Fox 2009).

The Ministry of Justice (2008b) has evaluated three specific restorative justice programmes. While the study focused on the adult population only, the research report indicated implications for juveniles. Overall it was found that the participants of restorative justice initiatives committed fewer offences (in terms of reconvictions) in the

subsequent two years, compared to offenders who did not undertake restorative justice work (See Ministry of Justice 2008b).

It is important to note that restorative justice interventions do not necessarily involve face to face interaction with victims, and it has been suggested that indirect restorative justice can be just as effective (YJB 2006c) . This is a relevant point for intervention work in prison based settings, including the juvenile secure estate. Indeed it has been argued that the benefits of restorative justice with young people in prison are similar as those that take place within the community (Williams 2005). The YJB (2006c) have reiterated this point, noting that within the secure estate, restorative justice can potentially be used as a method of dealing with conflict within the prison environment and managing the behaviour of young incarcerated people. Williams (2005) has noted interest among secure estate staff in applying the principles of restorative justice to the resolution of disputes between inmates and between staff, arguing that restorative justice could play a part in restoring principles of respect and dignity within the prison environment, thus enhancing the daily prison regime. Whilst contending that there is a consistent willingness and good will amongst the staff to consider the use of restorative justice within the prison environment, Williams (2005) has noted that prison initiatives are vulnerable to a range of exigencies. Reporting on a specific restorative justice initiative implemented in a Young Offenders Institution, which brought victim and young person together in a 'conference style context, Williams (2005) noted that the constraints of geographical distance (between victim and perpetrator) and shortage of staff time, as well as other resource limitations, interfered with the aims of the intervention.

The Restorative Justice Consortium (RJC 2009) have highlighted examples of good practice in the application of restorative justice within the secure estate. Here, it was noted that within the secure estate restorative justice has been successful in tackling problems between young people before they escalated to a gang or group level (RJC 2009). An evaluation of a restorative justice intervention with young people reported a 19% reduction in violence since the introduction of restorative justice into the secure

estate, with 95% of young people, who took part in the project, claiming to enjoy the experience (RJC 2009). While, focusing here on restorative justice in the secure estate, it is also important to note that the RJC, have highlighted how the principles of restorative justice may be applied equally when working with children and young people in the public care system. Indeed, Hopkins (2009) has described how, in the care system, restorative justice work has been used successfully to address conflict and bullying, as well as deal with disruptive, challenging and criminal behaviour among young people (Hopkins 2009).

The chapter finally turns to an introduction to the Duke of Edinburgh's Award which has taken up the YCAP challenge to engage, not only with a preventive agenda, but also with persistent offenders.

Introduction to the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme

The Duke of Edinburgh's (DofE) Award is a registered charity. It is a UK-wide voluntary provider which was launched in July 1956 by His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh. The Award is "committed to providing for young people an enjoyable, challenging and rewarding programme of personal development, which is of the highest quality and the widest reach" (The DofE 2008). Implicit in the principles of the DofE Award is that it should be inclusive to all young people between the ages of 14 and 25 and undertaken on a voluntary basis. This means that in principle young people with special needs, disadvantaged by poverty, at risk of offending or offenders can achieve the same Awards as their able bodied or more privileged peers (The DofE 2008).

Awards are individually tailored to meet the needs of young people, who ideally choose which activities they want to engage in to complete the relevant sections of the Award. The DoE aims to enable young people to learn new skills and engage in experiences that they might not learn or encounter in their everyday lives. The key features of the Award, as set out by the DoE include: non-competitiveness; commitment; self-discipline; self-reliance; responsibility to others; teamwork; enterprise and perseverance;

achievable; voluntary; personal development; personalised; balanced; progressive; achievement focused; and enjoyable (DofE 2008).

The DofE consists of three levels. Levels of the Award are (in order of achievement) Bronze, Silver and Gold. The length of time and commitment varies by Award level, with Bronze at six months, Silver at twelve months and Gold at eighteen months. Each level comprises a balanced content of different activities. Achievement of a Bronze, Silver or Gold DofE requires the completion of four or five elements depending upon the programme level. These are Volunteering, Physical, Skills, Expedition and Residential (Gold level only) (see appendix number one).

The individual element or sections of the Award are focussed as follows. Volunteering focuses on young people's contribution to communities and provision of service to others. Physical focuses on physical fitness and healthy lifestyles. Skill involves the development of practical and social skills, and personal interests. The expedition involves the planning, training for and completion of team adventure or journey. Finally in the case of the Gold Element Only, the residential element involves young people with those they do not know, who usually emanate from different backgrounds and who bring with them, alternative views (DofE 2009b).

The Award is delivered by authorities who are licensed to run the programme. Over a half of Awards (57%) are delivered via voluntary and community organisations (for example youth clubs or youth organisations), with under a third delivered by state or independent schools (29%). Other Award providers include open Award Centres, special schools and pupil referral units, Universities and further/higher education providers, young offending teams (YOTs), custodial establishments and employers. Any organisation, Local Authority or body concerned with the education, welfare or training of young people can apply to become fully licensed as a DofE Award Operating Authority.

In 2008 there were 161,136 new entrants to the Award, with over a quarter of a million Award participants registered on the DofE at any one time. Both new entrants to the Award and the total number of Awards gained by young people are increasing. In 2006/2007, 42,531 Bronze, 15,785 Silver and 6,371 Gold Awards were awarded. In order to gain their Awards, between them young people covered over two million miles walking, riding, canoeing or sailing.

The DofE website (DofE 2009b) describes many benefits to young people who undertake the Award. Hence they claim that not only can the Award assist young people to gain future employment or skills training, but it can also enable them to learn 'softer skills', which are often not taught. These may include interpersonal skills (e.g. increasing self-confidence and self-reliance plus a sense of achievement), and the discovery of new skills, interests and talents, cultures and lifestyles.

DofE carries out reviews of its work through quality control systems for its operating partners and through the commissioning of research investigating the outcomes of its activities for young people. Research undertaken in house by the UK Services Department, with young people who completed the Gold Award indicated how most recipients perceived that having completed an Award could: help secure employment or further training (93%), and, had taught them team leadership skills (79%), provided them with a greater understanding of the environment (83%), improved their decision making skills (78%), and enhanced their self confidence (85%). Moreover, 87% of the young people reported continuing with Award activities following receipt of the Award, with 61% continuing to volunteer in communities. There is also evidence of the status of the Award among UK employers. A survey of 12% of the UKs major employers in 2006 indicated that after formal qualifications, the DofE Award was rated as the most sought after non-formal qualification on curriculum vitas of potential employees (The DofE 2006).

The DofE operates in 127 countries, and in 60 of these on a national basis. Just over a third of the National Award Programmes, work with young offenders and the youth

justice system. In South Africa, for example, through partnership with the Department of Correctional Services, the programme operates in 60 youth offender institutes across the country, reaching over 2,000 young offenders each year. In 2007 the *A Second Chance: The Award & Re-Integration Strategies* conference brought together 40 delegates from 20 countries, which subsequently led to the implementation of the programme in young offender institutions in Ghana, Swaziland, the Seychelles and Côte d'Ivoire.

In the UK implementation of the DoE in the secure estate began in 1998 with the launch in Scotland of the 'New Start' pilot programme. New Start aimed to widen access to the DoE beyond its traditional reach, by promoting the DoE to organisations working with young people at risk of participating in offending and/or risk taking behaviour. The project targeted young people (aged between 14 and 25) considered at risk of offending, serving custodial and non-custodial sentences, and those released from prison. Thus, the focus was on reducing and preventing youth crime and promoting community safety (Blake and Stevenson 2001).

An evaluation of New Start suggested that it had increased self-esteem and confidence among participants, fostered sense of achievement and improved personal and career aspirations (Blake and Stevenson 2001). Through this scheme, the Award was promoted as a form of diversionary activity with the aim of enhancing the work of organisations with a focus on reducing and preventing youth crime and promoting community safety. Evaluation of the pilot concluded that the project was a successful instrument for actively engaging and retaining disaffected and/or vulnerable young people (Bitel and Campbell 2005). The Bitel and Campbell (2005) and Blake and Stevenson (2001) evaluations, along with an evaluation of a wider range of programmes for offenders under the supervision of probation (Taylor et al.1999) suggest rehabilitative value of such programmes for young offenders.

In 2006 the DoE launched the Aspire project, with the aim of exploring implementation of DoE activities with young offenders (DoE 2009c). Aspire initially focussed on those

secure estate establishments which were already delivering the DofE programme, aiming to develop a model of good practice replicable across the secure estate. Through ASPIRE, DofE aims to support prison staff and volunteers in the delivery of the DofE across the secure estate, through the development of partnerships to enhance the transition and resettlement of young people back in to the community. The licensing of the DofE within the individual institutions varies. The majority of establishments are either licensed through the national DofE office or local DofE regional offices. Overall, Aspire aims to increase the number of young people participating in the DofE across the youth justice system (DofE 2009c).

In 2009 the DofE (2009) produced a briefing paper on the restorative justice in the context of the Award programme. The briefing highlighted ways in which the DofE supports restorative justice by giving young offenders the opportunity to: make a personal contribution, appreciate the needs of others (and contribute to their well-being), understand their personal strengths and weaknesses, generate positive action in the community, trust and be trusted, overcome prejudice and fears, accept responsibility and increase self esteem (DofE 2009:2). The paper also describes practical ways in which the DofE may support restorative justice interventions. These include helping young people to develop skills to engage with restorative justice, recognising the values of every young person and giving young people the opportunity to effectively contribute within the community.

In 2007 the DofE was delivered by over 100 young offender groups, both in the secure estate and the community, across the UK (The DofE's Award, 2007). At the time of writing, there are 51 custodial establishments participating in the DofE across the UK and 61 Youth Offending Teams across England and Wales, who are involved in DofE delivery. In total (the secure estate and YOT) there are currently 995 young offenders participating in the DofE and of these, 506 are in the secure estate and 489 in YOTs across England and Wales. Between 2008 and 2009, a total of 99 Bronze Awards and, nine Silver Awards had been achieved by young offenders. The presence of the DofE

within the secure estate and with YOTs has grown significantly (by 54%) during the last two years, and continues to increase (DofE 2009d).

This chapter has provided a review of the relevant literature pertaining to young people and deviance, youth justice and the Duke of Edinburgh's Award. The chapter opened with an historical account of media presentation of deviance and young people. This was followed by an exploration of the concept of risk and risk factors in the context of youth offending, an account of broad (socially inclusive) understandings of risk, and the importance of social capital in desistance research. The chapter then considered policies and practices within youth justice today, focusing particularly on the work of the Youth Justice Board, relevant to this thesis. The chapter concludes with an introduction to the Duke of Edinburgh's Award which has developed its programme for implementation within the criminal justice field and most notably in the secure estate, and which is the subject of study in this thesis. The following chapter presents the study methodology and research strategy for the PhD.

The study aims to examine implementation of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award in the secure estate, drawing primarily on accounts of young people participating, and those delivering, the programme in a sample of secure estate institutions.

Research Questions:

- How is the DofE perceived by a sample of young people participating in the programme, and those delivering the programme, in the secure estate?
- What do key stakeholders (young people, staff delivering the programme, the DofE, Youth Offending Teams) perceive as the potential benefits of the DofE, and to what extent, are these benefits perceived as being realised by the programme?
- How is the DofE organised, managed and delivered within a sample of secure estate establishments?
- What are the perceived barriers to, and facilitators of, implementation of the DofE in the secure estate, and following release?
- What are the implications of DofE implementation for the rehabilitation of young offenders?

The Study

The aim of the study was to explore delivery and receipt of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, within the secure estate, from the perspectives of young participants of the programme and those involved with provision of the programme within and outwith the secure estate. I was drawn to this area of interest because of my experience as a student (at undergraduate and postgraduate level) of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Following my studies I worked within the field of youth justice and subsequently

delivered youth justice qualifications to youth justice practitioners across England and Wales.

While working within youth offending teams in Cheshire, I was particularly interested in the experience of custody for children and young people. My work within the Criminal Justice Team at Glyndwr University involved working with youth offending officers across the South West of England and Wales, attending various meetings with the youth justice board and youth offending manager for Wales. These experiences fuelled my interest in the experiences of young people and determined, not only the substantive focus of my study, but also, the methodological thrust of my enquiry. Hence, in carrying out this research with children and young people within the secure estate, my aim was similar to that of Smith and Wincup (2000:334) “not so much to become insiders in our chosen institutional setting but to see the world from insiders’ perspectives”. In identifying the topic, and obtaining an opportunity, I was very fortunate to be involved, from the outset, in a small evaluation commissioned by the DoF which focused on the implementation of the programme in the secure estate. With the agreement of my colleagues and the DoF commissioners, I was permitted to collect data for my PhD while carrying out data collection for the evaluation. The funders were satisfied with this arrangement because the data, and subsequent analysis afforded by my PhD study would, it was anticipated, add to their knowledge base about the programme and its implementation. The additional data and the interests which I brought to bear on the study enhanced the research and turned the evaluation, which was limited by resources, into a larger and more meaningful endeavour. The ways in which the PhD work and the funded evaluation differed in focus, and the implications of this for data collection, will be clarified in the later sections of this chapter which detail the process of the study. Before that however, it is necessary to clarify issues of methodology pertinent to the study.

My view of the world: Theorists and Theories

This thesis draws upon qualitative methodology rather than that of a positivistic quantitative approach. Positivists view the world in terms of facts in order to produce specific scientific laws (Gray 2004). Here, I felt that the scientific approach of positivism, which argues that “ideas only deserve their incorporation into knowledge if they can be put to the test of empirical experience” (Gray 2004:18), did not accommodate the type of study which I wanted to carry out on the experiences of children and young people in the secure estate. Hence, in short, I turned to a qualitative paradigm.

In considering the breadth of qualitative paradigms, it is important to understand what is meant by a ‘paradigm’. Kuhn (1970) defined a paradigm as existing where a high level of professional consensus is apparent within particular communities of scientists, regarding aspects of philosophical beliefs, theories, standards for research and exemplary findings. Denzin and Lincoln (1994:99) have usefully defined a paradigm “as a basic set of beliefs that guide action” and Guba (1990) has located this understanding in the context of doing research:

There are many paradigms that we use in guiding our actions: the adversarial paradigm that guides the legal system, the judgemental paradigm that guides the selection of Olympic winners, the religious paradigms that guide the spiritual and moral life, and many others. Our concern here, however, is with those paradigms that guide disciplined inquiry (Guba1990:18).

It is imperative that the researcher develops his/her own paradigm perspective (Denzin and Lincoln 1994), which reflects a co-ordinated set of ideas and actions (Becker et al. 1977). In identifying/understanding his/her own paradigm, the researcher must address issues relating to ontology, epistemology and methodology (Guba and Lincoln 1998). While ontology, understands the nature of existence (Gray 2004), epistemology is about the status of knowledge and the acknowledgement of what constitutes and what does

not constitute knowledge (Gray 2004). Issues of ontology and epistemology must be understood in the context of methodology. Methodology comprises the theoretical justification of any research method used (Gray 2004). Guba (1990:18) suggests that the way in which theoretical paradigms respond to the issues ontology, epistemology and methodology, “are the starting points or givens that determine what inquiry is and how it is to be practiced”, and are therefore the contexts in which researchers begin to consider their own methodological understandings.

It is important to start with theory. As in the case of many other PhD studies, this thesis is not driven by a pure theoretical framework. Rather it draws on different, overlapping and sometimes even competing theoretical ideas. The two theoretical perspectives which were most influential in informing the study are symbolic interactionism and phenomenology. The following section sets out some of the principles of these perspectives as a back drop to the current study.

Symbolic Interactionism and Phenomenological approaches

It was the work of the Chicago School in the 1920’s and 1930’s which established qualitative research as the study of human life and was influential in changing perceptions of carrying out research in a fundamental way (Denzin and Lincoln 1998). Briefly, the Chicago School (which comprised a group of researchers at the University of Chicago) was influential in the practical realisation of interpretative social science, which was guided by the theoretical precepts of symbolic interaction, and prioritised the process of meaning within research (Schwandt 1998).

Gray (2004:406) defines symbolic interactionism as a school of sociology “in which people are seen as developing a sense of identity through their interactions and communication with others”. From a symbolic interactionist ontological perspective, reality is perceived as being in a ‘state of flux’ (Shalin 1986:10) and human beings are understood to act in response to their environment according to the meaning that

objects or beings around them have (Blumer 1969). Epistemologically, society is understood as a function of 'emergent interaction' between individuals, which thus commands inquiry which is "sensitive to the objective indeterminacy" of social situations/settings (Shalin 1986:10).

The founding fathers of symbolic Interactionism were George Herbet Mead and Herbert Blumer. Mead (1863 – 1931), who set up the study of 'social behaviourism', and developed a concept and meaning of 'self', locating it within the research setting (Newburn 2007). In order to appreciate 'self', Mead argued the importance and meaning of communication, which is related to the symbol of language and the interpretation of words (Mennell 1974). Mead (1934), who recognised language as part of a situation created through mechanisms and processes, aimed to understand human behaviour, focussing on the reality of people's lives and their behaviours (cited in Gray 2004).

Herbert Blumer, drawing on the work of Mead, related the idea of self to objects and symbols (Newburn 2007) and applied the label 'symbolic interactionism' to the school of thought which Mead had defined as social behaviourism (Mennell 1974). Symbolic Interactionism, as represented by both Blumer and Mead, reflected what Schwandt (1998) suggested as respect for the true reality of the world. The Blumer-Mead theory of symbols understands human beings 'as purposive agents' and symbolic interactionism as the study of symbolic communications between social actors (Schwandt 1998:233).

It was in Blumer's (1969) seminal text 'Symbolic Interactionism Perspectives and Methods' that that concept of meaning was grounded within symbolic Interactionism as dependent upon the individual's experience within the real world. Meanings were thus understood as occurring within social interaction and informing the interpretation of that process (Gray 2004). In terms of research, Blumer's concept of meaning was central to methodological design of the current PhD study, which acknowledged that:

To ignore the meaning of the things towards which people act is seen as falsifying the behaviour under the study. To bypass the

meaning in favour of factors alleged to produce the behaviour is seen as a grievous neglect of the role of meaning in the formation of behaviour (Blumer 1969:3).

When drawing on symbolic interactionism, researchers study respondent actions, objects and society from the perspective of the respondents' themselves (Gray 2004:21). Symbolic interactionism requires that the researcher actively enter the worlds of people being studied, and this can mean entering the field setting and observing first hand what is happening (Gray 2004; Schwandt 1998; Becker et al. 1977). 'Boy's in White' was the research carried out by Becker and colleagues (1977), from the Chicago School, who adopted the principles of symbolic interaction in this seminal study. The study focussed on the professional socialisation of junior doctors, locating their experiences in the institutional context of the medical school. The influence of symbolic interactionism was clear from their understanding of human behaviour, as:

A process in which the person shapes and controls his(sic) conduct by taking into account the expectations of others with whom he (sic) interacts (Becker et al. 1977:14).

From the outset, Becker et al. (1977) were interested in the process of interaction and individual participation in the world of groups and group life. In order to achieve that, it was necessary, as is the case of research adopting principles of symbolic interactionism, for the researchers to enter the world of the subjects who were being studied (Schwandt 1998). Hence the theory influences practice. Symbolic interactionism is associated with methods of enquiry which include ethnography and its main constituent participant observation (Gray 2009). It is also associated with a grounded theory approach to data collection, analysis and theory development (Glaser and Stauss 1977). While the PhD study reported here did not adopt a grounded theory approach, as will be seen in the section on data analysis, aspects of grounded theory did usefully inform data analysis.

Whereas the roots of symbolic interaction are found in America in the 1930's, it was Europe that saw the development of phenomenology. Phenomenology was founded by the German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), who believed in being "true to the nature of phenomena themselves, free of preconceptions and prior assumptions" (Miller and Brewer 2003:227). Husserl argued the futility of speculating about the noumena (or actual object), and that knowledge derived wholly from phenomena (or perceived appearance by senses) (Mennell 1974).

The term hermeneutics has been used interchangeably with phenomenology (Dowling 2004). While phenomenology is best understood as a philosophy, hermeneutics constitutes a branch of philosophy concerned with the nature of understanding, and the interpretation of experience (Draper 1996). Whereas it is the objective of phenomenology to examine and describe phenomena, as they are consciously experienced (Morse and Field 1996), understanding that world through language and interpretation is the domain of hermeneutics (Dowling 2004).

It was Husserl's disciple, Alfred Schutz (1899 - 1959) who first popularised phenomenology. Schutz focussed on everyday knowledge and understanding, individuals understanding of the world and each other, and how human beings come to have similar perceptions and conceptions of the world (Mennell 1974). The ontological perspective of the phenomenological paradigm is that reality for humans is not separate from its appearance (Schutz 1972) and, it is the human consciousness, or the way humans think, that shapes reality (David and Sutton 2004). Epistemologically, phenomenologists believe that language is employed by people in order to describe experiences or concepts, and it is through this language that knowledge is developed or improved (Mennell 1974):

Phenomenology holds that any attempt to understand social reality has to be grounded in people's experiences of the social reality. Hence, phenomenology insists that we must lay aside our prevailing understanding of phenomena and revisit our immediate

experience of them in order that new meanings may emerge (Gray 2009:22).

Phenomenological enquiry has been described as the study of individuals' lived experiences and shared meanings and as the study of others' experiences as they perceive them (Dowling 2004). Its methods of enquiry are deemed as capable of producing 'thick descriptions' of people's experiences or perspectives within natural settings (Geertz 1973).

While within Husserlian phenomenology, objects are regarded as real, Husserl claimed that knowledge of the essential structures of objects (which he referred to as essences) was only possible by the 'bracketing'(or suspension) of all assumptions about the existence of an external world. Husserl referred to this process of bracketing as *epoché*. After bracketing, what remained was primordial phenomena which according to Husserl, was the starting point for phenomenological description. This was because it contained the original data of consciousness, prior to any form of judgement (Paley 1997).

It is generally understood that all researchers bring prior knowledge and understanding (preconceived ideas) to the research endeavour, and that these may be (unwittingly) imposed on the research process and influence interpretation (Crotty 1996). Bracketting was thus Husserl's response to this problem, in that it enabled (or so Husserl argued) researchers to bracket off, or set aside, their own understandings in order to see phenomena for what they really were (Dowling 2005). Bracketing thus supposedly protected interpretation from the self-interest of the researcher (Paley 1997).

Martin Heidegger (Husserl's student) approached this issue rather differently from Husserl, developing what has come to be regarded as a second strand of phenomenology: Heideggerian hermeneutics (Koch 1995). While Husserl and Heidegger agree on some aspects of phenomenology there are significant differences between the two. In brief, whereas Husserl required researchers to bracket out their

beliefs, Heidegger required them to render their beliefs transparent and include them as part of the interpretation (Dowling 2005). In acknowledging that preconceptions existed, Heidegger, similar to Husserl, stressed how what was uncovered (the appearance of phenomena) was likely to be influenced by the researcher. However, unlike Husserl, Heidegger highlighted the importance of acknowledging researcher pre-conceptions within the research process, so that: the researchers might refine clarity of purpose, reach a better understanding between participant and researcher, and produce a more authentic product via the acknowledged co-construction of data.

The current study, set out in this PhD thesis, has been influenced variously by the theoretical precepts of symbolic interactionism and phenomenology. That is, drawing on symbolic interaction, society is understood as emerging through interactions between individuals. Human beings are understood to act in response to their environment according to the meaning that objects or beings around them have for them. It is thus perceived as crucial that the researcher elicits respondents own understandings rather than imposing understanding of phenomena upon them. This in turn requires the researcher actively entering the worlds of those being studied, in order to grasp their perspective of events. From a phenomenological perspective, the researcher acknowledges that reality for a respondent is not separate from its appearance and that it is the respondent perceptions which shape that reality. She also holds, that as a researcher, she brings prior knowledge and understanding to her field of study which may be imposed on the research process and influence her interpretation. Rather than taking a Husserlian approach by bracketing off these experiences, the researcher, in Heideggerian fashion, both acknowledges and celebrates the role which these prior knowledge's and understandings may play in the co-construction (between researcher and researched) of an authentic account.

The chapter now turns from the philosophy of ideas to the major research paradigms, in order to contextualise the methods used in the current study against the back drop of scientific enquiry.

Positivism and beyond

Since the time of Descartes (1596-1650), researchers have tended to focus on the concept of the truth, asking what the truth is and what is its foundation? This focus, which came to be known broadly as positivism, has dominated discourse in both the physical and social sciences for over 400 years (Guba and Lincoln 1994). Positivist understanding is rooted in *realist* ontology, that is, the belief that reality is true; that there is a knowable real world out there, existing as an independent reality. Positivist epistemology, presumes that knowledge comprises a truth which may be extracted from the empirical world through systematic, objective measurement. According to positivist inquiry, truth is achieved via verification and replication of directly observable findings or perceivable processes (Poole and Jones 1996). Hence it is assumed that reality consists of what is available to the human physical senses, and that investigation must be based upon scientific observation (Gray 2009). Thus, positivism recognises knowledge if it passes the test of empirical experience and produce facts about the world in a prescribed fashion. In other words, science must be conducted through strict laws of empirical inquiry (Gray 2009). Moreover, according to positivist inquiry the researcher and the researched (or “object”) are assumed to be independent entities and the researcher is understood to be capable, through the application of prescribed research strategy, of studying the object without influencing it or being influenced by it (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a).

Positivism has traditionally informed methods of research inquiry in most of the pure and applied sciences, including physics, chemistry, engineering, biology and medicine (Hughes and Sharrock 1997). However, while the cannons of positivist enquiry were initially the domain of the natural sciences, it was deemed that they were also appropriate for the study of human behaviour. Hence positivism has also been widely accepted as the methodology of the social sciences, and applied to the study of human behaviour (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a). For the present purposes it is not necessary to elaborate upon positivist research strategies, suffice to note that positivism is associated with quantitative research methods, which embrace objectivity, scientific

method, and empiricism (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a). Quantitative methods are designed so that findings are repeatable and generalisable to wider populations and are often used to establish cause and affect relationships (Flick 2002).

Growing concern, however, among some social scientists about the appropriateness of positivistic approaches to the study of social life has challenged the use of positivist research approaches, and lead to what has been described broadly as 'post-positivism' (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a). Post-positivism responded to the criticisms of positivism by acknowledging the importance of respondent perceptions, beliefs, interpretations and social meanings (Guba and Lincoln 1994; Miller and Brewer 2003). Ontologically, while some post-positivist researchers continued to maintain that reality existed, they questioned the existence of single verifiable truths, argued that that truths could never be fully understood but only approximated, and argued the existence of multiple and competing truths (Denzin and Lincoln 2005).

Post positivism is sometimes referred to as comprising the position of those social scientists who challenged, and followed on from positivism, and who, while questioning some aspects of the approach, maintained a broadly similar ontological and epistemological outlook to positivism. However, in its broadest sense, post positivism has been used to capture a very wide range of post positive paradigms including critical realism, structuralism and post structuralism, post modernism and radical feminism. While these paradigms differ from each other in their ontological, epistemological and methodological positions, in common they reject the basic tenets of positivism and embrace a wide range of qualitative research methods. These include ethnography, unstructured interviewing, textual analysis, and historical studies (Denzin and Lincoln 1994).

The study reported in this thesis might be described as theoretically eclectic in that takes meaning from the different philosophical positions underpinning both symbolic interactionism and phenomenology. In terms of its post positivist position, ontologically and epistemologically it derives from the premise that the world does exist, but that it is

driven by natural laws that can be only incompletely understood, It also understands that 'reality' is differentially perceived, and these perceptions must be contextualised because they are individually and historically situated. This position necessarily demands a research strategy which sets out to elicit respondents' own understandings of their experiences, which in turn are located in a broader social context.

Qualitative Research

The qualitative researcher examines process, experience and meaning. Moreover, it is the researcher's aim to elicit reality, as perceived by the research participants. In doing so:

Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry. Such researchers emphasise the value-laden nature of inquiry (Denzin and Lincoln 1998b:8).

Unlike quantitative research (which focuses on measurement, frequency, amount and intensity), qualitative research focuses on the meanings which phenomena have for respondents. Hence, whereas quantitative inquiry might ask 'how much' and 'how often', qualitative researcher are more likely to ask 'why', 'how' and under 'what circumstances' does it happen. Whereas quantitative research will examine relationships between variables, in qualitative research it is the relationship between researcher and respondent which is central. That is, in qualitative research a relationship (of trust and understanding) is forged with the respondent in order to elicit the respondent's account (Smith and Wincup 2000). It is also recognised in qualitative research, that the data is produced in the research encounter as a function of collaborative endeavour between researcher and respondent. This is in direct contrast

to quantitative enquiry, where every effort is made in order that integrity of the data (that is the non contamination of the data by the researcher) is maintained.

Qualitative research approaches are particularly appropriate in circumstances where there is little known about the area of investigation, before the onset of a study. Rather than applying the quantitative strategy of applying pre-formulated hypotheses testing to the research problem, qualitative approaches allow hypotheses to be identified and tested during the study period (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a). Qualitative researchers often deploy a wide range of interconnected methods which are problem based. That is the most appropriate methods to address the research problem or question are identified. Researchers can choose between a wide range of methods, including in-depth interviewing, focus groups and observation (Smith and Wincup 2000).

Of central importance to the qualitative researcher are the related issues of transparency and reflexivity. To reiterate, phenomenology posits the imperative that researchers acknowledge the prior knowledge and preconceived ideas which they bring to their inquiry. In particular, Heidegger argued that researchers should both acknowledge and be transparent about these beliefs and knowledge's throughout the research process. Because of this researchers must consider the grounds of, or reasons for, their understandings, and any potential consequences of such 'reflective' beliefs (Dewey 1997). Reflective thought as defined by Dewey (1997:6) is:

Active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends.

It is thus important for qualitative researchers to maintain self awareness throughout the data collection process and acknowledge the partial nature of their endeavours (Miller and Brewer 2003). Thus, the qualitative researcher must acknowledge how his/her own understandings change while carrying out fieldwork. These changes may lead to developments in respect of the research focus and direction of the study. Hence it is

imperative that the researcher remains responsive to the research environment and reflexive throughout the data collection process. Reflexivity requires the researcher to have a critical attitude towards the data collected, and recognise the importance of context as well as sensitivities in the relationship between researcher and researched (Miller and Brewer 2003). Reflexivity has been described as the process whereby:

Attention is drawn to the complex relationship between processes of knowledge production and the various contexts of social processes as well as the involvement of the knowledge producer (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2000:5).

Hence, qualitative researchers should reflect critically on both their role within the research, and also on their assumptions, research methods and their application (Davis 1998; Punch 2002). Without such reflexivity researchers risk prioritising their own, rather than respondents' perspectives (Morse 1991). Hence, throughout the research process there is a need to continually reflect on the data collection process, referring back to the original aims and objectives of the research as well as acknowledging developments to the original agenda, in order to ensure that the process of knowledge production is rendered accountable and transparent (Davies 1998). As Denscombe (2003), has argued in this respect, reflexivity involves giving a public account of the researcher's self, relative to the position of the respondents and the data. While reflexivity is a key element of doing qualitative research, Connolly (1998) has cautioned against the researcher being over-reflexive by continually questioning the data collection process, his/her own role in that process and his/her relationships with respondents.

The qualitative interview comprises a context in which data are obtained through the joint endeavour of researcher and respondent. Because of this it is important to attend to the relationship between the researcher and researched. An important point here is the imperative that this relationship is one based upon mutual trust (Smith and Wincup 2000). As Smith and Wincup (2000) note, however, some settings are more conducive to the development of trust than others. It is arguably more difficult to establish trust in

institutional settings, particularly where the power relationship between respondent and researcher is obviously unequal (such as in the secure estate). Hence, while it is acknowledged that the relationship can never be equal because the researcher has set the agenda, and is ultimately responsible for the research outputs, some settings are effectively more unequal than others.

Other factors are also important to researcher/researched relationships. In particular, when researching younger people, the power relationship between researcher and researched is arguably more unequal than where the participants are of similar age. In research with younger people the researchers must endeavour to satisfy themselves that the young participants both understand what the research is about, and what is expected of them, and that the methods selected are appropriate (Punch 2002).

Where there is an assumption that the understanding and capabilities of the young respondents are the same as adults, then it is the researcher's responsibility to treat them as mature, competent individuals (Alderson 1995). Notwithstanding this, researchers generally contend that there are unique issues related to research with children and young people mainly resulting from the power difference between adults and children (Morrow 1999; Alderson and Morrow 2004). Disparities in power between adults and children are recognised as an obstacle and thus a challenge to studies including children and young people (Morrow and Richards 1996; Mayall 2000). Moreover, where research on young people is necessarily located in an institutional context, then the issue of power relationships between researcher and researched is further complicated. Indeed Liebling (2001) has noted that within the prison environment, for example, a researcher will always have complex relationships with respondents and issues of power to consider, irrespective of the age of participants.

The chapter now turns to the actual research strategy, or methods, adopted in the current study. The following sections guide the reader through the research process from sampling to data analysis.

PhD Study Design

The PhD research comprised a, mainly, qualitative study. It was originally contended that the design would contain a qualitative longitudinal element . Longitudinal studies are relatively unusual in qualitative research with an evaluative element. However, they are particularly appropriate in cases where the phenomena under study is complex, and where it is important to grasp process and, related to this, where outcomes cannot be captured simply at the end point of an intervention (and where likely outcomes are not easy to anticipate before the onset of the research).

It was anticipated that the longitudinal element of the study would involve carrying out a series of focus groups with young people participating in the DoFE within secure estate establishments, at two points in time. At the first, or base line, stage data collection would target young people in the initial stages of the programme. At the second stage, approximately six months later, a second round of focus groups would, it was anticipated, target the same young people.

Hence, the study proposed to use a longitudinal panel design (Collins 2006) whereby the same individuals (where possible) were studied on two different occasions over a six month period. This, it was anticipated, would enable exploration of micro-level changes as individuals progressed through a process, and more long term impacts on their perceptions and attitudes. While a panel design was deemed as more appropriate for the study than a repeat cross sectional design (where different but comparable respondent samples are used at different points in time) in practice this aim was not wholly achievable. That is, exigencies of day to day life in the secure estate comprised the original intention to capture the perceptions of the same young people at two points in time. In practice young people participating in phase one of the study were often not available at phase two. There were several reasons for this. These were, some young people had been released, some were moved to other institutions and some had been reclassified in a higher risk category which prevented their attendance at the focus group. Of the original 64 young people taking part in focus groups at phase one of the

study, 15 also took part at phase two. For this reason, other young people (who had not participated at phase one) were included in the phase two focus groups. These young people had been involved with the programme for a similar length of time as those who participated at phase one of the study.

Phase one fieldwork visits to secure estate institutions also included one to one qualitative in-depth interviews with a sample of staff delivering the programme. These interviews were followed up at phase two of data collection to capture any perceived changes in the intervening period.

To reiterate, while the study design was primarily qualitative a small quantitative element was included. This quantitative element comprised an online survey of all Youth Offending Team Managers in England and Wales. It should be noted here that this element of the research was not included in the original research design but incorporated when data collection within the secure estate flagged up a need to collect data on transition from the secure estate to the community.

While the survey instrument sought to collect some, albeit minimal, quantitative data on levels DofE participation by young people in YOTs, its primary purpose was to elicit more qualitative responses to open ended questions about the organisation and delivery of the DofE in YOTS.

Finally, the study included in-depth, one to one interviews with a sample of DofE staff from the DofE central management team, with responsibility for the development and organisation of DofE across criminal justice services. Again, this qualitative element was not included in the original research design but was developed when a need was identified to explore organisational strategy and future aspirations of the DofE central management team.

The PhD study and the wider evaluation project

To reiterate, my PhD study was part of a wider evaluation of the DofE programme in the secure estate. The wider evaluation, which was commissioned by the DofE was carried out by a research team at Glyndwr University (headed by my supervisor) in collaboration with Professor Andrew Pithouse from Cardiff University. From the outset I was a member of the research team. My role vis-à-vis the commissioned evaluation involved development of the evaluation proposal and research protocol, collecting the data, and data analysis.

The evaluation study used an 'offending behaviour' instrument 'CRIME-PICS II'. This instrument was developed by Michael and Associates in 1994, to capture changes in attitudes towards offending. It comprises a 35-item structured questionnaire designed to measure attitudes to offending, including offenders' attitudes and perceptions of their problems, both at the outset of the order and again towards the end, to assess whether there has been any change and has been effectively used to measure improvements in attitudes to crime (Harper and Chitty 2005). It consists of two components. First, 20 items that measure the extent to which attitudes are pro-criminal, i.e. supportive of crime; Second, a 5-item problem inventory that measures the number and extent of self-perceived problems (Rex et al. 2004).

CrimePix has been adopted by both the Probation and Prison services in England and Wales as a standard measure for the impact of interventions with offenders. It is also used frequently in evaluations of rehabilitation projects in the private and voluntary sectors and, according to Feasey et al. (2005:2), is "one of eight measures currently employed by the National Probation Directorate (NPD) to evaluate the impact of nationally accredited general offending behaviour programmes".

In the past, the effectiveness of interventions with offenders has been assessed though either simple activity measures such as compliance levels, or by measuring outcomes such as reconviction rates. The first of these measures, however, tell us nothing about

the impact of the intervention, while the second is not only a blunt instrument but involves an appreciable time lapse before outcomes can be evaluated (Frude, Honess and Maguire 1998). As CRIME-PICS II focuses on attitude change, it offered the evaluation a powerful evaluative measure of changes in offenders' thinking about crime and victims before and after the intervention (Miers et al. 2001). Reconviction rates can be statistically correlated with questionnaire scores so that a project's likely impact on reconviction can be assessed. This makes the instrument a good measure relating to reconviction (Raynor 1998). The instrument can also be used as a diagnostic instrument to monitor the progress of offenders. As it is easily understood by offenders, the results can be shared and discussed with them (Frude, Honess and Maguire 1998).

It was anticipated that as young people gained experience of the DofE and became embedded in the programme, a difference in scores would be apparent between the two phases of the study. Crime Pix was perceived as an attractive instrument by the funders, in that it was anticipated that the outcome measures would provide convincing evidence of the impact of the programme.

The thesis does not report on the Crime Pix data, which at the time of writing are being written up for publication. Suffice to note, however, that the overall scores from the instrument did indicate some positive changes between the two phases of the study. While the evaluation drew on qualitative data from the focus groups and interviews with those delivering the programme, these data were grouped around Crime Pics priority areas. Because the sole intention of these data was their anticipated use in explaining the Crime Pics results, they were narrowly focused. In contrast, The PhD study designed as a qualitative inquiry which would be theoretically driven by an inductive approach, through which understanding of the issues important to young people participating in the programme would emerge.

The data set from the funded study was also expanded to include three additional chunks of fieldwork. These were a survey (which collected mainly qualitative data) of YOT managers, interviews with YOT workers and interviews with members of the DofE

central management team. Details the data collection strategy and process are provided in the following sections.

Sampling

Whereas it is the imperative of quantitative research approaches to employ sampling strategies which ensure each respondent from any identified population has an equal chance of selection, this is not the case in qualitative research. Indeed, because it is the aim of the qualitative researcher to elicit respondent meanings in respect of particular research problems or issues, key criteria of selection is identification of appropriate respondents. Hence, the issue of who should be invited to participate in qualitative research is crucial, and while self-selection and even selection by others is sometimes appropriate, it is imperative that researcher retains authority to identify participants who will provide rich data (Patton 1990).

There is a range of sampling strategies available to qualitative researchers. Among these is convenience sampling, where the sample is selected according to ease of access and respondent recruitment (Maxwell 2005). Another sampling strategy used by qualitative researchers, is snowballing strategy, whereby initial respondents are identified, and in turn they identify other potential respondents (Miller and Brewer 2003). Snowballing can be an effective strategy when accessing vulnerable, or hard to reach groups, for the purposes of research. In addition, snowballing is a useful strategy where the sample is not easy to identify in advance of fieldwork (Gray 2004).

The most common strategy for sampling used by qualitative researchers is purposive sampling (May 2001). May (2001) defines purposive sampling as selection driven by specific reasons and according to known attributes of potential respondent groups. The purpose sample is thus selected to provide the richest data to address research questions. It has been noted that purposive sampling may be particularly useful for the

recruitment of small samples, and where samples might include informants who are experts or authorities on particular subjects (Morse 1994).

The study reported in this thesis used purposive sampling to recruit a sample of seven secure estate institutions in England and Wales in which the DofE programme was currently delivered. The sample size was determined as a function of being large enough to accommodate a wide range of different experiences relating to programme delivery within the secure estate, yet small enough to be manageable for qualitative analysis. The sample was purposive in that it sought to represent a range of secure estate establishments, including young offender institutions, secure children's homes and secure training centres. Establishments were also purposively sampled to represent geographical regions across England and Wales, and length of experience in running the DofE programme.

Of an original eight establishments approached, three declined to participate and another three were recruited to replace them. Of these three, access to two was successfully negotiated but access to the third (although agreement in principle was achieved) was not successful. Of the seven recruited, at one establishment the original terms of access agreed with gatekeepers was overturned, and while the researcher was granted permission to carry out some of the research tasks others, which will be detailed later, were not permitted. Although three young women's secure establishments were asked to participate in the study, all three declined to take part.

The sample included, five Young Offenders Institutions (digit code 1,2,3,5, and 7 in data extracts), one Secure Children's Home (digit code 4 in data extracts), and one Secure Training Centre (digit code 6 in data extracts). These establishments covered an age range of young people between 12 and 21 years. The age range for YJB funded YOIs is 15-17 and non YJB funded YOIs is 18-21 years. The age range for Secure Children's Homes is 12 -16; Secure Training Centres 15-17.

Within each establishment participating in the study, two respondent samples were sought. These were young people participating in the DofE programme and staff involved in delivery of the programme.

Youth Offending Team Managers for all Youth Offending Team across England and Wales were invited to take part in the study, along with a purposive sample of Youth Justice Practitioners from both England and Wales, who had specific and direct experience of working with children and young who had participated in the DofE either within the secure estate or within the community.

In addition, a purposive sample of 5 DofE staff with management responsibility for organisation and delivery of the programme in criminal justice services were identified.

Access

Gaining entry to the research setting is a key stage of the research process, for without permission to enter, access to the respondent group, and thus the research, will be jeopardised (Brewer 2000). The term 'gatekeepers' was coined by Lofland & Lofland (1984) to refer to those individuals who have the authority to permit or deny entry to the field of study. McGee (1999) described access as the most overlooked, yet problematic stage of any research project. It is important to understand the potential impact a gatekeeper may have on the research, because gaining the trust of gatekeepers from the outset is crucial to the success of any study. This is because gatekeepers are in a powerful position vis-à-vis the research (Hughes 2000). It should also be remembered, that while gatekeepers may be perceived as obstructive by the researcher, they actually play a very important role in ensuring that researchers do not cause any hurt or harm to the intended research subjects (Lofland 1971).

It has been suggested that gatekeepers within institutional settings are often highly evident and identifiable, having substantial control within their respective establishments

(Smith and Wincup 2000; Heath et al. 2004). Moreover as Smith and Wincup (2000:335) maintain, within any research setting there are usually layers of gatekeepers with whom the researcher must negotiate entry, each one of whom holds different levels of authority and power, and can either help or hinder the research life. Here, they argued that “getting in” to secure establishments within the criminal justice system, particularly prisons, “can be a time consuming and problematic process for outside researchers”. Some research settings are undoubtedly easier to access than others. Likewise King (2000) and Martin (2000) have highlighted difficulties for the researcher in accessing the secure estate for research purposes. Here, King (2000) makes the key point that access will depend on the benefits of the research proposal versus the nuisance of the research on secure estate staff. However he does suggest that research access by research students may appear less threatening to gatekeepers, than those funded independently to carry out research on behalf of other institutions.

The first task for the researcher in obtaining access to a research setting is to identify the appropriate gatekeepers. In this research a number of gatekeepers were identified from the outset. In terms of securing access to the secure estate, permission was sought from Heads of Institutions. Here, negotiations were carried out on behalf of the researchers, by DofE staff, because of the existing relationships they had with institutions delivering the programme. Permission was also sought from the Youth Justice Board, who had the authority to refuse access to the young people. It should be noted that members of secure estate staff delivering the programme were very supportive of the research, because they felt it may benefit the programme in the future.

The Youth Justice Board also acted as gate keeper for the survey of Youth Offending Team managers and the research visits to the purposive sample of YOTs delivering the programme.

Respondent Recruitment

To reiterate, within each secure estate establishment participating in the study, two respondent samples were sought. These were young people participating in the Award and those delivering it. Staff delivering the Award identified young people to take part, observing the research requirements. That is, the study sought participation from young people who were recent recruits to the programme. It was anticipated that recruiting respondents within the secure estate may be more problematic because of the nature of the secure establishments, and exigencies of prison.

Because of exigencies of secure estate life, staff played an important role in selecting those who were anticipated as likely to complete a section of the Award (that is they were unlikely to be moved or released in the near future) and who were deemed as being in an appropriate risk category. At each institution the study aimed to recruit 10 young people.

Those young people initially identified, were asked by staff, if in principle, they would like to participate in the study. Those who agreed (which was all those who were asked) met as a group with the researcher, a member of the DoE and two members of prison staff. Here they were told about the study in more detail, provided with written information and asked, if they wanted to take part, to sign a consent form. Where young people were under 16 years of age, a member of prison staff was also required to consent for the young person to participate, in addition to obtaining consent from the young person themselves. The consent form clarified that participation was voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without incurring any repercussions. They were also guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity in all of the research outputs.

The staff sample comprised two or more secure estate staff at each establishment who delivered the Award. Staff were invited by letter to participate, provided with an information sheet and required to sign consent forms. All young people and staff members approached to take part, agreed to participate in the study.

At the beginning of every focus group the aim of the research was explained clearly to all participants. They were informed their involvement is entirely voluntary, that they did not have to participate and that they could go back to the prison wing whenever they wanted to. All participants were assured that anything they said about the topics introduced by the researcher would be kept confidential. However, they were informed that should young people disclose information about criminal activity, previously not known to the authorities, that the researcher would be bound to report that information.

The researcher ensured that these matters were explained in a way which all participants could understand and the researcher adapted accordingly with the different age groups. Before the focus group started, all children and young people were asked if they were happy to participate and given the option to go back to their prison wing at any time during the focus group, if they did not want to take part in the research.

Regarding the survey of YOT team managers, each manager was invited by email to take part in an online survey about DofE delivery and receipt in YOTS. The invitation provided information about the study and informed recipients that the research received YJB approval. In addition, recipients were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity. However, at the end of the questionnaire respondents were asked to provide contact details if they would like to be contacted by the research team for follow-up data collection. Two subsequent reminders about the survey were sent to all YOT managers.

Following the provision of contact details for follow up, and analysis of questionnaire responses, two youth offending teams were contacted, and it was agreed by these teams, that the researcher could visit for the purpose of interviewing team members about DofE delivery with the YOT. The two teams, one in England and one in Wales,

were purposively selected because of their knowledge and experience of DofE delivery in YOTs. Information about the study was provided to all staff and informed consent was sought from all participants.

Finally, a sample of (n=5) DofE staff employed by the central management office within the DofE, were recruited to take part in interviews about the organisation, management and delivery of DofE in criminal justice services. Potential participants, who were identified by their organisational responsibilities, were contacted by email/telephone and those who agreed in principle were sent information about the study. Prior to interview all respondents were required to sign a consent form.

Research Tools

Qualitative researchers have a range of different methods at their disposal. These include in-depth (semi and unstructured) interviews, focus groups and participant observation. The study reported here used a mixture of focus groups, semi structured interviews, and a survey questionnaire which included a high proportion of open-ended responses

Focus Groups

Focus groups, which are popular among qualitative researchers, have several advantages over other methods. First, the group environment is sometimes conducive to stimulating interaction among members and can lead to very rich data (Cote-Arsenault and Morrison - Beedy 1999). This is especially so, where participants are known to each other, and/or share a particular experience which may be the focus of the research. Within a focus group setting respondents can react to and build upon other members' responses and this in turn leads to more spontaneous and in-depth data (Cote-Arsenault and Morrison - Beedy 1999). Kitzinger (1995) has noted that group

discussion is particularly useful to the researcher where s/he has a series of open ended questions and wishes to encourage research participants to explore issues which are important to them, using their own vocabulary, to generate questions, thereby pursuing their own priorities.

Sometimes focus groups can be less intimidating, or threatening, than speaking to a researcher in a one-to-one interview setting. It has also been noted that using focus groups may be particularly appropriate when researching children and young people, who may be more relaxed and willing to share perceptions when discussions are held with a group of peers (Horner 2000). However it has also been noted that focus groups suit some research projects more than others. So, for example, where the subject of the interview might be construed as a sensitive topic, respondents may be wary of disclosing personal information about themselves. This may be particularly so when participants are known to each other (Morrison-Beedy et al. 2001). Also in focus groups some participants may be more vocal than others, who may be intimidated in a group setting (Morrison-Beedy et al. 2001).

Conducting focus groups involves the development of interview guides, identifying a meeting place, and facilitating participation of the group members. Facilitation is important to encourage group interaction. Indeed, as noted by Kitzinger (1995), focus group participants should be encouraged to talk to one another: asking questions, exchanging anecdotes and commenting on each others' experiences and points of view. As in other forms of qualitative data collection, ideally the data analysis begins during the focus group session, as issues emerge in the context of group discussions (Horner 2000). For this reason it is advisable to have more than one researcher (or other non-participant) present to assist with group management.

Focus groups typically involved participation of 8-12 young people, a member of prison staff, the researcher and a DofE worker. Focus group discussion at phase one aimed to elicit young people's perceptions of the DofE prior to (or in the early stages of) delivery

of DofE activities. At phase two, discussion focussed on young people's experiences of the DofE activities in which they had participated during the preceding six months.

The researcher carried out focus groups with young people (n=110), aged between 14 and 21 years, in six secure estate establishments, on two occasions, with approximately a six month interval between visits. Given the exigencies of prison life, it was not possible to maintain consistency in participants across the two phases in some instances. Sixty four young people (at a total of six secure estate establishments) took part in focus groups at phase one of the study and 46 at follow up. Focus groups were audio recorded at five institutions with participants' agreement. At the sixth institution, where the researchers were not permitted to use audio recording equipment, detailed notes were taken during the focus group.

Number of young people who participated at Phase one (6 focus groups) – n = 64

Number of young people who participated at Phase two (6 focus groups) – n = 46

Data from the focus groups with young people is presented in Chapter four of the thesis. See appendix two regarding the information sheet and consent forms given to young people

Interviews

Interviewing has a strong claim to being the most widely used method of research. It is therefore not surprising that interviewing takes many forms. Indeed the interview is a favoured research method for both quantitative and qualitative researchers. However, interviewing is quite different within the two approaches. In accordance with the canons of quantitative methods, the interview agenda usually sets out to test pre-determined hypotheses, relies primarily on collecting quantifiable data, using scales and/or closed-ended structured questions and seeks to protect researcher contamination of the data (Neuman 2006). Contrastingly, qualitative interviews (whether semi-structured or

unstructured) rely largely on open ended questions, which are not susceptible to quantification (and which may change and develop over the course of the study), and the importance of the researcher in the production data is both acknowledged and celebrated (Neuman 2006).

May (2001:120) notes that development of conversation with research subjects and the interpretation of such data is fundamental to the process of qualitative interviews which may:

...yield rich insights into people's biographies, experiences, opinions, values, aspirations, attitudes and feelings.

Semi structured interviews are the most commonly used type of research interview. Here the interviewer asks specific questions, but remains free to alter the sequence of questions and include probes to gain additional information (Neuman 2006). Prior to interview the researcher will have identified a variety of prompts and probes, which may assist in progressing the interview as required. Here, Gray (2004) suggests that probing of views and opinions may encourage the interviewee to expand on answers and subsequent discussions which arise. In semi structured interviews the interviewer is thus afforded flexibility and the opportunity not only to encourage the elaboration of issues, but also to encourage respondent identification of new unanticipated issues relevant to the research problem (Neuman 2006). This is important as the direction of the interview may change, depending on issues which arise. Miller and Brewer (2003) note that while semi structured interviews do maintain a set of topics, the interviewee is allowed flexibility to digress, develop and expand on any given issue of relevance to the research questions.

In Qualitative interviewing, the skills of the researcher are paramount. Gray's (2004) guidance for qualitative interviewers includes the importance of preparation; preliminary discussion with the interviewee to build rapport, techniques for maintaining the conversation and ways to close down the encounter. In the current research I found

Gray's (2004) imperative of building rapport with the interviewee very important and crucial to the outcome of the endeavour. Where rapport is not developed, the quality of information gathered, suffers. A good rapport, reflects a relationship of trust and respect between researcher and researched, and allows the interviewer to keep the interview focussed on the topics concerned with the research and cannot be taken for granted.

To reiterate, the issue of trust has been flagged up by Smith and Wincup (2000) as particularly problematic in research which takes place in institutional settings. From their own research experience they note that "overcoming the institutional mistrust of outsiders held by both prison staff and prisoners themselves presented something of a challenge" (Smith and Wincup 2000:340). The authors highlight how these respondents have particular concerns over issues of confidentiality and may also be defensive about with the way in which they anticipate their views and opinions may be presented in research outputs. In the current study, any potential concerns about confidentiality and representation were addressed prior to commencement of interviews and reassurances were provided.

Smith and Wincup (2000:342) describe four types of researcher/researched relationship. The first, which is 'simulated equivalence', is where a focus is maintained by the researcher on shared interests of the participants which assists in the development of rapport and empathy. The second, 'researcher directive', is where the interviewer has struggled to develop a rapport, and has resorted to lead the discussions throughout. The third, 'respondent directive', is where the interviewee has taken control of the interview. The fourth, 'mutually advantageous', is where the interviewer listens to the interviewee and is the most equal and success of all relationships. As a relatively novice researcher, it was interesting for me to experience how, though despite aspiring to the mutually advantageous model of interviewing, the relationship type could shift from one category to another as interviews progressed.

While Smith and Wincup (2000) clarify relationship types which index different interviewing styles, other researchers, including Morrow (1999) and Alderson and

Morrow (2004) refer explicitly to the power relationship between interviewer and interviewed in the research encounter. To reiterate, while, by the nature of the encounter, most power usually resides with the interviewer (who sets the agenda, addresses self identified issues, analyses the data and presents the findings), it is important that issues of this power imbalance are acknowledged and addressed as far as possible. This means ensuring that the respondent is enabled to identify issues which are important to him/her, rather than simply imposed by the researcher, and that the researcher represents faithfully the issues as they are expressed by the respondent. It is also important to stress that in qualitative interviews the data collected are produced through the joint endeavour of interviewer and respondent. The interviewer's position and role in this type of interview is therefore extremely important.

At phase one of the current study, 15 semi-structured interviews were carried out with a sample of staff administering DofE at participating institutions. Interviews with service providers opened with the researcher providing a brief account of the main aims and objectives of the research. The interviews lasted between approximately one and two hours and were audio recorded, with respondent permission. All interviews were semi-structured and addressed broadly the research aims and more specifically, the research questions. These interviews focused on staff perceptions of the programme, perceptions of programme participants (including selection to the programme), programme structure, content and delivery, facilitators and barriers to successful implementation, perceived support and transition to the community. All staff interviews were digitally audio recorded with respondent permission. At phase two of the study informal meetings were held with staff members delivering the programme, to capture any developments in, or changes to, delivery.

Following administration of the YOT questionnaire (discussed below), visits were made to two purposively selected YOTs (one in England and one in Wales) to explore in depth DofE delivery in YOTs. The two YOTs were selected because they delivered the DofE within their respective YOTs and indicated willingness to be visited by the research team. During these visits a series of eight semi structured interviews with a range of

YOT professionals were carried out. These interviews were audio tape recorded, and focused upon DofE activity in the YOT, staff roles and responsibilities regarding the programme, programme organisation, structure and delivery and barriers/facilitators to deliver.

Five members of the DofE central management team were purposively selected with the aid of the DofE Youth Justice Project Officer. The aim of these interviews was to understand the perception of the DofE in working with children and young people involved with the youth justice system and to gain a greater understanding of the future vision of the DofE organisation within the field of youth justice. Each staff member was interviewed for approximately one hour and all interviews were audio recorded.

Data from the interviews with secure estate staff is written up in chapter five of the thesis, chapter six for the YOT staff and chapter seven for DofE staff. See appendix two regarding the information sheet and consent forms given to staff

The Questionnaire Survey

There has been an increase in recent years of internet based self completion survey's, which can be distributed via email and completed on a specific internet site (David and Sutton 2004). The survey is relatively easy to set up, and convenient for respondents who have access to email, and can protect anonymity.

With the agreement and support of the Youth Justice Board, Youth Offending Team (YOT) managers in England and Wales were invited to participate in an online internet based survey (n=157). All YOTs received an explanatory email with the survey web link attached (see appendix two). The survey instrument focussed on DofE related activities within the YOTs, and particularly on continuity of delivery of the DofE post release from custody. The questionnaire included both (a minority of) quantitative (focusing on level

of provision) and (a majority of) qualitative questions (about how the programme was implemented and received). See appendix two for more detail.

The completed surveys were automatically placed in a web based site, which allowed the researcher to begin data analysis.

It was known by the researcher, prior to the survey that only a minority of YOTs (67) were at the time of the survey, involved in DofE delivery in any capacity. Moreover, it was known that most of these YOTs did not deliver the programme in house but sign posted young people to community based provision. However, in order to preserve anonymity it was necessary to include all YOTs in the survey, although it was anticipated that returns would be low because of the low number of YOTs involved with the programme. The total number of completed YOT questionnaires was 27. However 69 YOTs emailed the respondent to explain non completion as a function of non-involvement with the programme.

To reiterate, where possible, respondent interviews were audio recorded. Interviews were audio recorded (using digital recorders) at all but one of the secure estate institutions. At this one institution, security procedures did not allow me to take a recording device inside the prison. Here, I took notes during interviews and the focus group, and immediately upon leaving the prison dictated these notes and other observations using the digital recorder. I subsequently transcribed this recording along with all other interview recordings.

There are several advantages to recording interviews. First, it enables the interviewer to concentrate on the interview conversation. Second, it captures all the conversation, and so seemingly unimportant issues at the time, which may later transpire to be important, are recorded. Third it appears as a more natural encounter, and therefore more conducive to good respondent/researcher relationships (May 2001). Finally, the transcript lends itself better to in-depth conversational analysis than hand taken notes (Rubin and Rubin 1995). On the down side it has been suggested that recording

equipment may intimidate respondents and being recorded may not be conducive to openness (Kvale 1996). However, modern digital equipment available to the researcher makes the audio recorder far less obtrusive and threatening. Finally, while transcription of audio material is time consuming, it is certainly worth the effort!

Data from the questionnaire survey is written up in chapter six along with the interviews with YOT staff.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began at the start of data collection, and continued throughout and following completion of fieldwork. This helped me to consider the data in light of the literature and thus revisit, where necessary, any prior understandings (Silverman 2005). I carried out full transcription of all audio material. Once audio recording were transcribed, I read each transcript as a starting point for the development of my analytic framework which was based on emergent themes and codes. Gray (2004) has provided a useful starting point for discussion about qualitative data analysis. He has noted how, when properly executed, qualitative analysis comprises:

...a rigorous and logical process through which data are given meaning. Through analysis, we can progress through an initial description of the data then, through a process of disaggregating the data into smaller parts, see how these connect in to new concepts, providing the basis for a fresh description (Gray 2004:319).

My data analysis took direction from constant comparative and grounded theory approaches. Grounded Theory is a method which was initially associated with the Chicago School (influenced by symbolic interactionism) and expounded in the work of

Becker and colleagues (Glaser 1992). Grounded theory, which was initially developed by Glaser and Strass (1967), is defined by Strauss and Corbin (1998:158) as a:

...general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed. Theory evolves during actual research, and it does this through continuous interplay between analysis and data collection.

In other words, rather than using a deductive approach to theory, whereby preconceived hypotheses are tested out on the data, an inductive approach whereby theory is developed through the data, is used (Strauss and Corbin 1990). In this way theory are grounded in the data and not vice versa.

In a pure grounded theory approach, the researcher brings no preformed suppositions to the fieldwork. S/he enters the field. Collects data and then identifies commonalities which are the beings of theory. These conceptions are then taken back into the field and tested for robustness against the data. This is an ongoing process throughout the research, whereby the theory is developed through the data (Strauss and Corbin 1997). For my study I did not use a pure grounded theory approach, but found elements of a grounded theory approach to data analysis very useful. That is, while my initial preconceptions (which were a function of both the literature review which I had undertaken and my own personal experiences of working in criminal justice services) did inform the semi-structured interview schedule, the schedule was developed throughout the fieldwork as respondents identified issues important to them rather than merely responding to those which I had prioritised.

Within grounded theory, the data is collected and analysed as part of a continuous comparative approach. This process starts at the first collection of data. Initial data are compared and contrasted with ideas emanating from the literature which then informs subsequent data collection via refinement of the research questions (Strauss and Corbin 1990). This process is progressively repeated throughout the data collection

period. The difference between grounded theory and other approaches is thus the continued emphasis upon theory development.

Grounded theory is now among the most influential and widely used modes of theory generation in qualitative research (Strauss and Corbin 1997), and has become popular as an approach adopted in education, health studies (Thomas and James 2006; Miller and Fredericks 1999). It has been favoured by sociologists (since the Chicago School researchers) as an approach which facilitates prediction and explanation of behaviour, advances the theoretical base of the discipline, and is particularly suited for practical applications/applied research (Glaser 1999).

When interrogating the data, I used a constant comparative approach (Lincoln & Guba 1985) compatible with grounded theory. This entails comparing incidents within the data according to broad categories, integrating categories and refining theoretical ideas. This is an inductive method which identifies and compares all incidents/events in the data within and between emergent categories (Goetz and LeCompte 1981). The process is most simplistically referred to as coding. Gray (2004:395) defines coding as “The process of transforming raw data into a standardized format for data analysis... ... in qualitative research it means identifying recurrent words, concepts or themes”.

The process of data coding should help the researcher to continually question his/her perspective, rather than taking for granted the developed and emergent categories.

Data from respondent transcripts are coded into categories initially identified through the research questions (which themselves were developed in conjunction with the literature review). As the data is gathered, newly coded data are constantly compared with data previously coded in the same category, in order to develop the categories properties and maintain the reflexive process (Denzin and Lincoln 1998a; Titcher et al. 2000).

In my study, from the outset, two separate coding mechanisms were used, one for service users and one for service providers. It was anticipated that some of these

categories (which represented identified data themes) may overlap and might be usefully merged at some point if that were the case. Rubin and Rubin (1995:238) note that coding can be applied to different interview levels. On one hand it can be used to thematically describe the data content and on the other it can be used to identify participant responses such as 'hesitations, blocking, signs of emotion, and indications of fear or amusement'. It is important to note that coding robustness is dependent on the accuracy of the data collected, which itself is dependent on the quality of transcription from the audio recordings.

Coding within grounded theory is developed usually in two stages (Titcher et al. 2000). This is the process I used for my study. The first stage involved the identification of 'open' coding. This involved using a wide range of indicators to support different categories. These were drawn from the literature review, my own experience of working in the field of youth justice and related to these, the research aims and questions. Some categories were identified thus and some emerged through the analysis of transcripts (through identification of similarity and difference) Once coding categories were identified, all the transcribed data were categorised. Data selected to be included in specific categories varied in length from a sentence to a few pages. In categorising the data I was careful to ensure that the codes reflected the substance and nature of the transcribed material (Miller and Brewer 2003). Having broken down the data into different categories, by means of open coding, I then progressed to the second stage of 'axial' coding. Axial coding is where material with the same codes are grouped together, and where relationships and connections between the concepts and categories are identified by putting the data back together (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Strauss and Corbin (1990) note that even though open and axial coding are distinct in themselves, when the researcher is analysing the data, s/he alternates between the two in order to refine the set data. Upon refining coding categories, these were tested for robustness on the entire data set. In the findings chapters of the thesis, extracts from the data with coded categories are used as evidence of the identified categories or themes.

Ethics

Ethical decisions are not being defined in terms of what is advantageous to the researcher or the project upon which they are working. They are concerned with what is right or just, in the interests of not only the project, its sponsors or workers, but also others who are the participants in the research (May 2001:59).

Criminologists are required to acknowledge any research conducted within the criminal justice system will involve ethical complications. Many of the respondents will be vulnerable, and because of this, understanding of ethical proceedings is necessary throughout the research process (Noaks and Wincup 2004).

Residents of secure establishments comprise a particularly vulnerable research group. For those in the secure estate this is particularly poignant because this group comprises young people some of whom are under 16 years old. Vulnerable respondent groups present particular issues for researchers (Smith and Wincup 2000; Liebling 2001; Alderson and Morrow 2004; Schlosser 2008). First, the fact of their incarceration may dispose respondents to take part in research because they fear institutional repercussions if they do not. Second, relating to this, the power balance between researcher and respondent appears even more weighted in favour of the researcher than usual (Liebling 2001). Third, given that prison populations are generally less educated with lower proficiencies in reading and writing, than some others, gaining informed consent may be problematic (Schlosser 2008). Fourth, given that incarceration is associated with social stigma, prison populations may be more concerned, than other respondent groups, about the imperative of confidentiality and anonymity (King 2000).

In my research I addressed these issues in the following way. Ethical approval for the thesis was sought from Glyndŵr Research Ethics Committee (GREC) (See appendix two). The research took guidance from the principles of ethical research practice set out by the British Sociological Association (BSA 2002).

First the study observed the principles of informed voluntary consent, anonymity and confidentiality. Informed consent is ensuring that respondents know what the study is about and the terms of their participation. Noaks and Wincup (2004:45) have stressed the importance of achieving informed consent “as a fundamental guiding principle for an ethically informed approach”. From the outset, all respondents were told about the study, verbally and in written format (via information sheets). In this information it was made clear that participation was voluntary, that no repercussions would occur as a function of non-participation, and respondents were free to leave the study at any point (whereupon all data collected from them would be destroyed). Prior to focus groups, interviewees were asked to sign consent forms and these were explained to them at the time. Where young people were aged under 16 years, consent was sought from institution carers as well as from all the young people themselves.

Respondents were also assured that they would remain anonymous in all output from the study. While generally providing assurances of confidentiality, respondents were told that the researcher was bound by law to report any criminal incidents disclosed to her which had not previously been reported to the authorities.

In written outputs of the study, including this thesis, it should be noted that non essential information about respondents/institutions has been altered in instances where it was deemed necessary to protect the identity of the institution and the participants.

Research respondents have a right to be informed of results of the research in which they participate (Miller and Brewer 2003). All participants of the study were told that they could obtain a copy of the findings of the study on application to either the researcher or the DofE (and contact details were provided on the information sheets).

Miller and Brewer (2003:97) suggest that “one of the most important aspects of social research is the protection of the participants’ identity”. Miller and Brewer (2003) note that;

Guide to respondent identifiers:

Focus Groups: Indicators for data extracts are as follows: the first digit indicates institution type, YP indicates Young Person, the final digit indicates research phase (baseline or follow-up). For strings of group talk the first digit indicates institution, FG indicates focus group and the final digit indicates research phase.

Staff Interviews: First digit indicates institution type, S indicates staff and final digit indicates individual staff identifier.

YOT interviews/questionnaire data: Short data extracts in text are un-coded. Longer indented quotations coded as follows: Y indicates YOT worker, digit (provided in respect of questionnaire data only) indicates institution type. Alphabetical identifier (provided only for face to face interviews) indicates institution visited.

The following chapter presents the findings from the focus groups carried out with young people and is the first of the four data chapters.

This chapter, which focuses on the accounts of young people participating in the programme in secure estate institutions, is the first of the four findings chapters. To reiterate, focus group participants were identified by secure estate staff. At phase one of the research young people selected had recently embarked on the programme. At the second phase of the research, they had been involved with the programme for approximately six months. While the initial aim was to include the same young people at both phases, this was not feasible for logistical reasons. Out of all the young people involved in the study, only fifteen participated at both phases of the study (for reasons outlined in the previous chapter). Moreover, because of issues of confidentiality, those young people who participated at both phases cannot be identified from their respondent codes.

The chapter presents key issues identified in the focus group data. The respondent identifiers indicate different institutions and different phases of the study. They do not differentiate between types of institution or between individual participants, as this was agreed with institutions in order to ensure confidentiality. Extracts from the data, are presented here to support identified themes. Every effort was made to ensure that overreliance on selected respondents did not occur.

The themes are presented in three sections. These are 'privilege and commitment', 'knowledges, skills and experiences', and 'damage and repair'. While the content of these themes interrelate and overlap, they have been separated out for purposes of clarity.

Privilege and commitment

At phase one of the study, young people in the focus groups had little prior knowledge about and/or any experience of the DofE. When asked, the majority, like 2YP1, said they had “never heard of it”. Those who had heard of DofE (mainly through school), for the most part understood the DofE to be for other more ‘bookish’ or ‘geekish’ young people. Hence they said “I thought it was just for the boffins and posh kids” (4YP2), “the geeks did it in my school” (2YP1) and “the ones who liked maths” (4YP1):

Int: Had you heard about it at school?

4YP2: yeh but I thought it was just for the boffins and that, posh kids

Int: you think it’s for posh kids?

4YP2: That’s what I used to think an’ all

4YP2: yeh the posh ones

Many young people in the focus groups agreed with 4YP2 who said “I just didn’t want to do it at school. It sounded boring”.

While the DofE was described by the young people as an activity which held little prior relevance or interest for them, the programme assumed a different meaning and importance for them within the secure estate for a number of reasons. The two main reasons given by young people for their participation in the DofE were instrumental. Firstly, the DofE was perceived as providing a distraction from the routine of prison life:

Int: What got you interested in the DofE?

4YP1: I thought it would be something to do

And

5YP1: just thought its something to pass my time so I'll do it

Secondly, the DofE was perceived as important for what it might offer young people in the future.

Focus group participants were aware that while the DofE programme was voluntary, it was not inclusive in the secure estate. That is, it was not perceived as accessible to all young people. Hence, participants described how “only certain people are allowed to do it here” (4YP1). To some extent, therefore, DofE participation was understood by participants as a privileged activity.

Some young people understood the DofE to be available only to those perceived as low risk by the institution. Hence in some cases, access to the programme was described as “depending on your security level” (2YP1). At some (but not all) institutions visited, access to the DofE was only available to those young people who were eligible for Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL). Hence one young person noted “they choose the good lads, the ones that can get released for ROTL” (3YP2). At all institutions visited, eligibility for ROTL determined access to the programme and/or, as we shall see later, the type of DofE activities in which young people were allowed to participate.

While institutional criteria, such as eligibility for ROTL, were beyond the control of young people, participants were aware that in other ways they themselves could influence their chances of selection to the programme. Here, they talked about different sources of information on which selection was based, including the “wing form” (1YP1) and other “information they have about you” (1YP1).

Although the institutions visited, employed different systems of privileges, at all the institutions young people were aware that their behaviour was key factor in whether they were invited to participate in the programme. Hence they talked about having to, “stay on gold” (an establishment behaviour classification) and “be good” (5YP2), and be “a good prisoner” (1YP1), because, “if you’re not well behaved” (3YP1) or “if you’re not

(good) they wouldn't really ask you" (5YP). As we shall see later, young people are mostly introduced to the DofE via word of mouth and it was interesting to learn how young people doing the Award introduced the programme to others:

Young people ask me what have I got to do to get on the course and I say 'stay on gold and be good, and then ask to put your name down' (5YP2).

Participants in all focus groups talked about themselves as comprising "the best candidates" (5YP2) for selection. Over and above their claims to good behaviour, respondents described commitment to the programme as very important. Hence they described young people "who want to do it" (5YP2), are "willing to learn" (5YP2), and who were "dedicated" (1YP1), as the most suitable contenders:

Int: were you chosen to do it?

5YP2: they asked

Int: do you know why?

5YP2: they said we were the best candidates.

Int: what do you think the best type of candidate is?

5YP2: fit, willing to learn

5YP2: someone who wants to do it

Many focus group participants felt that the opportunity to participate in the DofE should be earned rather than offered freely to those "not committed and not behaving themselves" (1YP2):

You've got to be a reasonably good prisoner. It is a good course to be on; they are not going to put people on it if they are not pulling their weight around the prison. Even if someone is mucking about on the wing, they shouldn't be allowed to do it (1YP2).

Thus, the view was expressed by some young people that only those who 'deserved' to be selected should be offered the opportunity to participate:

Why give them the opportunity to achieve something when they are not committed and not behaving themselves (1YP2).

Hence, young people talked about having to "earn the right" (1YP2) and described participation as dependent on their success in convincing staff "they can trust us" (1YP2):

Int: not everyone can do the Award here?

1YP1 : You have to be a well behaved prisoner

1YP1: That's one of the good things

Int: so you are different from other people here

1YP1: We done a lot of courses and stuff so they know they can trust us

Int: it's a trust thing?

1YP1: Yeh

1YP1: You gotta earn the right I suppose

As these data extracts indicate, being selected to participate in the programme was perceived, in some cases, as a privilege:

Not many people get this opportunity; most people don't get the chance to get this opportunity really. We are quite privileged to get this (2YP1).

Given that participation in the programme, within the secure estate, was perceived in some respects as exclusive, accounts of how young people became aware of, and interested in, the programme were quite telling. To reiterate, few young offenders

embarking on the DofE had any previous knowledge about the programme. In a minority of cases young people learnt about the programme from information on notice boards. Hence they described “posters in the gym” (2YP1), and “notice boards” on the wing (1YP1) as important in drawing their attention to the existence of the programme and possible opportunities for them to participate:

I saw the notice board with it on (4YP1).

Basically, what got us interested in the first place were the posters we saw in the gym and it went from there (2YP1).

While some young people in institutions learnt about the programme during induction to their units, mostly knowledge of DofE was learnt by word of mouth, that is: “talk about DofE with the other lads on the wing” (7YP1), and the likelihood that someone “I know did it and they just said it were good” (4YP1):

On E wing I talk about DofE with the other lads and they are interested in it especially the fact that you get to go out of the prison sometimes with the activities (7YP2).

Also the young people talked about ‘others’ who had succeeded with DofE and these ‘success stories’ were very important for recruitment to the programme. An example of this was where at one institution focus group members talked about a previous DofE participant who had completed the Bronze Award while in prison and had been successful in finding employment following his release.

While a minority of young people said that they had joined the programme because it was ‘something new’ to try, and “just thought I’d give it a go” (2YP1), the majority, in contrast, cited potential future benefits, of the Award as “good for your CV” (2YP2).

For those who had actual prior experience of the DofE, the story was different. For example, a young man who had first encountered the DofE through a Youth Offending

Team, prior to his custodial sentence, was enthusiastic about these early experiences – especially the preparations made “to go camping”- which fuelled his interest in continuing while in custody:

5YP2: I was doing it on the outside I was

Int: where were you doing that?

5YP2: With the YOT. I did about a month and as I went to go camping I came in here

Int: would you be interested in carrying on to the silver

5YP2: Yeah definitely

Int: When you came in here, did they approach you to carry on doing the DofE

5YP2: I just started it, when they did (others in the focus group). I wanted to carry on with it.

Throughout fieldwork there were many examples of young people who claimed to have had positive experiences of the DofE while incarcerated, and who described the DofE as “a really good idea for everyone to get involved” (2YP2). Interestingly, in retrospect, some focus group participants like AYP, regretted not doing the DofE prior to their incarceration:

Int: what’s it like doing the Award here.

1YP: I wish someone had told me about this when I was outside.

That the main way in which young people became interested in the DofE, while in the secure estate, was word of mouth, was supported by the assertion of some young participants that they would encourage others to take part:

(It’s) been an excellent experience and I would recommend it to anyone (7YP2).

I'd tell them that it is definitely worth doing, you learn a lot out of it. You also get to meet people and that. In the prison environment you go from your wing, to here, to there, but with this you meet people and have a laugh (1YP2).

The 'privileged' status accorded by young people to DofE involvement, was linked in participant accounts with conditions of successful participation. Most young people, at both phases of the study expressed commitment to the DofE and a willingness to succeed in obtaining an Award. Linked to this, they were also quick to highlight differences between those likely to succeed and those likely to fail on the programme:

You can tell by the first day if someone's not going to last. They'll (prison officer) say, 'listen you're wasting your own time here'. Basically –you're wasting their time. They came here because they thought it would be extra gym sessions. Once they realise you got to commit yourself – like with the running, you won't see them again (1YP2).

The above extract suggests, while those who stay in the programme are committed to the DofE, others do not necessarily perceive participation as a privilege. There was talk, among DofE participants, about misperceptions held by other young people in custody about the programme:

They think that you're always down the gym. They thinks that is what it's about like. But I've been working at it for two years and all they see is that I'm down the gym a lot (1YP2).

While young people argued that the DofE was perceived as a 'soft option' by non participants, those, like themselves, who stayed with the programme, perceived it as "hard work isn't it" (1YP3), and talked about the necessity of having "to commit yourself" (1YP2):

1YP2: you've got to be dedicated

1YP2: A lot of people started it and then about 2 weeks later they find out what its really about (they drop out)

1YP2: There was 14 of us now there's 6 of us

Int: why did they drop out

1YP2: Just lazy isn't it

When asked in which ways the programme demanded commitment from participants, young people talked about completing different sections of the Award (which together comprise the Bronze Award) and the necessity of "setting ourselves personal targets" (7YP2), and recording progress towards these goals by "marking it off, every time you have been (and) what have you done" (7YP2).

It was argued, by some participants that the misconception that the DofE was 'an easy option', might be corrected if the DofE were better explained to young people during induction sessions:

To be honest with you I think the people who introduce it don't explain it properly to you (3YP1).

They should go to the wing and explain to them what it's exactly about. Explain to them this is what you've got to do. Like if they had a day which showed them what it is about, it's about this, this, this and this. If you want to stay, stay, but there's no problem if you want to go back (1YP1).

Knowledges, skills and experiences

While focus group participants differed in the range of experiences, and skills which they brought to the programme, they all talked about the acquisition of new knowledges and new ways of learning.

The learning attributed by participants to the DofE ranged widely from very basic activities such “frying an egg” (2YP2) to the mastery of quite complex skills such as orienteering. When asked what the DofE involved, participants described a wide raft of subjects and activities, including, reading and math, fire fighting, cookery, physical fitness, sports, art, woodwork, voluntary and community work and expedition.

The majority of focus group participants had been under-achievers at school and had no educational qualifications. The DofE programme was distinguished from ‘school work’ and other routine activities in the secure estate, primarily in terms of its applied and practical nature. In the following data extract a young person describes the difference between his experience of traditional class based education, and learning through the DofE:

This is the best bit of education in this jail, if I’m honest. You haven’t got to sit there for three hours; you don’t have to sit there doing word searches like in English. You’re in a classroom doing that stuff and thinking well why am I here? In one of the classes he just makes us sit there, and you do the same bit of work. You’re put to education to learn something yeh? – Well I can come here (DofE) and I can right get rid of some of my energy and with people who know me. In the classroom that teacher doesn’t know you...I don’t know why in education you would want someone to

do the same word searches. But I come here and I can actually do something. I can write and learn to spell as well (1YP1).

Certainly participants stated a preference for hands on learning style and “the practical side” (4YP2) which they associated with the programme:

In education you can do different things like Maths/English/Healthy Eating, this one (Healthy Eating) is the decided favourite as you get to cook the food and then eat it afterwards (7YP2).

For most of the young people, this was often the first time they described experiencing any enjoyment related to structured learning activities. While on one hand they talked about commitment and hard work, on the other hand they described “having fun in the process” (1YP2).

The expedition

When talking about learning acquired through the DofE, young people focussed primarily upon the expedition component of the programme. While as we shall see later, not all respondents were eligible to participate in the external expedition, much of the DofE learning in the secure estate was perceived as leading up to this event, which was largely perceived as the pinnacle of the programme.

For most focus group participants, the expedition section was perceived as the most important component of the DofE, and was an event anticipated with great excitement. That it was associated by young people with activities outside of the prison grounds, was a major contributing factor to the perceived attractiveness of the DofE programme. Notwithstanding this, young people were aware that not everyone would be permitted to go on expedition and that only those eligible for ROTL (Release on Temporary License) were considered eligible. However, as we shall see later, some institutions visited

provided the expedition experience for young people doing the Award albeit within, as opposed to outside, the prison walls.

The young people were required to undergo considerable preparation leading up to the expedition component of the Award, irrespective of whether or not they would be eligible to participate. Expedition related learning was perceived as useful and important by young people, not only because of the end goal (the expedition) but also for its own sake. For example, a focus group participant ineligible for ROTL, and therefore unable to take part in the external expedition, described this learning as:

Valuable information ...really helpful as I had never read a map before. The staff made it easy to understand, and I felt like I got something good out of it definitely (2YP2).

To reiterate, the expedition required the acquisition of a range of skills, including “map reading” (5YP2), “orienteeing” (2YP2) and camp skills, such as erecting tents and “using the Trangia (camp stove)” (2YP2). Young people who had previously experienced an expedition became an important source of information for those in preparation. The experienced young people talked about helping the other less able “lads to read maps”, and more generally about providing:

...advice to the others because I knew it a bit better because I'd done the other one like. I knew what was happening, what would happen through the day (2YP2).

Reflecting back on the expedition, young people talked about having “to look for your food”, “cos you've got to find it”, and about knowing their ‘stuff’ like having to “pack the tent at the top because if it's raining you got to get it up quick” (1YP2). Certainly, high levels of preparation for the event were acknowledged by all young people who had taken part on an expedition:

We had practised before we went out and practised everything in the pre-training. It all went alright; it was good on the day (2YP2).

Despite rigorous preparation, young people reported anticipating the event with excitement, “I couldn’t sleep before the night “(2YP2), and “it is something to look forward to. I was looking forward to the expedition” (1YP2).

In addition to the style and content of learning which young people associated with preparation for the expedition, the expedition itself was linked in young people’s accounts with a range of new experiences.

On the expedition, you have to walk 21 miles. We jumped off a waterfall, it was serious. None of us had done that before, I’d never seen a waterfall before (2YP2).

I’d never seen a sheep before,

It is not a common sight. There was no fence and a sheep was in the middle of the floor.

It was chucking it down, we went on the walk and it was raining but it was nice rain, it was warm (2YP2).

In the data extract below, a young person notes how the provision of these types of ‘new’ experiences may be beneficial for other young people:

I went to a farm when I was young and I’d seen sheep, but some people are like – ‘it’s a sheep’. More expeditions would help people (2YP).

In addition to the skills and experiences acquired through preparation for, and completing the expedition, some young people talked about feeling changed as a result:

When you do the expedition you learn to respect the nature around you. If you are in the city you eat a pack of crisps and throw it on the floor, but we carried it around with us. I know it sounds mad, but it is like a lesson in itself (2YP2).

I have learnt how to deal with things a lot better. It has opened your eyes to a different kind of life, camping and that. It was something I have never done before. We have come to prison and we are being given opportunity to do something like this. It has really opened my eyes and thinking that we could progress on that. You could go camping with your family and that (2YP2).

To reiterate, in two out of the seven institutions visited, the expedition experience was simulated, inside the prison grounds, for those young people ineligible to take part in the external expedition. The simulated internal expedition involved a series of outdoor tasks and activities, comparable to those associated with the external expedition, including: setting up camp, cooking on the camp fire and sleeping overnight in tents. As we will see, young people perceived the internal expedition as very important, irrespective of whether or not they were eligible for ROTL. It is also important to note here that, while simulated, internal expedition counted as a legitimate aspect of the Award.

On internal expeditions, experienced participants (some of whom had previously been on external expedition) helped the inexperienced to get most out of the activity.

1YP2: for example described how he tried to “improve things, make more things to make it more realistic”. Here, the types of simulated activities on internal expeditions comprised “crossing a river, using planks of wood”, traversing “a mine field blind folded, where we could have got blown up” and “rowing 1500 meters in set times” (1YP2). At one institution, on the internal expedition, young people were given:

1YP2: Co-ordinates and we had to find things around the field...search techniques, what was it called again? ...you know like the police when they are searching for clues and things, we had to find a 10 pence piece. It was good

1YP2: And we had to walk to the campsite

1YP2: And there was a camp fire

1YP2: And we put our tents up and that

1YP2: You have to be quick with the rain and that.

1YP2: When that was all done we sat around the camp fire and ate some food and told some stories.

1YP2: It was good to be out at night time

1YP2: It was February and it was cold but I was warm cos I had so much clothing, I know it keeps you warm but when we were walking around I was getting hot .

The excitement associated by young people with the internal expedition is demonstrated in the following data extract:

2YP2 – I was on the first internal one with K, it was really good. The things we did were excellent. We did cycling, walking through the day, running with our sacks on. We got some of the equipment from the gym, rowing machines and that. We were set tasks to row 1500 meters in set times and that, it was really good. That was just the day time; after we did all the walking later on we had a BBQ. We had a fire

2YP2 – marshmallows

2YP2 – it did feel real, it felt good

2YP2 – we used the food thing, stove and used that. It was good to get to know how to use it and that

Int – how did you find that

2YP2 – it was good, we had practiced before we went out and practiced everything in the pre training. It all went alright; it was good on the day.

As the above extract suggests, for young people incarcerated, activities and experiences which might otherwise be perceived as fairly ordinary, assume especial importance. Despite the fact that the internal expedition is a simulation event, taking place within the secure estate walls, it appeared highly valued as an extraordinary experience by participants, some of whom were serving lengthy prison sentences:

Compared to everyday it is something different. Despite what people say it is a good laugh. You get to get out, walk about and keep your head clear for a while. It takes you away from this prison environment. Even though we are in prison, you are staying outside. I remember the first time I got to go out, it was a cold night but I stayed awake all night just looking up at the stars. I haven't been out for almost five years you see, it was a shock. I got to feel free for that one day; it was nice (2YP2).

For those who anticipated inclusion on an external expedition, the internal exercise was perceived as good preparation. Following the internal expedition, participants could “imagine doing it proper” and setting up camp “with no help from staff member” (2YP2).

The expedition aspect of the DofE, was thus perceived by programme participants as the central organising aspect of their learning. However, in addition to the ‘new’ experiences acquired through the expedition, there were a wide range of other benefits which were associated with the programme. It is to these benefits, that the chapter now turns.

Achievement and change

To reiterate, focus group participants, perceived themselves as in some senses privileged as a function of their participation in the programme. In the following data extract a young person distinguishes between those who participate in the programme and those who do not:

In here you are just in prison; you are the same as everybody else.
But, if you know you are doing work with the Duke of Edinburgh
then you are going to get that extra bit of bonus (2YP1).

Relating to this point, the DoE was perceived as conferring certain benefits upon participants. Some of these perceived benefits were linked by respondents to their immediate experiences within the secure estate, while others were associated with anticipated future/long term benefits.

In practical terms, young people talked about how inclusion in the DofE programme helped them to manage daily life in the secure state. On one hand inclusion in the programme provided an interest and activity:

Anyone who's in prison who has a little sense is not going to sit
around with a lot of time on your hands and do nothing (3YP1).

For others it was perceived as a strategy to avoid conflict in the secure estate. Hence, one young man said "I want to do this and not get into trouble on the wing" (1YP1) and another claimed:

When you are on something like this you try and stay on the
straight and narrow, because you are in prison it would be so easy
to get in to trouble. You are setting a target for yourself; you are

setting a boundary, a level. These are the opportunities you get (2YP2).

The perception of the DoE as a strategy to avoid getting into trouble was cited by several young people in the focus groups:

I think it (DofE) people want to get involved in it, because in here a little thing is a huge thing. This is massive, you can end up in trouble for the smallest thing, so when you get something good like this you try and do your best and hang on to it (2YP1).

Another way in which the DofE was credited, by participants, with improving their prison experiences was that through participation, new relationships with staff delivering the programme were developed. At one institution a young person explained that his motivation to complete the programme was fuelled in part by how he interacted with the prison officer delivering the Award:

If he is teaching you something, he stops being the prison officer and becomes one of the lads. You get motivated (2YP2)

Generally, participants described the relationships which developed between themselves and those delivering the Award as different from their relationships with other prison officers:

Staff on DofE are class. You can have a laugh with (staff member), you build a close relationship with them, it's a different relationship you have with them, nicer than the wing staff...because of DofE they treat you the same, most staff judge you for what you're in for (3YP2).

While respondents described having more ‘fun’ with, or ‘had a laugh’ with those delivering the Award, they also acknowledged a more serious side of the relationship. Hence, as noted in the data extract below:

We have a laugh with the staff...They’re strict and they’re fair as well, but they’re not soft (7YP2).

In another focus group, the staff member delivering the programme was described as “the best teacher ever” (1YP1). While, it might be argued that such praise may idiosyncratically signal special qualities/experiences of individuals, that so many of the young people highlighted good relationships with staff delivering the programme suggests that it is the nature of the programme and modes of delivery which informed positive relationships between staff and young people.

The accounts of some young people suggested that positive relationships with staff led to development of respect, which underpins increased levels of trust on both sides of the relationship. In the following data extract a young person describes the importance attached to the role of peer support mentor, allocated to him as a function of his DofE participation:

I was chosen out of 300 candidates. It was a big trusted job (peer support mentor) ... you got more respect, you could speak to staff, be more mature and they would listen to you. (2YP2).

Young People reported not only improved relationships with prison staff, but also with their peers. During phase one focus groups, young people were often reticent about discussing personal issues in front of other participants. However, in the second round of data collection, the same participants were noticeably more relaxed with each other and often prepared to talk about issues which would not have seemed possible at the earlier phase of the study. An example of this is provided in the data extract below,

where a young person is explaining how he missed a dentist appointment because he did not wish to forfeit a DofE session:

I should have been to the dentist, but I wanted to sit the test and get the DofE. I did my test with tooth ache, do you know what I mean. Tooth ache in jail is awful, you're sat in your cell and it is awful. When you have a cold and all you want is your mum, oh that is awful. That is the worst thing. I've not needed by mum since I was seven. Deep down you know when you have a cold, you know that all you want is your mum (1YP2).

I thought you were a man

(Laughter among the group) (1YP2).

It is notable in the above extract, that in 'opening up' to the group about his mother, the young man arguably risks making himself vulnerable to ridicule vis-à-vis, his peers.

An important aspect of improved relationships between the young people concerned their involvement in group and team activities. At phase two of the study, young people talked about the advantages of working together as a team in a joint endeavour:

You're enjoying it and you got to work with people a lot closer. In jail that is. And then when you are out there, team building and that, working well together (2YP2).

Here, they talked about the necessity of reliance upon and having "faith in other people to get you through it" (2YP2). While, this may not solely be a function of the DofE involvement (as the young people take part in a range of other joint activities while in the secure estate), certainly, some focus group participants credited the programme with improving group relationships:

We have a nice group of people who we can all work together. It's brought us closer like (1YP1).

Hence, young people recognised the importance of relying on other people, and working together as a team;

When I first started this course I was kind of hyperactive. During games I'd be over-energetic. But I was told 'right now you need to calm down'. It's kind of helped me to watch how I am and when (and) I think about myself, it's the team member bit, we need all the help we can get from other team members (2YP2).

If it wasn't for the Duke of Edinburgh we wouldn't know each other, we wouldn't be interacting with each other. At the end of the day if you can get everybody interacting with each other, it's going to calm the place; they won't be against each other (2YP2).

One young person, summed up the sentiments of other participants in a focus group at phase two of the study when he claimed that participation in the DofE had, "made you respect other people" (1YP2).

In addition to claims that the DofE led to improved relationships with staff and peers, young people talked about how the Award provided them with an opportunity to succeed in an endeavour in activities they had previously deemed impossible:

It makes you feel good to achieve something positive (7YP2)

It makes you feel that you have achieved something. It makes you feel better...When I got my one signed off, I was really proud of

myself. When I started it over nine months ago, I didn't think I'd get here. I got it and it made me more proud that I got it (2YP2).

Likewise, focus group participants described their experiences of DofE as giving them "more confidence" (1YP2), making them feel "more of a leader" (1YP2) and providing:

A chance to prove yourself (because) It gives a lot of people confidence that they think they never had (2YP2).

Some young people talked about how their involvement in the Award had lead to achievement in other areas:

Since I have completed the physical part of my Duke of Edinburgh award and got involved with it, it has led on to better things. I have completed my leader's award, got a first aid certificate and my manual handling and lifting certificate qualifications. It is an ongoing process since we started the Award (2YP2).

Given their disadvantaged backgrounds, some focus group participants acknowledged how this achievement was all the more poignant:

I think it is different, some of us come from backgrounds where it is not available to us and we have a chance to do something we don't normally do and we can prove that we can do it, because we have done it (2YP2).

Young people also talked about achievement in terms of helping others, as well benefitting themselves. The point about assisting others will be discussed more fully in a later section of the chapter. Here, suffice to say that some focus group participants who had completed the Bronze Award, or a component of it, talked about the importance of helping other people to succeed:

You don't realise how much people can't read. If you can learn them something it is worthwhile (2YP2)
and,
how the experience of doing the Award meant "you could become a good role model", for others (7YP2).

While some young people talked about the DofE learning as important for its own sake, it was apparent that completion (of the Bronze Award, or at least a component of it) was important to participants. Hence, dissatisfaction was expressed where completion was not perceived as likely or possible:

Personally it's annoying to commit yourself to something that you can't finish (1YP1).

The emphasis on completion was linked, in participant accounts, with the anticipated potential of the Award to improve future opportunities open to them. Hence, in the following extract a young person highlights the perceived importance of the Award in securing employment opportunities:

I would want the full Bronze, it would look better and be easier to help get a job (1YP1).

The importance which the DofE assumed in regard to the future aspirations of young people was particularly apparent when they talked about the implications of imprisonment for their future lives, and this issue will be discussed in more detail in a later section of the chapter.

That young people perceived the DofE as beneficial was also indicated by their expressed wish for more time to be dedicated to the Award, and increased staff support in completing programme. Institutions differed in extent to which priority was ascribed to

the programme. In the data extract below, focus group discussion focused upon some dissatisfaction with current arrangements for the programme at one institution:

4YP2: (We need) more staff, it is only once a week and he doesn't even come

4YP2: more correspondence

4YP2: he will come and say next week we will do something and then next week comes and he doesn't come

4YP2: he needs to fill in the booklets

4YP2: if we had been doing it in a group we would have finished, but we haven't

Similarly when asked how the programme might be improved, many of the focus group participants indicated that they would like more time dedicated to the Award:

1YP1: More sessions

1YP1: We get 4-5 hours a week

1YP1: One more day would help

Damage and Repair

From the outset of the study, most participants anticipated that the DofE, which was described by one young person as "looking good on your CV" (7YP2), had the potential to enhance their future opportunities. Hence, in the data extract below, a young person claimed:

The reason why I do this course and want to finish it is that it might give me a chance when I'm released (1YP1).

For the most part, it was anticipated that the Award might compensate for the lack of previous qualifications:

Some of us never got GCSEs and if that's the next thing after GCSE's then that's alright (3YP1).

In most cases, young people talked about their future opportunities being improved through completion of the Award, anticipating "the benefits we (will) see later on in life" (3YP1). In a minority of cases, young people anticipated that the Award might assist them in gaining access to educational opportunities upon release:

It looks good on your CV, especially for me. When I get out I want to go to college and do A levels. One of them is PE, so that will be good (1YP1).

When I get out I want to go to college and do A-levels...it is like a qualification, rather than just saying you went away for years (2YP2).

The majority, however, associated the Award with improved employment prospects. Before turning to this issue in more detail, it is important to examine young people's perceptions about opportunities which might be available to them upon release from custody.

The young people in the study were very aware of stigma associated with the secure estate. While incarcerated they are to a large extent protected from public disapproval associated with their past criminal behaviours but the boundaries separating inside from outside the prison are perceived as precarious. A good example of this is provided in a short data extract, taken from a group discussion focusing on the expedition. During the expedition in question, the young people stopped at a public house. As one young person explained, despite reassuring themselves at the time that "no one knows us

around here”, they described being “nervous going to the pub (because) people were looking” (2YP2).

Young people’s awareness of stigma was also apparent during a discussion about the Gold Award. When participants learnt that the Gold DofE was awarded in person by the Duke of Edinburgh at Buckingham Palace, they were sceptical about how their attendance might be received:

They won’t let people like us in there (the palace), convicts. They would be like, ‘you ain’t coming in here’ (1YP2).

Don’t they ask you where you done it? - Well we’re not going to say we done it in prison (3YP1).

In particular, the young people in the focus groups indicated awareness about the implications of having a discredited identity for their future opportunities. While the majority of young people sought reassurance from the group facilitators that the DofE would provide them with future opportunities, at the same time they were realistic about the possibilities. Participants often appeared disheartened and uncertain when talking about their release and about the future.

During the first phase of focus groups, when participants had little experience of the DofE programme, discussion often focused upon how they might be perceived on release by prospective employers:

Once they find out you’ve been in prison you get pigeon-holed. (They’ll think) ‘what’s going stop him doing again what he did before’. They might think, ‘he might do it to me’ (3YP1)

3YP1: I bet if I said to you I’ve been in prison

3YP1: It would be very very rare to get a job

3YP1: How many get a proper job?

3YP1: Or you just get a dead beat job?

3YP1: most of us have got long sentences – and not for some petty little crime.

In discussing future employment opportunities, one young person imagined himself as a prospective employer contemplating employing a young person released from custody:

If I had my own business and someone came out of prison and said like ‘I’ve bettered myself’. I wouldn’t give them a job. There’s a million people who haven’t been to prison and I wouldn’t have to worry about them thieving nothing. And they’re (employers) probably thinking the same thing as me, they’ll come up with a little excuse (3YP1).

Other young people in the focus groups took up this point, with equal animation:

But it won’t happen – you’ll meet the employer and he’ll give you a smile and you’ll shake his hand and say very nice to meet you, but when you’re outside it’ll be a different thing (3YP1).

They’ll ask where I’ve been the last two years and I’ll say ‘a training centre’ and then they’ll find out it was a YOI and they’ll say – ‘Oh you’re a liar’ (3YP1).

When asked by the group facilitator whether, as a prospective employer, “you wouldn’t give someone a chance?” the response was “No I wouldn’t. It’s my livelihood” (3PY1).

Hence the expectation of young people in prison, during the first phase of focus groups, was that once outside, their chances of securing good employment were negligible if not non-existent:

If I'm in competition with someone I'll do anything to throw them off. But when you're looking for a job you don't see the other people it's not like you're having a debate. Each person comes in and it's first impressions and a lot of people will have formed their impression of me before. They'll see me, I'll be polite and shaved and it'll be alright, and then they'll read my CV and ask where I've been the last two years. I'll say I've been in a Young Person's Institute and they'll think 'well...'. (3YP1)

Discussions about future opportunities among young people at the second round of focus groups were on the whole more optimistic. Indeed the DofE appeared for some young participants as a way in which they might repair discredited identities. During the second phase of discussions, participants were more adamant that the reason for staying with the programme was because of "the benefits we see later on in life" (3YP1) and "it might give me a chance when I'm released" (1YP2). Most importantly it was valued as something to have...:

Under your belt, especially when you have been in prison when it is difficult to get a job anyway (2YP2).

For some young people, confidence afforded by anticipated receipt of the Award led them to talk about:

Look(ing) forward to going out, it makes you feel like you are getting prepared to go out (7YP2).

DofE was valued by participants because it was perceived as a recognised qualification, for all young people and not just for those in prison. Participants emphasised that the Award was "known, isn't it", and comprised credible evidence that "that you've done that stuff". (1PY2). When asked what young people thought the DofE demonstrated, they responded without hesitation:

1YP1: If you want to go out and do voluntary work you can show them that certificate

1YP1: is your record of achievement like what you put your qualifications in?

Int: what does the award show about you?

1YP1: Commitment

1YP1: Leadership skills

1YP1: Responsibility

1YP1: Dedication and hard work

1YP1: Charitable work

The Award was valued by participants because it might help them in “finding a job” (3YP1), or to “get a better job” (3YP1). Most important of all, for many participants, the DofE offered an opportunity to be received by mainstream society and “accepted back in” (1YP2).

Re-integration, involvement and acceptance

Giving something back, which was an important theme in young people’s accounts, was provided the context of discussion about both contributing to their present environment and being re-accepted back into, and by, the community.

Young people described how the programme involved them in making a contribution to the maintenance of the institution. This work included “decorating rooms in the educational department” (2YP2) “cleaning on the wing” (2YP2), “keeping the gym clean” (2YP2), and “doing stuff in the garden” (2YP2). Also this work included representing young people on the wing by “being a wing rep” (5YP2) and assisting young people on arrival in the secure estate during their period of induction. This type of work was highly valued by participants as indicated in the following data extract:

These lads will be coming in on the induction wing; some have been here before others haven't. For those who haven't, I would give them the opportunity for induction and have a chat with them, reassure them... they are more vulnerable, they get upset when it is their first time. I used to chat with them, explain everything and give them the opportunity to familiarise yourself with someone. If they have a problem they can come and speak to us, if they feel they can't speak to a member of staff. If it was something minor they could speak to me...have a chat with them, reassure them (CYP2).

The DofE also involved young people with community groups, with whom they often had little or no prior personal experience. In some cases this involved young people visiting the community, and in other cases it involved community members visiting the secure estate.

Those young people, eligible for release on temporary licence (ROTL), described participating in DofE related activities in the community. These activities involved a range of different types of community service. One young person, for example, talked about "gardening for the elderly" (7YP2). Another described going "out of prison to teach old people" (3YP2).

In the case of those not eligible for ROTL, their contribution to the wider community took a different form. So, for example, a focus group participant, who had little prior experience with disabled people, described weekly visits to the institution by disabled community members:

...the disabled people come in every Thursday morning and we play games with them, play football, just have fun with them. It is alright, it was a good laugh. They are alright people (1YP2).

Another example of involvement with the wider community, was evident through young people's participation in local and national charity fund raising events. While young people denied ROTL, were not allowed to run marathons or compete in triathlons, they did run laps and cycled, equivalent distances inside the prison grounds, as part of national charitable endeavours. Hence the young people talked about "running out there (in the prison grounds)" (1YP2) as part of a national fund raising event, and cycling laps "for disabled children" (1YP2). In the following data extract from focus group discussion, young people talk about the personal achievement of participating in a national charity run, on the prison grounds:

At first I was dreading it like, the laps.

It was good after a while, you're like...

Yeh when you've done it you've achieved something

And it's for charity like (1YP2).

We ran that distance from here to Bradford and we cycled the
Bradford to Lambeth North distance

That was to make money for charity... and we raised 750 quid
(1YP2)

This involvement, as indicated in the following extract from the data, was reported by young people with pride in their achievement:

1YP2: They told us that you do a fair bit of running

1YP2: At first I was dreading it like- the laps-

1YP2: That first week when we did 15 laps

1YP2: It was a good day. The sun was shining.

It was good but after a while you're like...

1YP2: Yeh when you've done it you've achieved something

1YP2: And its for charity like

While young people highlighted positive experiences associated with personal achievement related to such activities, they also clearly emphasised the importance of the contribution made to others. In the extract below, for example, a focus group participant describes regular work with disabled community members:

I have a disabled brother as well yeah and for them it is the same stuff day in day out. But this is just to get away from it all. It is good man, do you know what I mean? (1YP2).

In the following data extract, a young person reflects upon the wider importance of their involvement in activities which provided some type of service to community members:

We are all here for committing crime and that, so it is good to give something back to the community. The special needs group only come in for an hour on a Thursday but after a while they come running up to and shaking your hand. Peter, this guy, he comes running up to you and you gain a relationship with them, they remember you. I missed today, but Peter saw me at the gate and he was shouting up to me and I went and shook his hand. It is giving something back. It feels like, even though he has a condition he does recognise you and that. He'll shout for attention and you can tell he is happy (1YP2).

Indeed, a notable theme, running through young people's accounts of the programme, was an acknowledgement of giving back, or making reparation, to the community:

...you can spend your time in prison but if you can help people then that is good. We are all in here for doing something wrong, so if we can help in one way change lives then it is a good road to go down isn't it? (1YP2).

As indicated in the data extract below, some young people anticipated how this form of reparation might assist in their return to, and acceptance by, society:

To do something in the community and be accepted back in
(1YP2)

Finally, in this chapter, it is important to re-emphasise the importance which young people placed on completion of the Award. Certainly, there was evidence of concern about young people's ability to complete the Award, and/or continue with it following release. These concerns were related to the perceived benefits of the programme, discussed above. Because receipt of the Award was deemed imperative for future opportunities, by some young people, the possibility that they might not be able to complete the programme was a cause of some anxiety. There were many questions, from young people, about DoFE following release, such as “what happens when I’m on the outside? How do I get my certificate then?” (3YP1) and “If I don’t do the expedition in here how can I do it on the outside (3YP2)?” Another issue raised by young people, with long custodial sentences before them, was the age limit for participation. In the data extract below, a young person of 19 claimed not to be deterred by the length of his sentence:

I’m in here till I’m 31. I want to get my bronze and silver in here
and then I want to get to an open prison to try and do it there
(2YP2).

While several participants said that they intended, for example, “get my gold like” (2YP2), following release from the secure estate, or claimed that their “YOT officer is meant to be setting up the silver for me” (4YP2), most anticipated that it might not be easy to continue with the programme upon release into either YOTs or the community. Many young people were uncertain whether or not they would be able to continue with the programme in the YOT, or whether upon release they would be able to access the programme in the community. Hence, one young person said, “if they (YOTs) don’t run

it I can't do it" (4YP2), and another questioned the ease of access to community provision, "I think it will be difficult to find somewhere that you can carry on (2YP2).

Transfer between institutions was perceived as another barrier to completion of the programme. Because young people might be transferred with short notice and to institutions about which they knew little, there was uncertainty in some instances about (a) whether they could take their DofE records/certificates with them, and (b) whether the new institution delivered DofE, and to what level.

Overall, focus group participants perceived that the DofE programme delivered outside of the secure estate would be quite a different animal. There were perceived benefits to participating in the Award outside of prison. Hence, focus group participants anticipated, "it's probably easier to do it when you're out" (3YP2), recognising that there might be more activities available to make up the component parts of the programme, not available in the institution.

Summary

This first data chapter has presented findings from the focus groups with young people within six of the secure establishments which participated in the research. Key findings highlighted in this chapter were presented under the headings: privilege and commitment; knowledge skills and experiences; and damage and repair.

For the most part, young people appeared to value the programme and perceive participation in it as in some senses, a privilege. Programme participation was reportedly valued for both the skills and new experiences it offered participants. Moreover, most of the young people, who had few or no educational qualifications, appeared to appreciate the 'hand on' learning style associated with the programme.

However, the programme was primarily valued by participants for anticipated benefits relating to future opportunities, and particularly employment. Here, the Award was perceived as conferring something special upon recipients which it was anticipated might make a difference into how they were received upon their release. Reintegration and acceptance into society was coveted by many focus group participants. In this respect, the DofE was perceived as strategic to the future plans and aspirations of focus group participants.

The following chapter, which focuses on the accounts of staff delivering the programme within selected secure estate institutions, picks up on some of the issues and concerns highlighted in the young people's focus groups, and which have been presented in this chapter.

Chapter Five: Secure Estate Staff delivering the DofE programme

This chapter which explores the perceptions of secure estate staff, delivering the DofE programme within the secure estate, comprises the second of the four findings chapters. The chapter is organised into sections, presenting key themes which emerged from the data. These are 'privilege and access', 'structure and delivery' and 'the learning'. While these themes interrelate and overlap, they have been separated out here for the purposes of clarity. The themes also link with some of themes identified in the focus group data and presented in the previous chapter. The difference is that the themes presented in this chapter reflect staff perceptions of the programme and its delivery and receipt.

Privilege and Access

Most secure staff delivering the DofE, interviewed as part of this study, claimed little or no knowledge about the programme prior to their employment in the secure estate. Hence, when asked about their preconceptions of the programme they said, "I didn't know the DofE Award existed" (5S2) or "I'd heard of it, but I didn't really know what was involved" (6S2). Similar to the young people who participated in the focus groups, prior to their association with the DofE, staff tended to associate the programme with more 'privileged' young people, "it was all privileged kids in school, all the well behaved kids and I wasn't one of them" (6S1). As we shall see, staff delivering the DofE, similar to the young people within the focus groups, changed their perceptions about the programme through direct experience with it:

We talk to the kids you know 'have you heard about the DofE before?' and they say things like 'oh yeah, at school' and we say 'well would you do it?' They say 'well no that's for nerds'. But then they have a completely different view of it than when they come and do it (6S2).

Other staff members within the institutions visited, not involved in the DofE delivery were perceived by staff who were involved, as prejudiced towards the programme. These prejudices were perceived by respondents, as based on ignorance about the programme. The most common misconception about the programme, described by respondents, was that it solely involved sporting and leisure activities. Consequently, staff delivering the DofE described the necessity of explaining the role and function of the programme to others:

We are going to have to put over to staff, as well as the young people that there's more to the Duke of Edinburgh than just playing football (4S1).

Respondents also claimed that those not involved in the delivery of the DofE, perceived the programme as merely a “jolly” for participating staff (2S2). Some claimed that DofE involvement was perceived by others to conflict with the role of prison officer because the programme somehow required them to be “too good, too soft, and too nice” (3S1). In the data extract below a respondent describes how he disabused a colleague of her pre-conceptions of the DofE, through introducing her to the programme:

I said to her, just come along and see what you think. She didn't realise how hard work it was going to be, how physically demanding it. She went back and told the staff that it is not a jolly and that we work physically really hard. The staff are now saying that they will get involved (2S2).

While acknowledging that their perceptions of the DofE (as an activity for privileged others) had changed through direct involvement with programme, respondents maintained that participants of the programme within the secure estate were privileged, in a number of ways. One way in which participants were perceived as privileged, was that not all young people in the secure estate were allowed to participate (this issue is

discussed in a later section). A second way in which young people were perceived as privileged was that the programme was perceived as providing opportunities for young people to improve their future life chances:

I think it is a privilege them doing it...life sentencers going down for their parole, if we could get them the DofE Award and they go for their first release date on their license and they have got something like that behind them, it will look better for them and will improve their chances tenfold (2S3).

It is important to note that, in the context of discussion about privilege, respondents stressed that young people in the secure estate were extremely disadvantaged, largely as a function of the social contexts from which they came. Hence, young people in the secure estate were perceived by staff as having multiple problems associated variously with disadvantaged backgrounds, abusive relationships, drugs and literacy:

Whatever you think kids can do they've probably done...a lot of the children are very damaged emotionally, physically, there's been no structure in their life, there's been no rules, no guidelines. By the time you get them here they've usually served a sentence, and if they're under a care order they're very damaged. You know they've gone through the mill, that's why they're in here. This is usually a last resort (4S1).

In the following data extract, a respondent at one research site, which accommodated young people on care orders, described some of the problems surrounding the lives of the residents:

Young people we're looking at here can cover the age range from 12 to 18, and can cover all offences you can think of, from being put in under a care order which means they're putting themselves

under risk in the community, from running away from home, drinking, getting sexually exploited. In both cases girls and boys, up to serious murder, rape. So we cover the whole spectrum (4S1).

At other establishments, which did not accommodate young people on care orders, respondents described how inmates tended to have a history of offending prior to imprisonment:

Because of their age, unless it's a serious offence, first offence they've all had community service, you know they've had a whole range of stuff before they even get sentenced (3S1).

In most cases, young people's backgrounds were described by respondents as extremely disadvantaged and very chaotic:

I mean the typical sort of background obviously would be a deprived area, you know family breakdowns, peer pressure, family who've involved in crime, you know like their dad or their mum, the main sort of sentences or offences that we have here is money related, so it's either robbery, burglary, theft, 90% plus have all had some sort of drug history (3S1).

Not only were young people in the secure estate characterised by an association with "drink, drugs, stealing, fighting" (4S1), but also more generally by a lack of social skills and education. Hence respondents acknowledged that young people within secure establishments generally "don't do school on the outside, they've all been excluded for one reason or another" and have been "left behind education wise" (4S1). Hence, lacking the requisite life skills and education, young people were presented by staff as bereft of any insight into how life might be different for them. In the data extract below a respondent describes these young people as not having:

...the confidence to say 'no'. There's no other avenues they can see other than going into that car to do that job or whatever. They're from (disadvantaged area), and never been to the beach, never been windsurfing or whatever. And maybe that one opportunity could take them away from whatever they're involved in and that could be their way out (4S1).

Given this depiction of young people, it is perhaps not surprising that the anticipation of their participation in programmes such as the DofE was perceived by staff as “totally alien” (4SM1) to the majority of young people in the secure estate.

Selection

To reiterate, one reason why staff perceive participation in the DoE as a privilege, is because the programme is not available to all young people in the secure estate. While procedures for selection to the programme do differ between establishments, some general principles of selection appear to prevail. Four key selection criteria are length of sentence, type of offence and (linked to this) perceived ability to secure ROTL (Release on Temporary Licence), and the young person's behaviour within the prison environment.

At the research sites, participation in the DofE was, for the most part, restricted to those young people expected to serve at least a six month sentence at the establishment. Hence, as one respondent explained, “we know that we are going to have them for six months” (2S2). In practice this meant recruiting those young people sentenced to a minimum of 12 months because, as it was noted, “they're only here for half of it” (6S3) and “that's only if we catch them from the day they walk in” (3S1). In order to capitalise on this limited window of opportunity, at the time of writing, one participating establishment was set to introduce an “initial assessment of need” (3S1), to be carried

out immediately upon a young person's arrival at the prison, which would provide, among other things, an early expression of "interest in the DofE" (3S1).

Length of sentence was also described as problematic by respondents in establishments characterised by a quick turnover of young people, who often remain for short periods before being moved on to another institution. Hence recruitment to the programme was described by one respondent as "complicated because some lads are only here for such short periods" (3S2). Equally, at another site visited, recruitment to the DofE was described as problematic because, the institution tended to receive young people "on remand" (2S1). While it was noted that the remand status of young people could change to sentence after a trial, this was difficult to predict.

In most cases, young people must have served six months or half of their sentence in order to participate in the DofE. Hence, as one staff member reported:

The biggest hurdle we have is the children's sentences, and you know you could have a child here for 24 months, but their behaviour doesn't warrant it, so you can't take them whereas you could have a child here for four months that is excellent but, they're not here long enough to do the award, so you know you only have, 2% of them that you would consider going out on the award (6S3).

One of the main reasons for staff reluctance to involve young people in the DofE for shorter periods was the imperative they placed upon programme completion:

I don't like to start somebody off and then they go somewhere else where they might not deliver the Award. It seems a bit pointless (1S1).

At one research site, housing only juvenile's, it was explained that transference to another institution at 18 years was inevitable. While, as the respondent noted, it was theoretically possible for young people to transfer to a DofE programme in their next institution, not all institutions delivered the programme. Hence staff were wary about including young people on the programme because they were unsure whether they would have "the prospect of maybe doing it at another establishment" (1S1). Indeed respondents claimed a preference of including young people where the length of stay was known, even when this involved relatively short periods, because this increased the chances of completion:

Well hopefully, I've picked the lads that have got at least six months to do here before they get moved or released, so hopefully they're in with a chance, but I've told them they can continue it on the other side as well, with whoever the local dean is (3S2).

Risk

Young people's access to the DofE within the majority, but not all of, the institutions was dependent upon the type of offences for which they had been incarcerated. Generally participation was not open to young people who, based upon the seriousness of their offences, were classed as high risk. Hence while ASM1 contended that the programme was "generally open to anybody that is living in the establishment", "high profile, high risk" prisoners were excluded. Generally respondents reported that eligibility to participate in the DoE was linked to their eligibility to obtain Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL). As the term implies, only prisoners who have obtained ROTL, which is subject to a rigorous approval procedure, are allowed to leave the institution grounds (albeit for a temporary period).

In the data extract below, a respondent describes types of offences which would preclude young people's eligibility for ROTL and thus, at that institution, participation in the DofE:

..they can't be a deportee, they can't be in for a sexual offence because they won't get released on temporary licence they can't be in for, violent, or excessively violent crime's because of release on temporary license, so straight away the criteria reduces our option (3S1).

One reason why eligibility for ROTL is perceived as a necessary criterion for inclusion on the DofE in some (but not all institutions), is that the expedition which is a key component of the Bronze Award requires, as the name suggests, outside activities over a prolonged period. Hence, young people not eligible for ROTL, are not able to complete that section of the programme outwith the institution walls. Consequently, respondents at one site noted that only if young people were "good enough for ROTL", could they "get on to this (DofE)". There were also reports from some respondents of "cherry picking" young people for inclusion in the programme "because of their offences" (4S1). It was also noted that even in cases where the lesser seriousness of offences might ordinarily have permitted ROTL, young people who had previously breached community orders had little chance of obtaining the license, and thus participating in the DofE:

If they've breached an order outside, then 9/10 they will not get ROTL out of the establishment (5S1).

Another criteria for gaining ROTL, and hence in many cases entry to the DofE, is length of sentence served. At sites visited, young people must have served six months at least, or have "done half their sentence" (5S1), before eligible for ROTL. The rationale provided for this was that caution was required where "they (young people) are new and you don't know them" (2S4), and the imperative of having enough knowledge about the

young person in order to be in a position to make the “judgement for them to go out of the prison” (6S3). Without this knowledge it was argued that young people were “deemed a risk” (6S1) to themselves, and/or because “there is a possibility that they could escape” (6S3).

Another condition for eligibility to the programme, related to institutional rules attendant upon specific categories of offence and the ways in which these offenders are managed. For example, at some institutions sex offenders are not allowed to participate in the programme for logistical reasons. That is at one research site the young male sex offenders resided in a specific accommodation unit, the nature of their offences was protected from other young people and were not permitted to work one to one with female staff. Some of these rules rendered participation in the programme problematic:

It's very carefully managed here. There are four Units. Males who have committed a sexual offence are in the (name of) Unit. We do give them cover stories. You generally though can't put them one to one with female staff. We have to work all that in when trying to get things done. You have to think who's working with the kid, what they're doing with him, where they're taking him, what risk he poses not just to himself but to the staff and the other kids (4S1).

Inclusion on the programme not only hinged on the length of sentence, the offence committed and eligibility for ROTL, but was also in part dependent upon young people's behaviour while inside prison. Hence staff talked about “monitoring the lads” (3S2) and “not just with us (running the DofE) but on the unit as a whole” (5S1). Those young people identified as “trouble makers” by staff recruiting to the DofE programme, were generally deemed as “unworkable” and therefore their recruitment to the programme was perceived as “pointless” (3S1). Respondents also acknowledged it was made clear to the young people that inclusion on the DofE was dependent on their past, present and future their behaviour. Hence prospective and current participants were told, “if your behaviour isn't good and if you do that three times in a row then you are not doing the

DofE” (4S2). Certainly the prospect of non-inclusion in the DofE was deemed by staff as an effective deterrent of bad behaviour:

I didn't pick these because they were the best lads in the prison, they wanted to do it. None of them have caused any problems. Whereas on the football team it is a different matter. Those on the Award, no one has said anything about their behaviour (2S2).

It was therefore not surprising to learn that DofE participation was sometimes used by staff as a strategy for controlling young people, in other words as “a carrot to good behaviour” (2S1). In the data extract below, a respondent describes criteria that prospective participants to the programme must meet before they are considered for inclusion:

I will look at their behaviour and say to them if you want to do that you have to improve. I think it is a privilege them doing it, it is a good thing. I will say to kids, if someone comes and approaches me and they are a nightmare on the unit. I will give them criteria that they have to go by (2S3).

Once on the programme, the prospect of being excluded from taking part in the most popular activities (associated with the expedition) also served as a behavioural deterrent. As one respondent noted, “If they want to go (out on expedition) then none of that anti-social behaviour” (6S1). However, aside from the prospect on non inclusion in popular DoE activities, another reason why non-inclusion or dismissal from the programme may serve as a forceful deterrent of misbehaviour, is because, as dint of the selective process, participants “see themselves as being quite special” (6S2) and therefore of interest to non-participants. Hence, one respondent noted that participation served as a source “of some, well not envy, but you know other kids want to know where you have been? What have you been doing?” (6S1). Given that participation is perceived as ‘special’ and that a series of exclusion criteria exist, the level of motivation

perceived among would-be participants was another deciding factor in the selection process. Hence a respondent reported that prospective participants needed to “show the interest and they really want to do it” (1S1). At this particular institution those under the age of 18 were rarely included because it was felt that they were not “in the frame of mind to come on to a DofE course” (1S1):

We very rarely take people on the course that are 18, because they're still in that stage where they think they know it all. They are still in the juvenile way of thinking (1S1).

Structure and Delivery

The organisation and delivery of the DofE differed between research sites. As noted previously, however, it was clear that at all sites the majority of staff charged with delivery had little or no prior knowledge about the DofE before setting up/joining the programme within their respective institutions. In the majority of cases, staff volunteered to deliver the DofE, “I stuck my hand up” (4S1), or was asked to volunteer by the Governor. At a few sites, responsibility for the programme was part and parcel of respondents' wider roles. As one respondent noted, “you get given tasks and one of my tasks was to get the DofE up and running” (2S1).

Irrespective of whether respondents volunteered for the role or it was simply allocated to them, DofE duties were perceived, and treated, as supplementing, or an add-on, to contracted responsibilities. Respondents differed in the extent to which they had successfully negotiated recognition for their input into the programme. In most cases respondents reported juggling to fit the DofE around their statutory duties. However, in one case a respondent had successfully negotiated recompense for the additional work with the DofE entailed:

when I said I'd do the job, the agreement was I wouldn't do the job unless they gave me a day off per month for my Duke of Edinburgh day, so I'm rota-ed off for that one day (4S1).

Given the complexities involved with programme delivery, it was not surprising to learn that where support (which varied between establishments) for staff delivering the DofE was forthcoming, it was valued highly. The sources of support highlighted as pivotal to successful delivery included prison governors, other prison staff and the DofE.

At two research sites respondents highlighted the importance of having the prison governor's backing for the programme, and it was evident in one institution particularly that the prison governor was perceived as taking considerable interest in the DofE. Not only was he reported to have given £1500 towards programme costs, he was noted for his enthusiasm about, and interest in, the DofE, "every time he is down here, he is asking about how things are going" (2S1). This particular governor had supported the housing of the DoE within the prison resettlement unit, which dealt with for example, "the pre-release side of things, or the release on temporary licence" (3S1). This was perceived by a staff member working in the Unit as appropriate because "I manage family liaison, so I manage really everything which is about family ties, and preparing them for release" (3S1).

Support of the governor was also perceived as key to the attitudes towards, and involvement in, the DofE by staff members across the institution:

The Governor's very supportive, that trickles down then and as long as I've got his support, the rest will follow either voluntarily or by force (laughs) but obviously voluntarily is best (3S1).

Staff bought a range of qualifications/expertise to their DofE role. Some had experience of working in youth organisations such as the Scouts and Guides; others were trained to deliver physical exercise programmes leading to vocational awards. A couple of

respondents were ex-outward bound trainers, and several were ex-armed forces. The single prior experience that most staff had in common was working with young people, in some capacity, in the community. In addition to the experience of working with young people, some staff stressed the importance of 'life skills' for their job:

I think the older you get, the more life skills that you offer this job and that's a lot. I know people who come here don't go through the University side, social work degrees and all this business...I think a fairly large percentage have life skills. More the blokes, the older blokes. There's a lot of ex-forces work here, there's a lot of ex-forces work within the childcare system as a whole, and I think that's a lot to do with discipline, management and again life skills and experience (4S1).

The qualification which staff perceived as most relevant to their DofE role was the Basic Leaders Expedition Award, because it qualified them to take young people "out on expedition" (5S1). The majority of staff delivering the programme had received this training and qualification since joining the secure estate.

At most study sites the DofE was organised by those working in the gymnasium, and even in the institution cited above, the programme was delivered jointly by gymnasium staff and those in the resettlement unit. The gymnasium was perceived as an appropriate base for the programme because of the focus on physical activities (associated with the physical activity section and the expedition component of the DofE). Certainly gymnasium staff, who delivered the program perceived it fitting in with their interests and expertise. This is nicely summed up by 1S1 who said "I'm interested in the expedition side of it, the other sides of it have come with what we do in the job anyway" (1S1). Hence, while institutions differed in the extent to which DofE delivery was devolved to other areas of the prison, the programme was largely perceived to be the prime responsibility of the gymnasium staff.

Not only was the DofE primarily gymnasium based, at most sites integration of the programme across other prison activity areas or staff, was limited. Treating delivery of the DofE as the exclusive domain of the gymnasium was perceived by most respondents as problematic. Organisation and delivery was time consuming and particularly so when it fell to the responsibility of just a few staff. To reiterate, many respondents talked about the additional work pressures, “(we) try and run it, but it is in conjunction with our other duties here and they are really specific” (4S1), and claimed often to work on the programme in their own, unpaid, time.

At most institutions visited, staff recognised potential advantages of providing a more integrated delivery, in that it would relieve pressure on their small staff group; “like you scratch our back we’ll scratch your back” (1S1). Integrated delivery was also perceived as being the most advantageous model for young people. In the data extract below, a respondent describes taking a more radical restructuring approach at one research site:

I’ve taken the responsibility away from the gym officer and said ‘you know yes I’ll use you when we do the expedition and stuff and use your experience in that sense, but what I want to do is make it part of the prison’. So a lad can come into prison and come to work, you know being in construction and not only get his qualification in the construction workshop but also link it into other stuff. Then not only are they going home with a qualification from the bricks workshop, hopefully they’re also going home with a bronze award from DofE (3S1).

While an integrated approach was presented as the ‘ideal’ model, by many respondents the practicalities involved in restructuring delivery were complex:

They’re doing an OCN accredited award (‘cookery’). It’s a twelve hour award, so that fits in exactly, fits into the Duke of Edinburgh Award, and that will work. (However) people they’ve got other

things going on and trying to fit in Duke of Edinburgh into the normal days work is very difficult, unless you come in early or stay in late (4S1).

As indicated in the above data extract, bringing other staff on board with the programme was not always easy, because those not currently responsible for delivering the programme had, in the words of one respondent “got to do 101 other jobs during the day and that’s (the DofE) the last thing on their minds” (4S2).

There were also logistical problems relating to restriction on the movement of some young people around the institution. Hence as one respondent reported, “if somebody was a high risk prisoner they could not work in certain areas of the establishment” (1S1). This relates to previous points made about restrictions on the movement of, for example, sex offenders and regulations specifying staff/young people ratios and rules prohibiting male sex offenders from working one-to-one with female members of staff.

Another issue relating to the level of integration of the programme concerned the ways in which delivery of the DofE was scheduled across the week at different institutions. At sites where delivery was still wholly gymnasium based, whole days or half days (often at weekends where there were no competing demands on the young people’s time) were dedicated to delivery:

It occupies them on a Sunday instead of them sitting around all day doing nothing. We don’t discuss it with them unless they ask a question of us during the week; we sort of leave it all until the weekend (5S1).

Another advantage of this model was that the programme was easier to deliver as a group module:

I thought if I contain the DoE in one unit it'll be a lot easier and then when they're doing activities they'll all do it together the same activity, so we achieve more (6S1).

In contrast, under a more integrated model young people might be engaged in DofE tasks alongside their other designated activities throughout the week. While, offering a wider range of DofE experiences for young people, the integrated model proved logistically difficult to implement for most sites visited.

Despite these caveats, even in those institutions with least evidence of integration, it was apparent that some attempts had been made to involve the assistance of staff working outwith the gymnasium. This was described as important primarily because of the diverse range of skills and activities which might be accessed, and, in the words of one gymnasium based respondent, "there are occasions when we simply have to go out and ask the education (section) to help us out" (1S1). Hence, despite the difficulties involved, most sites were in the process of attempting to widen staff involvement across the whole of the prison. For most part this was achieved by inviting staff, not involved, to participate in DofE activities. The expedition, which proved so popular among the young people, was equally used by those delivering the DofE to entice staff to participate:

We are building a framework up at the moment. It is now about staff getting involved, C got involved with the expedition and she will go back and tell other staff how she felt about the expedition side of things. So it is trying to get everyone involved. We are building (2S1).

Barriers to Delivery

This section focuses on barriers to delivery of the DofE in the secure estate. Many of the issues overlap with those discussed in the previous section, but have been

separated out here for reasons of clarity. Barriers to delivery were, for the most part, described by staff in relation to institutional constraints. One of the main constraints on delivery described by staff was a function of risk. In the previous section the issue of risk was discussed in relation to the recruitment of young people to the DofE. Here risk is considered in relation to elements of the programme content and participant behaviours.

Respondents talked about the difficulty in executing planned programs like the DofE because of both structural constraints and the unpredictability of young people's behaviours:

They've done 4 hours of the course, 10 minutes before the next course they could get involved in a fight in the unit, they might not do it, they might be restricted, they might threaten a young kid, another young person with a knife at the dinner table. That'll be it then, they won't be allowed complete this course because of the risk they pose to the young people on the course. There are 101 scenarios to every day, to try and complete this course (4S1).

As indicated in the data extract above, young people, by dint of their behaviour, can be withdrawn from the programme. Moreover, even where activities have been carefully planned in advance, the behaviour of young people, which may put themselves, staff and other residents at risk, can, and does lead to cancellation of activities at the ninth hour.

The section of the DofE most often cited by respondents during discussion of risk was the expedition. Here, the greatest risk highlighted was absconding. Absconding was perceived by staff as having implications for both those authorising the expedition, the young people themselves, the community, reputation of the institution and the future of the DofE within the institution.

Authorisation necessary to take a young person out on expedition is granted by the Youth Justice Board who issue the Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL). For the most part, while staff found it frustrating when a young person was refused permission to join an expedition, they acknowledged that the final responsibility, should a young person revoke the terms of the license, lay with the YJB:

There's quite a few (young people) we put (forward) to the YJB (for ROTL), and they're like 'oh sorry, they can't go'. And then, we're like 'but we know this young person and we've put in extra staff'. But obviously they've got their job to do and if they were to say 'yes' and something happens, then it's their job on the line (6S1).

In this context, staff tended to view "the authorities" as "quite strict on the ROTL side of it", entailing "a lot of criteria to meet before they can do it" (3S2). Several examples were provided where YJB refusal of ROTL meant that planned expeditions were cancelled:

Well it was all planned, and we'd booked the minibus and at the last minute we were told by the YJB that they couldn't go, so you know. But they're our masters so we do their bidding (6S3).

History of success in obtaining ROTL differed between institutions, which in part respondents described as a function of prison security levels. For those least successful, ROTL was depicted as "our biggest problem", and unfavourable comparisons were made to other prisons which, it was perceived "don't have the same issues as us" (5S1). Certainly some were frustrated by the process, especially where, in the words of one respondent, "you know full well that (at another YOI) they're out every week on ROTL" (5S1).

Notwithstanding these frustrations, respondents were clearly aware of implications of expeditions which "go wrong", for the reputation of the institution:

If we were to lose one prisoner it will affect our positioning. We are in the top five prisons in the country on performance and it would affect that (2S3).

Indeed, at one research site a respondent described how a previous expedition that had “gone wrong” (2S3) meant that expeditions outside the prison were vetoed. This information was common knowledge among respondents from other institutions, one of whom elaborated on the circumstances:

(The expedition was) something they did do a few years ago, but then people kept running away. Well they had an incident up in (a rural location) when they took them up (a mountain) and since then they haven’t done it. I think they had to restrain a child on a mountainside and something else happened of a sexual nature. The risks far outweigh the advantages of taking them out (4S1).

Staff were also very aware of the implications of media portrayal, “what if something happens, and in this current climate?” (1S1). In particular respondents, were concerned about media representation of young people and youth violence, and the “kind of press that would generate” (6S3). Media publicity was seen by some as a double-edged sword in that while on the one hand if “one goes out and comes back, the publicity we’d get from the local media would be fantastic”, on the other “If we take them out and they don’t come back then it’d be more difficult” (PS2). Some respondents reported that while the media were quick to cover stories which might fuel public concern they were less willing to report on the young people’s achievements:

What would people in the community say if they (young people) were quite violent, and they’re enjoying themselves, while their victims are sat at home? We’ve got to weigh up how it looks. We gave the cheque to the adventure centre who we’ve raised the

money, for and ...there hasn't been a press release about that (6S3).

Respondents emphasised both the institutional risks associated with the expedition component of the DofE, and the risks to young people. In particular it was noted that young people had much to lose by breaking the conditions of their ROTL:

If they (the young people) do go, then they are jeopardising themselves basically. You know they know they'll come back and they'll have to stay here longer. It's not good on them. They'll never get the opportunity ever again. All the boys are fully aware of that within this group (5S1).

Staff were also aware that if problems occurred on the expedition, the future of the programme within the prison would be jeopardised. In addition to the rigorous requirements by ROTL applications, respondents themselves talked about having a final say in who they took on expedition: "I wouldn't take anyone on unless I thought they were worthy of that chance" (1S1). As noted by another respondent, staff on expedition are aware that they put themselves at risk:

We could have woken up in the morning and there could be nobody left in the tents. They all could have gone or I could have had a shovel over my head. The five lads we took are all in for serious violence. They do have it in them to do that, but there has to be a balance of trust (2S3).

Another major barrier to DofE delivery was described by respondents as the attitudes of other staff to the programme. This issue has been touched on in the previous section in respect of the different models of programme delivery. To reiterate, the tendency to locate the programme within one section of the prison, puts the burden for delivery on a few staff members. Related to this, respondents described friction between themselves

and staff working in other areas. In the data extract below a respondent talks about friction between gymnasium staff and staff responsible for discipline:

There is friction between “PE staff and discipline staff...I’m not saying we are insular but there has always been a bit of friction between discipline and PE. We have all been discipline staff at one time, but it is just breaking down barriers. Getting to know people” (2S1).

It is acknowledged that this friction may be a function of the very different roles of gym instructor and those with responsibility for discipline. While the former is associated with leisure and therefore fun, the latter with correction and punishment. Indeed it was noted previously that staff delivering the DofE were perceived as “too good, too soft, too nice” (3S1). At one research site it was reported that staff who delivered the programme “got stick” from some other staff for “doing above and beyond” (2S3) on the DofE, out with their paid hours:

It is amazing, because you are doing above and beyond you do get, not a hard time, but stick from the people who come to work, do as little as possible and go home. That is a large percentage of the prison work force. To be honest, there are doers and those that don’t do. There are some very lazy people and if they see (DofE instructors) going in to the wing in their own time and sitting down with the young people then you are open to getting stick from them. That is kinda how it is (2S3).

Notwithstanding this, respondents agreed that the best way to breakdown staff prejudices, and get them on board with the programme, was to either “sit down with them and explain what the programme is and how it works” (3S2), and/or (as described previously) invite them to participate.

At all sites visited, levels of staffing necessary for effective delivery of the programme were also described as “a major problem” (4S1). To reiterate, the reality for most respondents involved with DofE delivery was that “they have to do it in their spare time” (2S1). As one respondent explained “I’ve got no set time to do it. Myself and (colleague) have now still got to do all our other duties and we have to just make time” (2S3).

The most difficult issue for staff in many cases was finding colleagues to assist with the expedition, or in the words of one respondent “cover the shifts” (1S1). While the expedition requires a high ratio of staff to young people, under the conditions of ROTL, prisoners do not require constant supervision. That prisoners on ROTL “don’t need to be supervised the whole time” (2S3), has implications for payment of staff accompanying young people on expedition. Hence staff understanding that they may not be paid for their shifts, mitigates against recruitment of the necessary staff complement for expeditions.

Not all respondents experienced the same problem, but described the issue of payment for additional shifts associated with the expedition as “a really grey area” (2S3). Some staff supervising an external expedition accumulate considerable hours which are over and above their normal working week and an example of what happened at one research site is provided in the following data extract:

We’ve just done an external expedition and (colleague) has actually managed to claim all her hours and has come back with 40 odd hours in the bank from three days out. She has a week off work because she came on camp (2S3).

However the same respondent noted that other staff had either been paid for duties relating to same expedition, or were still in negotiation with the prison concerning the extra hours.

Internal expeditions are events organised by prison, which replicate as far as possible, the conditions of expeditions taking place outside of the prison, but which take place inside the prison grounds. The internal expedition was used at some study sites where external expeditions were not permitted, young people were ineligible for ROTL and as a practice run for the expedition proper. As conditions of ROTL do not apply, payment for staff on internal expeditions does not incur the same problems as external expeditions, and as noted by one respondent, “the internal camp is different they will have their hours” (2S3). This is despite the high security for prisoners on internal expedition, who are not (often because of their risk status) approved for ROTL.

Other regulations including “restrictions on female staff, who can’t be alone with particular residents” (4S1), highlighted in a previous section, also have an impact on staff pressures:

There’s one of the female staff who’s running the cooking course, she might not be allowed on her own with one of the male young people, so we might have to have another member of staff in with her (4S1).

Establishments differed in the extent to which they could access resources for the DofE and staff who were delivering the DofE were grateful for any “financial backing we can get” (2S3). While none of the respondents reported that resource limitations stopped them from delivering the programme, certainly the delivery of some activities was affected. In respect of expeditions, for example, respondents reported a lack of equipment such as, “tents and things like that, we just haven’t got enough” (5S1), difficulties in replacing old stock, and inadequate resources for unexpected contingencies such as “flasks, for when we need a hot drink” (5S2). At some study sites, staff were successful in funding applications to the YJB, which in one institution funded “The fire cadet course” (3S2). Alternatively at other sites, respondents competing internally for scarce resources were told by their line managers “you’ve got no chance” (5S1).

Continuity of delivery

The continued delivery of the DofE programme to young people upon leaving the institution was highlighted as a problem by many respondents. Irrespective of whether participants were transferred to another secure estate institution or released into the community, respondents agreed that mechanisms for continuing receipt of the programme were inadequate. In the data extract below a respondent voices his concern about completion of the DofE in the community:

I'm not overly convinced that when the young person leaves here they will ever complete the award. Not down to the fact that they don't want to, it's whether the YOT will take it on board and say 'right OK well we'll finish this off, finish that off', are they ever going to complete it outside? (5S1).

To reiterate, when recruiting to the programme staff were concerned to select young people who would be most likely (by dint of the length of sentence) to complete a section of the programme. It was not surprising therefore that staff were frustrated by the prospect of young people leaving without having accomplished this. This was particularly apparent at one site which did not run expeditions, where, as a result, young could not receive the full Bronze Award while in prison:

You've got loads of kids, but they can't actually complete the whole Award unless they do it on the 'out'. But you know they probably haven't got the structure on the 'out', to complete it (6S3).

It was claimed by one respondent, that the success of continuity post release often depended on the determination of an individual young person and their motivation to achieve the award. Below he provides an example of such a young person:

We think he is the type of young person who, pushes himself, and he pushes YOT, he says 'listen I've started this I want to finish it'. Whereas there are other young people we could take on it, or just for 6 weeks and they're getting out, but then they get out are they going to just say 'well my YOT never told me, never sorted it out for me so I can't be bothered' (5S1).

While respondents said that they encouraged young people to "continue it (DofE) on the other side" (3S2) their knowledge about what happened to young people was limited and differed between institutions. In the data extract below, a respondent describes the absence of an outreach facility and how he was "not allowed to have contact with the children once they leave" (4S2):

When they leave here we generally don't follow them out in community. That's another option that has been discussed and talked about and maybe the Duke of Edinburgh award co-ordinator could be involved in that. It would be a good thing because we lose continuity with the kids (4S1).

At other sites, staff reported making contact with relevant YOTs to find out whether young people had continued with the programme. Staff at one establishment reported with enthusiasm that a young person after release had requested records of his DofE involvement because he "wanted to continue it outside," (6S1). Another respondent reported receiving "phone calls from outside agencies saying is 'it right that they started the award here?'" (AS1). In one instance only, a respondent reported knowledge of young people leaving the secure estate and completing the programme:

Of the ones that I have got involved previously, I actually referred into the YOT. It was a difficult task to achieve, but I know that two of them have completed the bronze now (4S2).

Overall, staff reported a lack of continuity for young people following release from the secure estate and few opportunities for the institution to ascertain who had continued with the programme. Mostly, this because of data collection methods and a lack of data sharing mechanisms. One staff member reported, for example, that only numerical records were available; “we never collect names” (5S1). Given perceived inadequacy of current data collection systems, respondents were supportive of the proposed ‘Wired up Youth Justice’, which they perceived would enhance contact between secure estate institutions and with community. As one respondent explained:

everything will become electronic, which in terms of the young offenders and the e-asset tool will make it a lot easier for us to be able to track people (5S2).

Respondents emphasised that having the support from Youth Offending Teams would be key to enabling young people to continue with the DofE on release, and the importance for the future of the young people involved:

It does impact, it can impact on their life, to do the bronze here then go on to do silver and gold, on the outside, it can have a huge bearing on their life (4S1).

The Learning

Respondents linked a wide range of benefits to participation in the programme. These included acquisition of practical skills as well as the development of more indeterminate (implicit and less definable) qualities.

Staff involved with the DofE are charged with delivering on the four sections of the programme (Volunteering, Physical, Skills and Expedition), while it was apparent that

the expedition was the main focal point of the DofE as far as the young people were concerned, respondents claimed that “expedition is only a small part of it” (6S1). As noted earlier, not all young people are eligible to take to take part in the expedition because, among other reasons, they are unable to obtain ROTL.

Respondents emphasised the practical focus of the DofE programme. Given that most of the young people were educational under-achievers, staff highlighted the importance of ‘hands on’, and ‘goal orientated’ learning:

We have to focus on ‘hands on’ because their reading and writing skills are not great, they’ve been excluded from school and they don’t work well in the school environment. So I think the Awards we’re doing have to focus on the more practical sides: you know your cooking, your wall building, your plastering, your drawings, your computer work. Where they can see an end result as they’re doing it (4S1).

The acquisition and/or development of basic reading and writing skills, through the DofE, was achieved not through traditional ‘chalk and talk’ pedagogy but integrated into the learning of practical based subjects in a ‘hands on’ approach. Because of this the programme was also valued by respondents as providing “a back door” (3S1) route into the education system.

The major thrust of DofE learning was described by respondents as vocational, “Where they learn the skills side of it” (3S2). However, staff purported that while the study sites already offered training in a range of vocational courses, irrespective of the DofE programme, that the experience and qualification of the DofE was an added bonus for young people which conveyed more about them than simply the acquisition of trade skills:

A lad can come into prison and come to work in construction and then not only are they going home with a qualification from the bricks workshop, hopefully they're also going home with a bronze award from DoE. So they've got a qualification that they can take to anywhere, and an Award that says 'this is my commitment which is nationally recognised', and it may lead them to go onto silver and gold I don't know (3S1).

In an attempt to provide the widest range of opportunities for learning at some study sites, staff groups variously drew on their own skills (such as gardening plastering and cooking) when delivering the DofE (4S1). At other study sites (where more integrated delivery had been achieved) , staff attempted to provide a wide range of courses and activities available to young people, irrespective of the skills of staff members:

We've got car mechanics, catering, money management, music, we've got a radio station here as well. We also deliver skills related to PE and try and cross with key skills - literacy and numeracy, so there are different aspects we can all link together (1S1).

There were also examples of staff innovation in the development of new courses. One study site, for example, had introduced "golf" into the programme, on the grounds that it was:

Probably the largest growing area within sport and leisure. They not only learn a new sport, but they also learn golf course management (3S1).

At one study site, which accommodated both males and females, respondents talked about ensuring that the range of opportunities offered through the programme acknowledged gender-related preferences. While generally it was noted that traditional

gender-related preferences maintained, with girls opting for subjects like “nail beauty and child care” and boys opting for “chess, pool and music appreciation” (6S1), there were grey areas such as cookery which attracted young people of both genders.

Where possible DofE activities for young people in the secure estate were, according to respondents, linked to the ‘outside’ world. In addition to the expedition section, activities meeting the volunteering section of the DofE are tied into wider community activities. Two examples are provided below which illustrate the type of involvement young people on the DofE have with the community. The first of these was a young person whose DofE activities were linked to his interest in horses. Here, a horse trainer visited the prison, in addition to which the young person was granted ROTL to carry out work experience at a local pony rescue centre:

There’s a young person whose doing the Duke of Edinburgh’s here who at the moment going to a pit pony sanctuary, his life is horses, so that’s his escape from reality when he gets back out, and hopefully we’re looking at getting him a job there (4S1).

The second example involved young people (under the conditions of ROTL) carrying out voluntary and charitable work, such as lawn mowing and hedge cutting for older people in the community and providing services for charitable causes. This type of activity was perceived important by staff in that it might assist in repairing relationships between young offenders and the community:

The one thing that the service (Volunteering section) does a lot of is charity work because it sets up a good rapport with the outside community. Mainly what we look for in the service (Volunteering) part is what can we give back? And we’ve done various challenges for the local community and the local hospital (1S1)

To reiterate, only those young people able to secure ROTL are allowed to engage in activities outside of the prison. Young people unable to secure ROTL, however, are able to engage in community activities through innovative strategies. For example, at several study sites young people took part in nationwide drives to raise money for charity, without leaving the prison grounds. In one case young people ran laps on the prison grounds to raise funds for a national charity event. Another charity endeavour which involved walking between two major cities was simulated inside the prison grounds by young people walking the exact distances required in the national event. By taking an innovative approach:

The lads can do a sponsored event in the gym, so they don't need ROTL at all to complete the Service (Volunteering) Award (3S2)

The most innovative strategy to replicate the challenges posed by the DofE was the implementation, at several study sites, of the 'internal' expedition. As described more fully by the young people in the previous chapter, every effort was made on internal expedition to replicate the activities and experiences of the expedition proper. The internal expedition was perceived as useful training ground to prepare young people for the expedition proper, and also provided a simulated experience for those unable to obtain ROTL:

Because we've got the grounds, is they actually do the camp inside this prison, but they still have to set up camp, they still have to do the cooking they still have to do all those types of things, so we might still be able to get people we can't get released on temporary licence to do that (3S1).

The importance attached to the experience of camping out (irrespective of whether it was inside or outside the grounds) was not underestimated by the staff, and indeed is reflected in the accounts of young people given in the previous chapter:

It's something that the lads look forwards to, you can appreciate some of these lads have never ever slept outside for the last however many years they've been inside, they have come from Secure Homes to go through the system, so for them to have to, experience camping out for even for one night is a big thing for them (1S1).

Respondents perceived that a key aim of the DofE in the secure estate was to introduce young people to a wide range of new activities and experiences, through which they might "come to realise their own potential" (3S1). Thus over and above the qualification demonstrating success in acquiring a new skill, the DofE was imbued by many respondents with the development of a wide range of personal skills and qualities. At times respondents had difficulty in expressing exactly what these qualities were because of their intangible and tacit nature. In the words of one respondent, "what they'll learn about is getting up in the morning, going to work and about being told what to do" (3S1).

Previously in this chapter it was suggested that because the DofE was popular among participants, it provided a useful strategy, in the short term, to control behaviour. Consequently, respondents described using the DofE as "a carrot to good behaviour" (2S1). In addition to the immediate benefits, respondents claimed that the DofE may have a longer term impact on participant attitudes and behaviours:

When he first came (here), he was quite aggressive, quite nasty, I don't know if it's because he's been here quite a while now, or if it's partly to do with the DofE, but even when he's playing football on the football pitch you know he's thinking of other people all the time. If it's starting to get a bit nasty he's like 'come on boys it's only a game, there's no need for this' (5S2).

Respondents described how the DofE fostered the development of good “relationship with the kids” (5S2). Certainly there were reports that young people doing the DofE related to staff delivering the programme differently to the way that they interacted with other staff members:

They could be going ‘ra ra ra ra r’ to another member of staff, and you could walk on the unit and they will go quiet straight away because they don’t want to look as if they’re, you know, being immature in front of you (6S2).

The development of trust between those delivering and receiving the programme, which was highlighted by many respondents across study sites, was perceived by staff as indicative of the development of young people’s maturity and responsibility:

You see a change in people. We always say we’ve seen them grow up, might sound, might sound like trivial to yourself, but, they grow from being a child into an adult...and they accept what they’ve done, what they’ve achieved and where it can take them. And it might not be that it’s a qualification as in a certificate, but the underlying the skills that they’ve learned, communication, being learned how to work as a team, all those kinds of things, the underlying things, they may have got more out of that than the actual Award itself...what we see, is they’ve gone from being Mr Angry, to someone that will listen to other people’s points of view (1S1).

In the data extract below a respondent describes an incident, unrelated to the DofE, but which involved a young person participating in the programme. In describing the incident, the respondent claimed that it provided an example of the way in which the DofE affected the relationships between young people and staff:

There was a riot in the prison last weekend and this young person prevented an officer from being harmed. Another young person was going to hit the officer over the head with a snooker cube and he stood in and took the force of the hit. He has been commended by the prison governor as the staff member would have been seriously injured had he not stood in. He is being allowed out on ROTL for four days, due to his good behaviour. The prison staff are over whelmed by his behaviour, because he stood up for one of the staff against the other young people on his wing (2S2).

Hence, while respondents reported on the importance of skills acquisition for the young people, it was the indeterminate qualities and demeanours which were often highlighted over others:

I don't think they realised their confidence was improved, their leadership skills has been improved or they've learnt leadership skills. A lot of these kids in here followed the crowd ... they haven't got the confidence to say no (4S1).

In this respect, staff emphasised the importance of learning to think about other people, "learning people skills" (5S2) and "working together as a team" (2S1):

They've never actually thought of anybody else before apart from themselves. Once they start thinking as a team, and working together as a team, some of them are finding it strange, or different, but they're all putting a lot of effort into it (5S1).

Respondents described young people as having "come on in leaps and bounds" in terms of their relationships within the group (5S2). One, of many, examples, was given of a young person whose behaviour had noticeably changed since joining the programme:

If some young people are doing something wrong, he'll try to correct them, which probably when he first started in the establishment he'd never had... He wouldn't have cared you know, whereas now his social skills have improved (5S1).

DofE activity which was generally highlighted by respondents as having the most impact on the young people's behaviour was the expedition. At study sites where ROTL had permitted external expeditions there was most reference to the "change in the children" (6S3). Respondents agreed that the young people appeared, in the words of RS3 to "mature once they've been out on expedition" (6S3). In the following data extract a respondent describes his understanding of how the experience is perceived by participants:

It is tough, it is hard. A lot harder than I thought it would be, not from a physical point of view but from a motivational point of view. It was quite an insight. I think the guys themselves got quite a lot out of it, both in self belief, confidence, the ability to almost be the master of their own destiny (2S4).

Respondent enthusiasm for the expedition illustrates, as discussed previously, why the experience is sometimes offered to non DofE participating staff as a strategy to bring them on board with the programme. All respondents interviewed who had taken part in an external expedition described it as "rewarding" (6S2) because of the new experiences it was perceived as offering young people:

Those kids out in that environment and acting the way that they were acting, it was brilliant. It's really hard to put into words actually, you know going past fields of cows and them getting excited because they'd seen fields of cows and they'd seen sheep

and they thought they were on a safari (laughs) and it was, it was truly brilliant (6S2).

Hence, staff talked about how young people's "lifestyles hasn't included things like the Duke of Edinburgh scheme" (4S1) and the importance of "broadening their horizons" and "opening up their worlds a bit more" (3S1). Respondents also highlighted young people's achievement in the contexts of disadvantaged backgrounds:

I give them full respect for what they achieve. This one lad he's due to leave soon, he's a deaf lad, and we got him through... so it's a personal achievement for him, and obviously it's a personal achievement for ourselves because it was a challenge, for him to achieve that from the background that he's come from I think was got to be a success (1S1).

Respondents also talked about how the young people developed "a sense of pride in what they're doing" (4S1) and how they were "so proud of their achievements". According to respondents the fact that young people had proved to themselves that they "they can do things and are committed to things and they can get on with things" (4S2), was an important stage in their rehabilitation:

He completed the Award within the establishment, got his full Bronze Award. He had a big presentation, the Governor came in, we had all the people from the YOT come over, and he got presented, papers were in taking photos of him with his family and stuff, and he was really you know really proud that he had done it. He stood up in front of all the boys because we took loads of young people over, and they've sat there. He stood up in front of them and said "well you know I really enjoyed this Award, I thought it was really challenging, and it gave me new skills, I've done things that I never would have dreamed of before". So he then had

the confidence after that to stand and speak in front of them which he probably never would have before (5S1).

However, from staff accounts it was apparent that perhaps the most important potential benefit of the DofE programme was that it showed these young people an alternative way of living, which was accessible to them:

Giving young people a second chance. I am a member of the public, and if you look at what offences they have committed you wouldn't want to. But when you talk to them there has always been a situation. You can turn your back on these people and when they get out they will fall back into the same situation. Or you do something really constructive. I am not trying to be a 'do-gooder', I just want them to get something out from it and benefit (2S2).

Whatever work we've done with them, whatever they might have got, done the whole Duke of Edinburgh scheme, they're going to go back to the same house in the same area, with the same friends, the same family, the same problems are going to be there. But we would like, I think all staff would like to think, that even if we put one little idea into their head about doing something different, then it's worked (4S1).

Summary

This chapter has presented findings from the interviews with staff in secure estate establishments which participated in the study. The key findings were presented under the headings: privilege and access; structure and delivery; and, the learning. Staff delivering the DofE perceived participation as a privilege in that access to the programme within the secure estate is subject to organisational constraints. Most

notable of among these constraints is risk, which was perceived as operating on a number of levels in relation to, for example, institutional reputation, safety of young people and staff, and public protection. Staff also highlighted a range of barriers to successful DofE delivery, which primarily focussed upon style of programme organisation and, relating to this, involvement (or not) of staff members across the secure estate institution. An important issue for staff, given institutional exigencies which include the sudden movement of young people between institutions, was continuity of delivery both between secure estate institutions and between the secure estate, YOTs and the community. Continuity of delivery assumed especial importance for staff given their imperative of completion by young people of (at least) a discrete section of the programme.

Staff highlighted the importance of the programme in transmission of education, skills and social competencies, and the appropriateness of the 'hands on' style of programme delivery. This was deemed especially important given what were perceived as the socially and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds of most of the young people. Most importantly, perceived programme benefits according to staff related to the anticipated future opportunities which young people might perceive as assessable (and may actually access) as a function of participation in the programme.

The following chapter presents the findings from the online survey with YOTs and selected interviews with YOT workers.

Chapter Six Youth Offending Teams

This chapter, which presents data gathered from Youth Offending Teams, constitutes the third findings chapter of the thesis. While the main focus of the study was on DofE programme delivery in the secure estate, because of issues to do with the imperative of completion and, relating to this, continuity of delivery across secure estate establishments and following release from custody, it was deemed important to explore issues for DofE delivery across different youth justice settings. As the data indicate, there are some issues for programme delivery in YOTS which differ from those highlighted in secure estate (some of which may be a function of the latter's 'captive audience'). However, there are many important similarities, which become evident through the different sections of the chapter.

Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) in England and Wales (157) were contacted by email and invited to complete an online survey regarding their involvement with DofE delivery. Of the 157, only 27 returned completed questionnaires, despite two reminders. At the time of the survey, only 61 YOTs had any involvement with the DofE. Moreover, among those 61, the level of involvement differed greatly. While a minority of YOTs (n=15) delivered the programme in house, at the other extreme YOT involvement with the DofE simply comprised sign posting of young people to DofE programmes based outwith the YOT. Hence, the low response rate is arguably attributable to fact that the level of involvement with the DofE differed significantly between YOTs, 69 of which gave low level of, or no, involvement with the DofE as a reason for non completion. However, the remaining 61 of the YOTs offered no reason for not responding.

Notwithstanding the low responses rate, and the evident differences in DofE involvement between responding YOTs, the questionnaire responses were useful in highlighting some key issues for YOT workers vis-à-vis the programme. The questionnaires required both closed and open ended responses, and it is to a brief discussion of the quantitative data which I now turn, before exploring the open ended responses which enabled respondents to elaborate on issues which were raised (or

which they wished to raise). In addition to an examination of the questionnaire responses, the chapter also draws on data obtained during fieldwork visits to two YOTS (one in England and one in Wales). At each site a series of group interviews (n=8) were carried out with YOT workers. The YOTs, which were identified through the survey (for a fuller discussion of the methods please see Chapter 2), were invited to participate in the study because they provided DofE programmes in-house.

Closed-ended responses

To reiterate, the low response rate and apparent differences in DofE involvement across YOTs, has implications for the robustness of the survey findings. Notwithstanding this, the questionnaire responses are useful in highlighting key issues for YOT workers, some of which were followed up with workers at the two YOT's where qualitative data collection subsequently took place. Key issues emerging from the closed ending respondents are discussed below. While approximately three quarters of respondents (n=20) perceived the DofE to be of benefit to young, several barriers to its successful delivery were highlighted in the questionnaire responses.

First the responses indicated that the level of knowledge held by YOT managers about the DoE programme was variable and low. Only six of the managers reported having a "good" understanding about the programme, compared to eleven who described their understanding as 'limited' or 'very limited'.

Second, the level of trained staff, dedicated to DofE delivery, was low. Less than half of the YOTs responding to the survey (n= 11) had a member of staff dedicated to DofE delivery in the YOT, and two thirds of YOT workers had no training for DofE delivery.

Third, the level of DofE participation among young people in the YOTs was generally

(non-existent) or low. Where this activity was evident it was largely concentrated in a few YOTs. Hence, almost half of the responding YOTs had no young people currently participating in the DofE, and over half (n=16), had not had a young person complete the bronze, silver or gold DofE within the past 12 months. The responses indicated that DofE completion (and indeed activity) is confined to a small number of YOTS, three of which claimed to have between six and twelve Award completions the previous year. Approximately a quarter (n=7) of YOTs reported supporting young people who had participated in the award within the secure estate.

Fourth, in the majority of cases YOTs reported minimal contact with secure estate institutions delivering the programme. Over three quarters (n=21) of the respondents claimed to have no contact, and among the other responding YOTs contact was limited to a maximum of three times a year.

Fifth, most responding YOTs claimed no or minimal contact with the DoE. Over half the respondents (n=14) reported no contact. Of the remainder, it was evident that contact with any DofE office was minimal. The majority of respondents, however, anticipated that increasing support from the DofE would help more young people from the YOT engage more positively with the award.

The following sections of this chapter are based upon qualitative questionnaire responses (focussing on delivery and receipt of the programme), and data from the group interviews with YOT staff. These data are organised under the headings: 'Structure and Delivery' of the programme, 'Positioning the programme', 'Engagement' and 'Perceived Programme Benefits'.

Structure and Delivery

The data suggest great variation in the way in which YOTs participating in the study implemented the DofE. YOTs taking part in the study represented a wide range of experience. While Some YOTs, for example, delivered the DofE in-house, others simply signposted young people to Youth Services. YOTs were also at different stages of development vis-à-vis DofE delivery. While some had well established programmes, in other cases delivery of the award was described as “very new”, and at a stage where “staff have been trained and we plan to start delivering to the first group of young people” (YS17).

YOT workers claimed to differ markedly in their understanding and knowledge about the DofE, which in turn was linked to their involvement (if any), with the programme. While it was evident that YOTs had received varying levels of support from DofE through training events and, information sessions, many of the respondents identified a need for more knowledge about the DofE, in order to promote, in the words of one respondent, “a better understanding of the Award” (YS2) within the youth justice setting.

Where YOT’s had a dedicated worker within the staff team, the programme was directed through that individual, hence, “our link to DoE is via our DofE worker” (YS16). Conversely, where the DofE was delivered through Youth Services, contact with, and support from the DofE was delivered indirectly through that organisation. Many respondents, with limited experiences or knowledge about the DofE, indicated interest in the programme and in the words of one respondent “would welcome input regarding some of our young people participating in the scheme” (YS3). Others reported that they might usefully have “more engagement with the Award and knowledge of local representative” (YS11).

Overall respondents identified a need for greater communication between DofE and YOT’s, and also a need for more communication between YOTs. It was suggested that “presentations at the YOT offices from DofE staff” (YS8), would be beneficial and that:

YOT's would welcome "some training/advice on the DofE and how it could be run within the youth offending service or how we could access it for our young people" (YS13).

Understandably, respondent knowledge about, and involvement with, the programme was most apparent where YOTs had a dedicated DofE worker who was well integrated into the staff team. The terms of employment regarding DofE dedicated workers, differed between YOTS, usually as a function of their funding. In some cases these workers were centrally employed by DofE and placed within YOTs. In other cases, dedicated workers were employed directly by YOTs.

For the most part, DofE dedicated workers described themselves as well integrated, "very much seen as part of the YOT...and there is support within the organisation" (YSB). Integration was evidenced by their inclusion in, for example, YOT team away days and local authority training events and where DofE managers sat on YOT panels and other professional meetings. The level of integration of DofE workers in the YOTs, identified by respondents as key to successful programme delivery, was linked in respondent accounts to the commitment of YOT managers to the programme:

A lot of this is to do with the YOT manager's vision. The way that we have been integrated into the team, we are not seen as other workers. Most people don't even realise that we are not paid by the local authority. It is good. The manager's vision is very much preventative, we are a big team rather than everybody having their own remit and at the end of the day it is a young person at the centre of it all (YSB).

Integrated programme delivery appeared best evidenced in respondent accounts where DofE workers worked across the whole YOT. In cases where a several YOT staff members were involved in delivering DofE, respondents were more likely to perceive delivery as a well co-ordinated programme. Here, respondents talked about programme

inclusiveness, involving a spectrum of professionals, who brought their expertise to DofE delivery. This corresponded very much with accounts of integrated delivery described by secure estate staff in the previous chapter. Integrated delivery in YOTs was perceived by respondents as prioritising participants by putting “a young person at the centre of it all” (YSA) and reflecting a commitment to “see them achieve the Award” (YSA):

The more staff we have on board the more we can achieve for the young people (YSB).

Respondents from those YOTS with reportedly integrated programme delivery, claimed to demonstrate a model of good practice which, in the words of one respondent, “isn’t evident in other places” (YSB).

Many of the constraints on programme delivery were described as a function of organisational resources. The most important of resource constraint sited was linked to staffing. Here, respondents reported, for example, “insufficient resources, the size of team is spread too thinly” (YS18) and having “no worker” (YS15) who could take on responsibility for the DofE. In addition, in YOTs which had dedicated DofE workers, that these workers were employed primarily on temporary contracts, was described as a source of concern for YOTs.

It was anticipated by respondents at those YOTs which did not have a dedicated DofE worker, that the appointment of a DofE worker would increase the capacity of the programme because “take up would be greater” (YS23), enable the YOT to “engage with more young people” (YS6) and provide “specific staff with skills to work with very challenging adolescents” (YS21).

Most YOTs participating in the study employed only one worker who was either DofE trained or dedicated to working with young people on the DofE. Where this was the case, resources tended to be concentrated on specific sections of the DofE, either by

delivering, for example “the service (volunteering) element of the Bronze Award” or a specific activity, such as “through a motor project”. DofE dedicated workers described their reliance on other YOT staff to deliver the service:

I have staff over the summer helping me, but if it wasn't for them I wouldn't have been able to do it (YSB).

Some respondents reported using volunteer workers (including Millennium Volunteers) to overcome problems associated with lack of staffing. However, it was noted that the demanding requirements of the programme often exceeded what volunteers might reasonably be expected to contribute, hence, “a lot of the activities I run are for full days and it is too much to ask volunteers” (YSB).

DofE workers with specific skills, particularly those relating to sport and outdoor activity, were reported by respondents as being in great demand:

I also do all the outdoor pursuits, the YOT has got all the equipment and they want me to get more involved and do all the outdoor pursuits (YSB).

Overall, respondents highlighted the importance of having a very broad based skills team which could accommodate the various requirements of young people participating in the programme:

We need more people in the capacity to deliver as well as guide. More people who are able to deliver and specifically a female worker who would be able to work more closely with females, in relation to female activities. It is just widening everything that we do (YSB).

That staff skilled to deliver the programme were in much demand meant that, as illustrated in the data extract below, they might be coveted by neighbouring YOTs:

We need more staff. These other YOTs are always asking for our services, but we don't have the resources (YSA).

Effective delivery, according to respondents, required not only adequate staffing in terms of skills, but also in relation to operation and management of the programme. For example, it was noted that access to the programme was problematic for young people where YOTs serviced large geographical areas and where the young people might be relatively dispersed. As reported by one respondent, "access to a single project in a large county is difficult for most young people" (YS21). Often young people had "issues with transport" (YS6), which necessitated "a lot of time spent driving around in order to pick all the young people up" (YA).

Positioning the programme

Respondents reported pressure from both within and outwith the YOT to treat the DofE as a 'catch all' programme for young people, addressing crime prevention, rehabilitation and reparation. The majority of YOTs implementing the DofE positioned the programme within their Early Intervention Teams. In cases where there was no dedicated Early Intervention Team, however, the DofE tended to target young people on either Referral Orders or Final Warnings. Some respondents reported receiving referrals for DofE from preventive pre-offending programmes (such as Youth Inclusion Programmes (YIPs)). In one case, a YOT respondent noted that the DofE was deployed as an early intervention option for young people on Supervision Orders. However this was not described as standard practice:

Obviously, if they have a Supervision Order then they have history. We have had a few who have done a first offence and

been put straight on a Supervision Order. For those cases we have agreed that we have worked with them. That has been positive, though it has to be an exception (YSB).

As the above data extract suggests, there was concern among respondents about YOT staff capacity. As noted previously, not all YOTs had dedicated DofE workers which limited their capacity to deliver the programme:

The YOT like it when we work with Supervision Orders but we just can't open it up any more though. It is almost unmanageable as it is and that is just with referral orders (YSA).

In the data extract below, a respondent working in a well resourced YOT, delivering the DofE in-house highlights benefits of the programme in prevention work, while simultaneously acknowledging resource constraints:

It fits into prevention as well. You are hopefully preventing them from getting involved in criminal activity...and also, to try and help motivation. They can bring along some of their mates and they can get involved... ...One of the lads came along as a mate and then he actually carried on by himself (YSB).

Hence, for the most part, DofE involvement was discussed by respondents as part of their prevention remit, and this may account for the fact that there was less emphasis in the data on the implementation of the DofE with young people following their release from the secure estate. However there were exceptions to this. In one case the YOT had reportedly moved away from delivering the DofE as an early preventative model, focussing more on its use as in resettlement of young people. Here it was noted that the DofE programme was "delivered as part of an order where there is a need for high level of support i.e. Resettlement and Aftercare" (YS27).

Ease of entry to the DofE programme was described by respondents as a function of the relationships which YOTs (and DofE dedicated workers in particular) had fostered with referring agencies/panels. While participation with the DofE is voluntary, as one respondent explained, where a referral is made via a panel contract, “the initial meeting they have to explore with us (DofE staff) is statutory, but after that it is voluntary” (YSA).

YOTs implementing DofE with young people on Referral Orders tended to describe close working relationships with the Referral Panels which facilitated the entry of young people into the DofE programme, leading, as one respondent noted, to “more and more referrals” (YW). Close working relationships between YOTs and referring panels/agencies included, for example, the YOT based DofE worker contributing to “referral panel training, maybe once every 2 months” (YSB). In one case, members of the YOT reported that they “carried out presentations” (YSA) at panel training sessions. At another YOT it was described how, where referrals were made to the DofE, “a copy of the contract comes straight from the panel” (YSA). Other examples of close working relationships were of panel members making DofE referrals on young people’s contracts, prior to the young people meeting their YOT workers.

Success in engaging young people was described by respondents as largely a function of how well its activities were integrated with the YOT statutory provision. Respondents reported that, from the outset of their involvement with young people, every effort was made to link DofE activities with YOT business. Hence, at the initial point of contact DofE workers introduced themselves to prospective participants when the latter were making routine visits to their YOT workers:

Normally the YOT give me the referral and then the young person comes here to see their workers anyway and I try and tie in to that...I just pop along and talk to them informally (YSA).

It was reported at one YOT that young people joining preventive programmes, such as YIP, were encouraged to sign up to the DofE, where it was available and where the programme activities were perceived as compatible:

For the YIP they have a core group of 50 young people that they work with for a minimum of 6 months at a time. When they sign on to that, they sign on to the DofE as well, as the activities can be recognised by the DofE (YSB).

Respondents also noted that integration of DofE activity with YOT statutory provision could be linked to incentives for young people to sign up for the Award: An example of such incentives is provided in the data extract below:

Every young person who is completing reparation in the community is asked if they want to register for the DofE scheme and if they do they are registered and their reparation hours can count towards the voluntary aspect of the Award (YS9).

Clearly it was perceived that in order to optimise delivery of the DofE programme, integration with the YOT statutory provision was necessary. Hence, as noted by one respondent, only where the DofE was well integrated into existing programmes had it “it worked quite well” (YSB).

Respondents highlighted the importance of maintaining flexibility vis-à-vis delivery of the DofE, many examples of which were provided. To reiterate, the best models of delivery were described as those which aligned the structure and content of programme delivery with YOTs’ statutory provision, or in other words which fitted in with the ‘bread and butter’ work of the YOT. There were also reports of YOT’s tailoring the DofE programme to meet the individual preferences of young people:

We offer them group activities or individual one to one if it suits the young person and if a young person wants to do something on a one to one, we will pay for that (YSA).

Another example of flexibility of DofE provision was evident in the commitment of one YOT to continue delivery of the programme to participants following completion of orders and when the young people were no longer accountable to the YOT.

Where the DofE was delivered by Youth Services, and not in-house by the YOTs, respondents reported signposting “young people to local DoE youth club” and “facilitating initial meetings” (YS11), or working “in conjunction with (local) Youth Services” to deliver aspects of the programme (YS25). In one case, the Youth Service and YOT were reportedly working on joint delivery, comprising “a team of five staff seconded to the YOT through the former Youth Service” (YS18).

Engagement

Generally, respondents compared the ability to engage young people in the DofE within YOTs, unfavourably with engagement in the secure estate:

When they are in prison it is a captive audience, it is something they can do, but as soon as they come outside they have got to make the effort to continue doing it. The vast majority boils down to the individual themselves and if they want to continue with it or not (YSB).

Notwithstanding this, some young people entering YOTs were perceived as easier to engage in the programme than others. To reiterate, most respondents positioned the DofE as a crime prevention intervention. This reflected their perceptions of most suitable candidates for the programme. Hence most respondents described the DofE

as best suited to young people who “are motivated to change and at early stages of offending” (YS7), “lower end offenders and those on preventative programmes” (YS19) or “at prevention pre-court level” (YS24). Those deemed most easy to engage with the problem were described as having strong family relationships and, in the words of one respondent, “if the family is not on side it is nearly impossible” (YSA).

Some respondents suggested that entry age to the programme should be reduced so that “young people starting comprehensive school” (YSB) might take part. Here, respondents reported “there is a gap in terms of provision” (YSB) at a critical age when young people might begin offending. Moreover it was noted by one respondent that lowering the age of entry on to the DofE would facilitate a longer period of exposure to the programme to enable DofE workers to “work longer with young people” (YSB).

Ironically, while respondents tended to describe the programme as more suitable for younger offenders, willingness to engage was simultaneously linked in their accounts with maturity. Hence respondents talked about how “some young people are not ready for the discipline required” (YS7), that they might “not see the activities relating to their everyday lives” (YS27), and lacking “motivation to complete some parts of the Award” (YS22).

Young people perceived as the most difficult to engage in the DofE were described as “prolific offenders” (YSB), “high risk offenders” (YS21), “Persistent Young Offenders (PYO’s)” (YS24) and those “most entrenched in offending” (YS7). Whereas younger, early stage offenders were generally perceived as having “less complex needs” (YS6) than those more entrenched in offending, the latter were characterised variously as young people “whose self esteem is quite low” (YS11), “who struggle with self motivation” (YS11), and as “lacking motivation to change” (YS15). It was noted by several respondents that the programme was less suitable for young people with “substance misuse issues” (YS19). Consequently it was deemed that whilst these young people might “enjoy the programme, their instinct is to shy away from it” (YS11).

A major issue for young people's engagement with the programme was time. Here staff highlighted a 'mismatch' between the length of time required to complete DofE sections and length of orders imposed on young people. Hence it was reported:

Our team has a staff member who is able to deliver on the Duke of Edinburgh Award although it has not been possible to complete mainly due to timing (YS1).

Some are with us for only a limited amount of time so we would struggle to support them in an end to end process (YS11).

While this mismatch caused problems for structure and delivery of the Award, it was the implications of non-completion for the willingness of young people to engage which concerned respondents most. Certainly, this was an issue raised by secure estate staff delivering the programme, in the previous chapter:

Due to the poor literacy and numeracy of the majority of the YOT clients it is necessary for long periods of training to ensure that the young people are at the required level for unsupervised expeditions. During this time the young people become demotivated and lose interest in taking part in the whole Award. Changes need to be made to ensure that this section can be attained quickly with this client group to ensure that it is a motivating section as those who successfully complete gain a large amount of enjoyment from taking part (YS19).

The above data extracts indicate the importance which respondents placed upon young people completing the programme. In acknowledging the difficulties attendant upon completion of, for example, the Bronze Award, One YOT identified the need for "shorter units" (YS15), so that the sections might be obtained during the young person's

sentence. Likewise, the respondent cited below suggests that more emphasis might be constructively placed on completions of Award sections:

The length of time to gain an Award is a big commitment for some of our young people. I have tried to encourage young people to join the Award to gain just one section -whilst taking part in a YOT project that would cover it, for example, Skill section - but this was frowned upon by the DofE. However, gaining one section should be celebrated just as much as achieving the entire Award (YS12).

Sentence length was also highlighted as problematic by respondents in that it was not always compatible with the imperative of the mapping the DofE onto locally available activities. Hence certain activities identified as appropriate for the programme were not included due to the length of time to which they took to deliver. The DofE programme requires minimum participation for a three month period, whereas available activities in YOTs did not always suit that time frame. Hence it was suggested that DofE delivery in YOTs might more usefully be based on “number of hours rather than length of commitment over time” (YSB):

Many of our young people take part in other locally run activities (such as fire courses) which are potentially suitable for the service (Volunteering) section. These involve over and above the required hours but only last for a week. Due to the high demands of these courses (physically, mentally and emotionally) the young people get the same benefits from taking part in them as they would in a one hour a week, three month programme (YS19).

In addition, statutory requirements of orders meant that not all young people were able to complete the expedition section of the DofE while with YOTs. Respondents reported, for example, how conditions placed on orders, “many of the young people have curfews” (YS23), may interfere with planned DofE activities. Mismatches between

statutory requirements and programme provision were no more apparent than in the case of expeditions, which according to one respondent were “only allowed to take place from April to November” (YS23). Hence, respondents argued for more flexibility regarding the DofE programme requirements, noting:

We have all the new (DofE) guidelines and a lot of it doesn't fit in to Youth Justice, especially the expedition (YSB).

Additionally, some respondents highlighted the need for more flexibility in respect of what counted as DofE activities within the Youth Justice Service. Here, for example, a need to “increase the range of activities more suited to British minority ethnic and inner city groups” (YS27) was highlighted. Respondents also described conformity to the programme structure as problematic for young people who have chaotic lifestyles. Such young people, it was suggested, required positive experiences from participation of the Award to increase the likelihood of them continuing. Here, again respondents highlighted preferences for “shorter units” (YS15) in order that “sections could be completed during sentence” (YSB).

Success in engaging young people in the programme was also described by respondents as a function of programme content and delivery style. Here, similar to secure estate staff, respondents highlighted the importance of hands on delivery style, suited for those..:

... who require an alternative education programme or need variety and a more supportive timetable” (YS26).

The DofE was perceived as most attractive to those interested in “practical” (YS21), outdoor pursuits and to “active young people” (YS1), because “it keeps the young people interested” (YW). Hence, the most popular sections of the Award were described as “the physical and Expedition” (YSB).

To reiterate, in most cases the DofE was targeted at early intervention stages. Thus, there were few reports of programme planning and continuity that would bridge the transition from secure estate to YOTs (or vice versa). In one case, a DofE worker claimed that the opportunity for her to work in collaboration with the secure estate would only arise if her remit was expanded to include more persistent young offenders. This might include working with Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP), which is the most intense community penalty that is available to the courts. While acknowledging that “ISSP work with a lot of the top end of offenders, who are more likely to go in to custody” (YSB), there was some recognition that “they may only be on ISSP for a couple of months” and that “it is harder working with that client group” (YSB), hence engagement with the DofE was considered problematic.

For the most part, YOT respondents reported having little communication with those in the secure estate delivering DofE:

In the past I have had one book (DofE) come through from (YOI) and that was very difficult. It was only through her supervising officer that it became apparent that she had done the DofE and that she wanted to carry it on. There was no phone calls, no information, so that we could get something running before she came out. It is very difficult; we didn't know what her needs were. I have sent books the other way, to the secure estate, but no feedback, no general information as to what is happening (YSB).

There were a few notable exceptions of continuity between the secure estate and YOT, but these were not the norm:

He was fantastic, he had done his bronze before (in YOI) and he wanted to do his silver (in the YOT) (YSA)
and

I have a girl. She didn't do it in custody, but she did it at cadets. She was in for a first offence and they basically banged her up. She has come out on to a Supervision Order and I have agreed to work with her. She is doing really well now, she is engaging in everything we can throw at her, she wants to do it (YSB).

Another example of liaising between the secure estate and YOTs was provided by a respondent account of how the YOT and Young Offender's Institution (YOI) collaborated to obtain Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL), for a young person in custody who wanted to do the DofE Expedition. As indicated in the data extract below, in this case YOT staff were involved in the assessment of ROTL applications:

Team members assist in assessing ROTL applications involving Young People at the YOI and may refer young people they supervise/provide Casework Service for (YS10).

Those delivering DofE in YOTs expressed a wish for more information about young people and their needs, prior to release from the secure estate:

It is about information. If we have got somebody that is coming out, we need the information in advance. We need to address it almost straight away so that we can have continuity with what they have been doing inside. We need to establish the links and support we can give them when they come out, so that we can reduce the likelihood of re-offending (YSB).

Generally respondents were keen to develop seamless delivery of the DofE from the secure estate to the community. One respondent suggested that this might be achieved through Resettlement and Aftercare Projects (RAP) which reportedly have appropriate connections with the secure estate and the facilities to structure DofE in to resettlement plans. A greater role for the DofE in management of the transition of Award participants

across settings was also highlighted as important by respondents. Here, it was suggested that the DofE might usefully inform and/or train secure estate staff responsible for offender resettlement:

It would be helpful for casework and resettlement department at any HMYOI to receive presentation or visit from DofE to increase awareness and referrals (YS10).

A lack of continuity was also highlighted by respondents in respect of young people leaving YOTs. In this respect, respondents suggested more:

..Sourcing of provision within the area to allow young people to continue to work towards their Award when they move on from the YOT (YS16).

Respondents reported on difficulties experienced by young people in making “the step from all of the support that we give them”, when moving from YOT to the community (local Authority run Award). As noted previously, some YOT workers offered continued support to young people on completion of their order, in order to assist them completing the Bronze Award. In most cases, completion of the DofE unassisted was perceived as difficult for young people:

They will carry on under my guidance, but if they are mature enough they can do it through the local authority...the three I have now are doing it under my guidance (but) I'm not sure if they would have the maturity to do it alone (YSB).

Here respondents noted the importance of working collaboratively with community based DofE providers (such as schools) “to facilitate exit strategies” (YS20). They also highlighted the importance of increasing awareness of DofE programme within the

community, and especially to young people outside of mainstream school. Here it was suggested that the programme might be delivered in, for example:

...pupil referral units and schools for young people with special needs, which many of our young people attend). If it was they may be more aware of the award and may feel more comfortable asking for support from school if they need it (e.g. if they need to get a teacher to sign off a section etc)” (YS12).

As indicated in the above data extract, knowledge about the DOE prior to sentencing might encourage or smooth young people’s entry onto the programme in the secure estate and/or YOTs.

Perceived Programme Benefits

YOT respondents attached similar benefit to the DoE as those highlighted by staff delivering the Award within the secure estate. Hence, the certificate was perceived as valuable to young people because it demonstrated a range skills and social competencies:

The acquisition of new practical and life skills it signposts young people to other opportunities (YS10)

The benefits of having DofE on the CV which shows young people are motivated and can stick to a programme – this helps them gain employment/education places (YS12).

Especially important to the respondents, was that the DofE was perceived as a “nationally respected and recognised award” (YS17) which provided young people with an opportunity to gain “recognised qualifications” (YS17):

The Award is a mainstream and recognized qualification which young people can build on when contact with YOT has ceased (YS16).

In addition to what achievement DofE may confer upon young people, it was valued for the sense of achievement which it fostered among the young people themselves. This was summarised by one respondent in the following data extract:

...a sense of achievement really. Most of the young people we work with are under-achievers; they may not be in school or on reduced timetables. They often don't achieve the same things as most young people who are in full time education (YSB).

Respondents also talked about the ways in which families of the DofE participants responded to this achievement. Here it was noted, for example, how "they (families) recognise that this piece of paper is the best thing that has happened," (YSA). In one instance a YOT held a "ceremony for parents to attend", to mark a young person's achievement of the Award (YS18). Another respondent described how s/he had:

.....been on home visits and the sectional certificates are framed in the house and are pride of place. It is a good thing, especially in this sector (YSB).

YOT workers also talked about the ways in which young people responded to, and changed through the programme, indicating an overall improvement in their individual "interpersonal skills and communication" (YS10), "increased confidence" (YS19) and "increased self esteem" (YS7):

Some of them have made quite a journey and have changed quite a lot. They have gone from not being interested in much, to going on to college (YSA).

Again, respondents talked about the ways in which the DofE, for example, encouraged the development of “maturity” and “positive adult relationships” (YSA): In the data extracts below two respondents describes changes in the demeanour and attitudes of young people over the course of their DofE participation:

Gemma, she was hectic, she was hyperactive. She was looking for mischief when she was out with us. She is now chilled, grown up and chatty. She got herself a Saturday job. I don't know if that is because of us, but we are adults that you can have fun with and she changed (YSA).

When Tony started with the DofE he just sat at the back of the van and then by the end he was sat up front in between us. Chat, chat, chat and his confidence just grew. He was a happy lad, completely different (YSA).

Summary

This chapter presented findings from the online questionnaire survey of YOTs and interviews with YOT workers at purposively selected YOTs. While the primary focus of the study was DofE delivery and receipt in the secure estate, because the issue of programme continuity assumed such importance among (particularly) those delivering the programme at secure estate institutions, it was decided that this issue, among others, should be pursued with YOT workers.

The findings in this chapter were organised under the heading: structure and delivery; positioning the programme; engagement; and, perceived programme benefits. In terms of structure and delivery, YOTs appeared to experience similar issues to those in the secure estate. That is, while difficult to achieve because of staff knowledge of the programme and staff resources, integrated delivery across the YOT was perceived as the best model of implementation. YOTs incurred an additional problem in that unlike in the secure estate, dovetailing the DofE with statutory programmes was problematic in that whereas the DofE is voluntary, requirements of statutory orders must be met. Hence while young people might elect to withdraw from DofE participation, in YOTs this cannot interfere with their completion of statutory orders.

Another issue raised by YOT respondents was that whereas in the secure estate young people are a 'captive audience', this is not so in YOTs, where engagement of young people in the programme appeared more difficult. Moreover, YOTs appeared to struggle with issues relating to the positioning of the programme. Whereas in the secure estate, the programme necessarily targets those with offending records, YOTs tended to understand the DofE contribution mainly in terms of prevention, or early offending. While there was evidence of some DofE implementation with established offenders, this was patchy.

Overall, YOTs reported similar benefits of the programme to those highlighted by secure estate staff. The imperative of completion similarly informed concerns about continuity of programme delivery across different youth justice contexts and the community. Certainly little contact was reported between the secure estate and YOTs. The issue of continuity was arguably more problematic within YOTs given the reported problems of engagement of young people in that context.

The following chapter, which is the final of the four findings chapters, presents findings from interviews with representatives from the DofE central management team.

This chapter, which presents findings from the interviews with representatives from the DofE central management team, constitutes the final of the four findings chapters of the thesis. The chapter explores three key themes arising from the interviews with DofE representatives. These are 'Inclusiveness', 'Branding' and 'Engagement'. While these themes interrelate and overlap, they have been separated out for purposes of clarity. In this chapter respondents talk about the broader aims of the DofE, in addition to focussing more specifically on implementation in the secure estate. In a final section of the chapter, respondents describe their future aspirations and plans for DofE delivery across youth justice services.

Whereas respondents in the previous findings chapters of the thesis refer to the delivery of programme in the secure estate as the Award or the DofE, representatives from the DofE central team describe this aspect of their work as the 'Aspire' project. As detailed in chapter one of the thesis, the Aspire project was launched by the DofE in 2006, specifically to facilitate implementation of DofE activities with young offenders (DofE 2009c). Aspire initially focussed on the delivery of DofE programmes in the secure estate, with the aim of developing a model of good practice to be implemented across the secure estate. Overall, Aspire aimed to increase the number of young people participating in the DofE across the wider youth justice system, through developing partnerships with other youth justice agencies to facilitate the transition and resettlement of young people back in to the community (DofE 2009c).

Inclusiveness

DoE respondents emphasised inclusiveness as an imperative of the wider DofE programme (not restricted to the secure estate). Hence, they stressed the importance of involving all young people, from a cross section of society, including those from more socially disadvantaged/marginalised backgrounds, to ensure that:

...everybody does it...absolutely any young person, from whatever background, with the right leadership and right guidance (R1).

Here, respondents were quick to emphasise the success of the programme in working with a wide range of young people, highlighting how its impact might be more keenly experienced with young people most socially disadvantaged:

We know that the DofE process, programme works for any young person. Without exception they get something positive from the experience. When you start to think about young people who have a background that has disadvantaged them, not given them the opportunities to experience even a reasonable education, then you could imagine that the Award might have even greater impact. It provides whole lot of motivation, and outlook on life and view of the world, that for a lot of us, our parents, or other support mechanisms, give them to us. Whilst the award is of great value even to people like you and I who had support mechanisms, it will be of even greater value to a young person who hasn't had that kind of support mechanism (R1).

While more recently implemented interventions, like Aspire and New Start, were developed specifically to target young offenders, or those at risk of offending, respondents noted that including disadvantaged young people had been a founding aim of the DofE:

The foundation of the Award was not about bright, white middle class youngsters. It was about young people who had a disadvantaged start in life (R1).

Likewise, respondents agreed that their current work with young offenders sat comfortably with the original aims of the DofE to target marginalised groups:

From its earliest days the award has been intended to engage difficult challenging young people. The very first pilot project included boys clubs in London, which would involve what is now called young people not in education or training and Borstals. It is something that we have always done. the (DofE) was originally set up to bridge the gap between the school leaving age of 15 and the national service age of 18, so it was obviously not set up for young people who were academically gifted (R4).

For these respondents, experience of doing the DofE was perceived as both valuable and enabling for young people, irrespective of the context in which they participated:

All the things that we say the Award does I actually believe that they work for young offenders as much as they do for a posh private school kid. You could come from a posh private school down the road, or you could be doing your Gold Award inside (prison), and you are both gaining and accredited in different ways, but both reach the same level (R2).

While respondents agreed that working with young offenders was not a deviation from DofE remit, it was acknowledged that running the programme in the secure estate challenged some public perceptions about the DofE, and the work that the organisation carried out:

The brilliant thing about ASPIRE is that it is actually shifting the focus and highlighting something very specific without changing the fundamental nature of what we do ...(it) debunks some of the myths that a lot of people have about what we do (R3).

While heralding the Award as inclusive and, relating to this, a positive experience for young people in the secure estate, it was simultaneously acknowledged that the programme was not available to all incarcerated young people. Institution regulations, particularly pertaining to risk, debar some young people from participating. In some institutions, for example, sex offenders were not permitted to participate in the Award. One reason given for this was that these young people may not be allowed to mix freely with other inmates doing the Award (or indeed participate one to one with a staff member of the opposite sex delivering the Award). Another reason why sex offenders may not be permitted to participate, implied by respondents, relates to the status of the Award and what it confers. Hence, on leaving the secure estate, possession of the Award may be perceived as an indication of worthiness, not usually ascribed to those perceived as high risk to the community such as, for example, those on the sex offender register:

If they have done the award then they have an accreditation. You say, 'isn't that a good thing'? and they (undesigned others) say 'no', because when they leave they have a piece of accreditation that says they might be a good person (R2).

The respondent cited above went on to differentiate between the perceived meaning of the Award (that it confers trustworthiness upon the recipient) and its actual conferment (as an indicator of positive achievement):

So, if you have an Award, does that mean that you are a good person? No. But it at least means that you are doing a positive activity. The fact that they don't allow some sex offenders to do it for that very reason, says what their perception of the benefits of the award actually are (R2).

A fuller account of the reasons which prevent young people in the secure estate from participating in the Award, including type of offence committed and length of sentence can be found in chapters three and four of the thesis. Suffice to note here that respondents indicated some concern about the preservation of the reputation and standing of the DofE, in the context of Aspire. This issue is explored further under the theme of 'branding'.

Branding

While respondents stressed the DofE imperative of inclusiveness, they also emphasised the importance of maintaining the standard and reputation of the Award. On one hand these two imperatives were described as compatible or mutually reinforcing:

The work that we have done in developing the brand has told us the unique selling point of the award is its breadth (R1).

As indicated by the data extract above, a key advantage of the Award was perceived as its flexibility and scope, and, linked to this, its attractiveness to a wide range of young people:

Are we short of the number of kids? No. We can't cope with the number of kids who want to do this, from every background (R1).

Respondents talked about how, with appropriate support, the Award could be tailored to a wide range of client groups and contexts:

We know given the right support, in the right way, the right pace, this works (R4).

In the data extract below, a respondent provides an example of the way in which the skills and experiences acquired through the DofE programme, effectively dovetailed with the needs of training courses offered by industry:

(British Gas) are saying that the apprenticeships that they have coming through who have done the DofE are light years away from the apprentices they have had previously. I said 'that can't be down to the DofE', and he said absolutely 100%. The technical input is identical, the motivation input, the outlook on life, the communication skills, team working stuff is all from the DofE. The fact is in almost any circumstances it adds something (R5).

While stressing the importance of inclusiveness, on the other hand, respondents acknowledged the importance of maintaining the reputation of the Award. This required the striking of delicate balance between the “bread and butter” work associated with the programme and developing the focus on “disadvantaged young people” (R2). Certainly, respondents acknowledged risks involved in catering to such a wide range of clients and contexts:

We do have to be careful, because the reason the award is a value to the young people we are talking about... is because it is a value to the young people who go to Eton (and) Harrow, and because employers know that if a young person comes to them with the Award, especially the gold, then they are special (R1).

Equally, respondents were concerned that the Award should not become pigeon holed as an intervention for young offenders:

As an organisation we don't want to become known as the organisation that helps kids in prison. We want to be the

organisation that has a credible Award structure that helps everybody (R4).

Because of this, the Aspire project is conceived as a component of the wider Award agenda, operating as:

...one of the portfolio of things that we have to offer, both to individuals and companies and It is a very attractive proposition...Because (it) is a specific project, it is much more likely to be attractive to funders (R3).

Engagement

Branding of the DofE has implications for engagement. Engagement emerged as a key issue for the DoE at a number of levels. These include engagement with other organisations and funding bodies, engagement with organisations within the youth justice sector and engagement with young people themselves.

When describing the relationship of the DofE with other bodies, respondents were mindful of the funding imperative. That is, the DofE as a charitable organisation must depend upon continued financial support from its sponsors. In emphasising the importance placed on financial stability, respondents talked about the organisation undergoing a recent “overhaul to ensure financial security (and provide) a platform for growth for the next 50 years” (R1). It is in this context, which respondents talked about the importance of engaging those bodies perceived as crucial to the continuance of the organisation.

To reiterate, the DofE is very focused upon the ‘branding’ of the Award as an inclusive programme available to all young people. While combating the commonly held perception that it is not an organisation solely catering to “nice middle class achievers”,

but one which also engages with “challenging young people” (R4), the DofE must be careful not to alienate its traditional sources of support. Hence respondents stressed that while the Award targeted all young people, it was not the intention of the DofE to privilege the socially disadvantaged or young offenders at the expense of other groups of young people:

Our bread and butter is state schools, we shouldn't not do that because we want to focus on disadvantaged young people. There is a lot going on in the voluntary sector for disadvantaged young people and actually a lot of kids are forgotten because of that. Just because you come from a middle class background doesn't mean that you don't have low self esteem, low self confidence and all that kind of stuff. It is really important that we focus our breadth, but we must do the breadth (R2).

Engaging support for the Aspire project must therefore be handled sensitively and is done so by DofE staff dedicated to that project. Success in gaining and maintaining support for the project relied upon the (often) informal and individual relationships developed and nurtured with key stakeholders. Respondents thus talked about the need to convince, “people who provide the resource...to trust us on this project” (R1):

If you have a good person you can talk to and they are interested and if you have a good relationship it works, but if you don't have that, it doesn't (R2).

Resourcing aspects of the DoE work with young offenders, was described as most challenging by the respondents, and, in the promotion of Aspire respondents, were keen to emphasise its attractiveness as just “one of the portfolio of things that we have to offer, both to individuals and companies” (R3).

Government support for the DofE was acknowledged by respondents as key to the future success of the programme. It was explained that while the DofE did receive some Government funding, this was not specifically allocated for their youth Justice work:

We do get some funding ...from the government, it is the education funding. It funds the training, for people who want to deliver and support Young People on DofE...But it has no targets for Youth Justice or Aspire. (While) we want to be an independent charity; it would be useful to have some money from the government (R5).

Hence the DofE attempt to maintain a balance between being recognised by the Government as a charity, which may work within the realm of youth justice, yet at the same time retaining independence:

We don't want to be a Government organisation; however do we want government to facilitate the structures they have control over to undertake the DofE (R1).

The DofE have a strategy to engage Government support for Aspire. Most importantly this strategy involves the development of an evidence base through the commissioning of an evaluation of the Aspire programme in the secure estate (to which this PhD study is linked). The aim of the research was to identify the impact of the programme on young offenders' attitudes towards offending and, related to this, highlight potential implications for future reduction of re-offending behaviours. Much store was consequently placed upon the anticipated research findings:

We can go and talk to the Home Office and I guess if the evidence we get from the research is strong enough then we will have a case to make to them for resources (R1).

It was also anticipated, by the DofE youth justice project officer, that the research findings would be used by the DofE to develop and implement a youth justice strategy:

It is about us as an organisation being clearer about where we want youth justice to go. We have all the evidence from the research and it (Aspire) is now permanently funded by the DofE central office so it would be short sighted of us to not put a strategy together for the next 3 to 5 years (R5).

As part of this strategy, the youth justice project officer post (previously a temporary appointment) was made permanent. For the youth justice project officer, this signalled DofE commitment to working in youth justice:

My post is now permanent, so I am a permanent member of staff on external funding. I have job security and it shows that they are serious about Aspire and working within youth justice (R5).

Another strategy employed by the DofE to court support for the Aspire programme, has been to invite young people who have experience of the DofE, while in the secure estate, to share their experiences of the Award with key stake holding groups. Hence, for example, at the launch of the research findings, a young person who had started his Award, while in youth custody, and who had subsequently achieved his Gold Award, spoke (to an audience including the Minister of Justice, Prince Edward and YJB representatives) about his positive experiences of the programme and his plans for the future.

Engagement of the DofE with youth justice systems/organisations was perceived by respondents as important to the success of the Aspire project. In particular, the DofE courted the support from the Youth Justice Board. YJB support for Aspire was perceived as crucial to obtaining, and sustaining, the involvement of secure estate institutions, and YOTs in programme delivery. Moreover, as indicated in chapter four, on

a practical level, the YJB was noted by secure estate staff delivering the programme, as key to the determination of which young people are granted ROTL, and hence able to take part in the full range of DofE activities. Hence, not surprisingly, DofE representatives talked about working with the YJB to foster DofE support/recognition across the Youth Justice arena. The importance placed upon YJB endorsement of the DofE was reflected in the DofE's planned representation at the forthcoming Annual Youth Justice conference:

If we get to speak at the YJB convention in November, this would be a huge endorsement that we are a charity who are able to do that and that the YJB think it is worthwhile to hear our story (R5).

Endorsement by the Youth Justice Board was thus perceived by respondents the key to raising awareness about the programme across Youth Justice settings and particularly the secure estate:

The more general awareness there is, the easier it is to try and get it (DofE) accepted in prisons because people know about it (R4).

DofE respondents also highlighted the importance of their relationship with the secure estate. Because the DofE do not have a formal arrangement about implementation of the programme which obtains across the secure estate, respondents talked about the necessity of developing robust relationships with individual institutions:

There is no formal communication and I don't think there can be. Whilst you think the DofE as a big charity could talk to the secure estate, it is never going to work. We have to understand that we need to have individual relationships with different institutions or establishments (R2).

The task of the Aspire project was not, according to respondents, to facilitate delivery of the programme in the secure estate by DofE employees, but to support institutions and key individuals within youth justice settings to carry out delivery. In this respect, the modus operandi of the Aspire project was described, by respondents, as comparable the way in which the programme is delivered outwith the youth justice setting. However, supporting the programme within the youth justice setting (and particularly within the secure estate) was perceived as especially challenging. Partly this was perceived as function of the fact that the DofE is not recognised publicly for its work in the secure estate, and, partly because of the associated resource implications:

The trick for us is to find how we can support the secure estate to do this for itself. We don't have the resources to do it and we don't need to because they have the resources. We need to find a way to do this as economically as possible; we are a charity (R1).

In order to gain the support necessary to run Aspire, respondents acknowledged the importance of identifying individuals to 'champion' the cause. Within the secure estate, prison governors were identified as those best positioned to champion the DofE programme:

If they (prison governors) are interested and they want it to work it will work. It is the same with schools; if the head teacher wants it to work it will work. It doesn't matter where you go, if the head of that institution is passionate and wants it to happen. Actually, even if they just allow it to happen that could be enough. If they don't get it and they are not interested then it doesn't work (R2).

While acknowledging the important role played by prison governors in supporting Aspire, respondents also noted that successful delivery of the DofE would only be realised with the support of staff working within the secure estate. To reiterate, in chapter four, interviews with secure estate staff members highlighted the importance of

ensuring that the broader staff group were committed to the Award and that those involved in delivery effused “dedication and enthusiasm” (R4).

While delivery of the programme in the secure estate was a focal point of respondent discussion, much emphasis was also placed on the importance of continuity of programme delivery across youth justice settings. This included movement of young people across secure estate establishments, as well as between the secure estate, Youth offending teams and the community.

Plans to locate the DofE within the ‘joining up’ of youth justice services will be discussed in the final of the chapter. In this section, the chapter concentrates on the emphasis which staff placed upon individuals, within youth justice settings, to ensure continuity of delivery. In the following data extract, for example, a respondent talks about the important role played by secure estate staff in sign posting delivery in other contexts:

The leader will naturally need to have links beyond that environment. I am sure many of them do, so that there is a kind of sign posting that can happen and also preparation before they leave that environment (R3).

As indicated in the above data extract, those individuals playing a key role in DofE implementation, in different contexts, were referred to by respondents as Award leaders. Respondents highlighted the importance of engaging not only with Award leaders within the secure estate, but also within Youth Offending Teams and the community. Again, great store was put on Award leaders, who were perceived as particularly influential in matters of programme delivery. In the data extract below, a respondent describes how some community based Award leaders may harbour perceptions about ex-young offenders which are contrary to the ethos of the programme:

Some of the Award leaders actually want to CRB check the young people. It is about educating those Award leaders that ...they are trying to make a positive contribution. There needs to be recognition for good Award leaders, who aren't blinkered and just doing it through their passion. It has to be someone who is prepared to work and to be all inclusive with all young people (R2).

Engagement of young people

Engaging young people with the programme, across youth justice settings, was perceived by respondents as a very challenging aspect of Aspire's work. Here, respondents acknowledged how young people's perceptions of the DofE as being "for bright middle class" (R1) or "good geeky kids" (R4), acted as a barrier to their initial engagement with the Award. Respondents talked about the importance of disabusing young offenders of these preconceptions, maintaining the imperative that the Award was inclusive for all young people. It is this imperative which, according to respondents, gave value or 'currency' to the Award in the eyes of young people:

So the currency if the award is that everybody does it. Everybody can do it, but it's value to the kids that is its currency. So we don't want to loose that currency. So we don't want to become known as the organisation that just helps kids in prison. We want to be the organisation that has a credible award structure that helps everybody (R2).

Material evidence that young offenders can achieve the Award, was also perceived by respondents as important for engagement of young people in the secure estate. In chapter three it was highlighted how those succeeding in obtaining the Award in the secure estate were perceived as role models by young people and staff delivering the Award in the secure estate. In recognising the important role of these Award holders,

the DofE were, at the time of writing, training young people, who had obtained Bronze Awards while in the secure estate, to assist in delivery of the Award within secure estate settings.

Continuity of delivery between secure estate establishments, the secure estate and YOTs and YOT's and the community, was raised as problematic, for engagement of young people, by respondents. Again this issue echoes concerns raised by staff delivering the programme in the secure estate, and young people receiving it. Whereas within the secure estate respondents noted:

...you have them as captive audiences in young offender institutions or in pupil referral units. Once they leave you lose them (R3).

To reiterate, continuity was perceived by respondents as a particularly poignant issue in the context of the secure estate:

What happens when a young person leaves? If they have already got their Award then that is fine and they have something which means they can move on in their lives, but if they are part way through or have just heard about it and weren't allowed to do it, then having that positive activity once they are outside has got to be a good thing. How do we link that up, is a challenge (R2).

As indicated in chapter five, at the time of writing, a small minority of Youth Offending Teams ran their own in-house DofE programmes. The majority, however, signposted young people to mainstream DofE groups. This, however, was perceived as ineffective, because of inadequate links between YOTs and community based DofE provision:

There are more and more YOTs who are setting up their own groups because they found that they can't integrate the Young

People in to the more mainstream groups, but most just sign post Young People on. There is no real support function there, to check that the Young Person is going along to the DofE group (R2).

While, as it was noted previously, individuals delivering the programme within criminal justice services were currently relied upon to facilitate continued receipt of the programme upon release (into YOTs or the community), it was acknowledged as the responsibility of the organisation to oversee a joined up system for delivery and receipt of the programme. Indeed, it was here that endorsement of the DofE by the Youth Justice Board (discussed earlier) was perceived as playing a potentially important role:

I think the only way we can get some continuity in terms of the YOT is by getting complete YJB endorsement....Having some kind of memorandum of understanding with the YJB that this is a programme of choice which young people should be able to continue if they have either already done it, or wish to start it, when they come out of custody (R5).

Strategies for joined-up delivery would, it was argued facilitate both “sustained communication” with young people and engender among them a “sense of common involvement” (R3). At the first phase of the strategy, the DofE planned to implement a new system within the secure estate, and subsequently at a later phase, broaden out the system to include YOTs and the community:

I would like us to be making a link to resettlement, I think once we have a module that can be replicated in the secure estate the community will be relatively easy (R2).

While continuity of delivery across the youth justice services had yet to be achieved, it was noted by one respondent that models of good practice might be developed on a regional basis. At the time of writing, for example, one DoE regional director had set up

a youth justice task force “specifically to support and develop and strengthen the YOT and prison links with local authorities” (R5).

It is to the future aspirations and plans for delivery of the DofE programme across youth justice contexts, as described by DofE central management team representatives, that the final section of the chapter now turns.

Looking to the future

Respondents talked with enthusiasm about new developments for the DofE, which involved enhancing joined up delivery of the programme within youth justice settings. For respondents, enhancing joined up delivery meant developing the capacity to collect and store information concerning young people’s participation in the DofE and using this information to assist young people to continue with the programme on moving to another secure estate institution, from the secure estate to YOTS and from YOTs to the community. Hence, one respondent noted:

It is not just about the secure estate, how we make those linkages in to the community are crucial (R1).

Moreover, it was anticipated, by respondents, that the planned electronic facilitation of this development would increase young people engagement with the programme:

We are introducing e-DofE. The aim of this is to give us up to the minute information. In order to get this up to the minute information, we need to engage people in providing that information. What we have created is a system, where young people will put their information straight into the system. They can record their activities, voice recordings, pictures and videos. They

can capture what they have done in a much more live and solid way (R2).

Participating in a system which operates online is problematic for young people in the secure estate, who are denied internet access. The DofE in collaboration with the YJB had, it was reported, identified a way of resolving this issue, by operating an internal offline network within the secure estate. The online database would only be accessible, by young people, upon release from custody:

When young people are released they can upload the information... They will have a live record and a live place in our system. They are in the Award system, and just because they did it in prison doesn't mean they are out of it. The trick for us then is to make sure they are linked to the award network when they come out of prison (R1).

A further advantage of eDofE, according to respondents, was that young offenders could be included in the wider DofE data base, rather than constituting an outsider membership group.

To reiterate, an important advantage of the programme described by those delivering the DofE in the secure estate, was its currency among all young people, irrespective of social background. In so positioning the Award, respondents perceived that it would appeal not just to the "captive audiences" within the secure estate but also upon release into YOTs and in the community. Hence, it was anticipated by respondents that the eDofE would assist the transition of young people upon release into DofE programmes in the community:

The leader within YOT's would have access to eDofE and it is about recognising that Young People will hopefully have access themselves and if not then they can gain access somehow. A

Young Person coming out of prison would need to be uploaded or attached to their local authority and the live group (R5).

DofE strategy to improve continuity of delivery and receipt of the Award also included information and training for custodial establishments. Hence, in the data extract below a respondent talks about the development of:

....a resources pack to enhance the delivery of the DofE within the secure estate. Then, regional teams can make the delivery of DofE actually happen (R5).

Educating DofE leaders in the community was also identified, by respondents, as a priority. To reiterate, it was noted by one respondent how those delivering the Award outwith criminal justice settings may harbour prejudices towards ex-young offenders. Hence respondents perceived a need to engage with Award leaders about the importance of working with young people who had been imprisoned and released back in to the community in order to support continuity of the DofE post release. To this end, the DofE planned to develop an 'Introduction to the Award' course, for Award leaders, which emphasised the importance of diversity among young participants:

If we can introduce into the Award course, where a YOT officer or probation officer comes along and says, 'I have a young person', at least they may have heard about it somewhere along the line (R2).

The imperative to ensure that young ex-offenders are given the opportunity to either continue with the DofE post release, or to start as a new entrant to the Award, had a further advantage according to respondents. That is, as willingness by Award leaders to include all young people in the Award, so the opportunity for disadvantaged young people and/or young offenders to mix with young people, whom they might not ordinarily have encountered, increases. Indeed it was acknowledged that for all young people,

irrespective of background or experience, the Award offered the opportunity to engage in a joint endeavour which cut across social background. For this reason it was argued that the DofE should strive to:

Work with youth groups and organizations to accept young offenders, and they would be able to engage with other groups of young people which they wouldn't ordinarily. That is the magic plan (R2).

In promoting these changes, respondents highlighted the importance of ensuring consistency in their communications across criminal justice settings communication and messaging. That is:

If we are to make a good go of it, you know, you need unity of purpose you need unity of aspiration (R3).

In chapters four and five, those delivering the DofE within both the secure estate and YOTs noted inconsistencies in knowledge about, and delivery of the Award. For this reason some respondents advocated a centralised system of management, information and training to replace what were described as existing "piecemeal" arrangements. To reiterate, currently the DofE is either managed through a national licence or by individual DofE regional offices. Prisons either hold independent licences, similar to the national operating licence, or they are managed by regional directors. Here, respondents reported that the system might usefully benefit from a clear standardisation, which would involve, in the words of one respondent, identifying "what structure it is that we want" (R5).

Two developments relating to the delivery of DofE, occurring at the time of writing, were described by respondents. The first of these was the secure estate institution mentoring scheme, where by:

Prisons can mentor other prisons in terms of setting up DofE, showing them s what they do with their licence (R5).

The second development was a DofE tool for the secure estate. The aim of the kit was to provide the secure estate with detailed step by step guides on how to run the DofE within different establishments, focusing upon:

The offender journey, as they all go through sentence planning, looking at where DofE fits in and any extra information that is needed (R5).

Finally, the DofE respondents talked about the aim of engaging with female prison institutions. Access to female institutions was described as problematic by respondents, and as noted previously access to female institutions for the purposes of this study was denied.

Summary

This final data chapter presented findings from interviews conducted with staff of the central management office within the DofE. Key findings from these interviews were reported under the headings: inclusiveness; branding; and, engagement. DofE staff accounts focused upon the inclusiveness of the Award, in its targeting of all young people, irrespective of social background. Because of the inclusiveness imperative, implementation of the programme in youth justice contexts was reported as observing the established aims of the Award. Notwithstanding this, targeting young offenders poses some challenges for the DofE. That is, because the programme is not traditionally associated this group of young people, presentation of the Award to funding bodies must be handled sensitively. In addition, that the Award is commonly understood to confer certain positive attributes upon recipients, renders problematic the inclusion of

some young offenders (notably those whose offences are deemed to be of high public risk).

Respondents also highlighted practical issues for implementation of the programme in the secure estate. While some of these issues related to organisation and delivery, a main focus of respondent accounts was on barriers to continuity of delivery between secure estate institutions and between the secure estate and YOTs. Related to this, a key issue for successful programme implementation, highlighted by respondents was engagement of young people with the Award across different youth justice contexts. Here respondents reported on DoF future strategy, focusing upon the way in which the Award might be integrated within the YJB wiring up of youth justice services.

The final chapter of the thesis presents a discussion of the study findings in the context of issues raised in the literature review.

Caveats to the study

This thesis is based primarily upon a small longitudinal qualitative study which included seven purposively selected secure estate establishments in England and Wales. It is important to note that the DofE programmes in all secure establishments, taking part in the study, ran alongside the prison regime of regular education and training provision within these institutions. Therefore, it must be understood that the young peoples' achievements described within this thesis are not generalisable to all young offenders in the secure estate nor did they arise solely as a function of their participation in the DofE programme.

It is also acknowledged that gaining access to secure estate institutions, for the purposes of research, and the identification of potential respondents is fraught with difficulties. Not all the institutions which were initially identified, agreed to take part, and regrettably no institutions for young females. Upon securing entry to the institutions, identification and recruitment of young people to take part in the study was outwith the researcher's control.

Additionally, because of the exigencies of life in the secure estate, where a range of factors (such as prisoner risk status, date of release and movement to other institutions), become problematic for the researcher, particularly where the research design has a longitudinal element. As described in chapter three, the proposed longitudinal study design was compromised because it was not possible, because of the above factors, to include all the young people who participated at phase one of the study, at phase two.

Despite this caveat, however, accounts of the DofE programme in this thesis, provided by secure estate staff, YOT staff, DofE staff and the young people themselves, were largely in agreement about key aspects of the programme and the accounts also

supported many strands of the literature review which identified important issues for the rehabilitation of young offenders.

It must also be noted that the imperative of maintaining institutional anonymity, made problematic the description of differences in delivery between types of establishment within the secure estate. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that differences in delivery were primary a function of the way the programme was managed and organised within different institutions, rather than a function of institutional type per se.

As a final caveat to the study, it must be noted that interviewing in a prison environment is somewhat extraordinary. The balance of power between researcher and researched, which usually resides with the researcher, is acknowledged as more unequal in the current study. Young people in the focus groups may have been predisposed to be positive in their stated perceptions about the DofE for a number of reasons. These included the likelihood that participating in the group discussion was preferable to staying on the wing, that participation in the programme is linked to good behaviour and that a member of prison staff was always present. Notwithstanding this, young people in the focus groups appeared relaxed and were candid in their opinions about issues raised in discussion.

A social leveller?

The DofE programme has been promoted as socially inclusive, being open to all young people, between the ages of 14 and 25. Moreover, the DofE organisation has expressed a clear commitment to working with disadvantaged young people (DofE 2008). Notwithstanding this, it was clear that while DofE representatives stressed that the programme was open to all young people, irrespective of demographic differences, many of those encountering the programme for the first time had preconceived ideas about the inclusiveness of the DofE. Both the young people in the focus groups and many secure estate staff had little or no prior experience of the DofE programme,

believing it to be the exclusive domain of socially advantaged children and young people. At school, the DofE was described as being the domain of the more 'academic' and/or 'posh' children, and outwith the experience of the type of young people taking part in the study. This point is important because the literature signals how other young people, who, for example, succeed in education and/or avoid offending, arguably occupy a social context far removed from the experiences and social world of respondents who participated in this research. Moreover entry to, and acceptance by, that world was largely perceived as unattainable by young people in the study, particularly in the first round of focus groups.

It is therefore important to consider the social background and experiences of young people in the secure estate, who participated in the study. The findings suggest that the backgrounds and experiences of young people who took part in the study reported here were far removed from those of young people most typically associated with DofE participation. Specifically, the young people who participated with the DofE, within the prison environment, were acknowledged by secure estate staff as emanating from the most dysfunctional, disadvantaged backgrounds and amongst the most damaged young people in society.

Drawing on the literature, it is useful here to focus on the association between social disadvantage, young offending and risk of crime. While, any detailed portraiture of the social backgrounds and prior experiences of the young people was beyond the scope of the present study, it is arguable that they lacked those resources, associated with social capital, which may act in a preventative capacity vis-à-vis-pathways to crime (Crawford 2007). Certainly, in respect of their educational and skill acquisition accomplishments, the young people may have lacked that (linking) social capital which includes associations and connections to wider networks and which has implications for access to education, training and employment opportunities (Webster 2006). That majority of young people participating in the study had no formal educational qualifications, and many had problems with literacy and numeracy, goes some way to supporting the research findings of Lewis et al. (2003), who have described the reading level of

prisoners on a par with 11 year olds. Related to this, it is also arguable that these young people were likely to have been constrained within the limitations of bonding social capital, which means that any socio economic opportunities available to them were linked to social networks limited to families and friends (Case and Haines 2009).

While unable to discuss in detail, aspects of the young people's lives, prior to incarceration, the type of social capital which they might claim to have, was unlikely to have operated as social glue fostering integration, cohesion and order. Rather, according to respondent accounts, it was likely to correspond more with what Webster et al. (2006) have termed the 'wrong' sort of social capital. That is, a type of social capital which supports and sustains deviant subcultures. It is this type of social capital, which has been associated with risk factors for crime, and which is particularly useful in understanding pathways into and out of offending (see Boeck et al. 2006 and Kemshall 2007b). Crime is not equally distributed across communities, and it is in those neighbourhoods where social capital, community integration and social order are most in decline, where it is most prevalent (Stephenson et al 2007). It is also arguable that it is in such communities where the most marginalised and socially excluded young people are found.

It has been generally understood that social exclusion may be addressed in some measure through the development of social capital, which may also assist in diminishing crime and anti social behaviour (Hancock 2006). This argument was substantiated by the findings of a study carried out by Boeck et al. (2006) which suggested whereas those with high crime lifestyles lacked the social capital necessary to make the transition to non-offending, young people with increased social capital were competent in navigating risks, managing life transitions, and taking the risks associated with leaving problematic situations. To date such understanding, however, has provided little direction for practitioners on how to build social capital or to assist young people in desisting from crime (Whyte 2004).

The DofE is one of a number of interventions targeting young offenders, which might potentially enhance their experiences and, in providing them with skills and social competencies, enable them to build social capital. However, when targeting young people in the secure estate, there are many constraints on how the programme is delivered. Here, it is important to acknowledge how the DoE is an established programme which offers a universally accepted accreditation for young people. Indeed, it is this universal accreditation, or the reputation of the DofE, which might make it most attractive to young people who not only are bereft of qualifications, but are also socially marginalised as a function of their offending behaviour. A major consideration for the DofE organisation, which recognises that its continuation is a function of the goodwill of funding bodies, is that it delivers the same product inside the secure estate as outside, while ensuring that the good reputation of the DofE is not diminished.

An important constraint on DofE delivery in the secure estate, is that not all young people accommodated therein have access to the programme. Not all secure estate establishments run the DofE, but those which do, operate strict rules of access. Central to selection to the programme is the concept of risk, of which several types of risk are relevant. First, is the risk to the reputation of the institution, if, for example, young people involved in the programme should abscond while engaged in DofE activities taking place outside of the prison premises. The literature review highlighted how the media focus more upon youth deviance rather than on their accomplishments, and also colludes in and exacerbates the 'demonisation' of young people (Scruton 2009b). Certainly the study findings indicate awareness of and concern about media interest in activities of young offenders, among secure estate staff. Second, is the (physical) risk to staff accompanying young people, for example, on the expedition element of the programme, which takes place outside of the prison, and any potential risk to the public. Third is the risk posed by young people to themselves, should they attempt to abscond during DofE activities. Fourth is the risk that young people pose to each other inside the secure estate.

At some secure estate establishments participating in the research, young people were not eligible for inclusion on the programme if they were designated as high risk prisoners and considered as a risk to themselves and/or others. The most important criteria for selection to the DofE, which is linked to risk, was eligibility for Release on Temporary License (ROTL). In the majority of cases only young people deemed eligible for ROTL, were considered for DofE participation. This was because an important element of the DofE Bronze Award is the expedition, which usually involves participation in activities outwith the prison. Over and above this, the designated level of risk associated with those ineligible for ROTL in many, but not all, cases prevents them from being selected to the DofE programme.

While some young people, not eligible for ROTL, may be selected to the programme, certain categories of prisoner are deemed problematic regarding their inclusion. This is particularly poignant in respect of sex offenders, who are deemed particularly at risk from their peers. Moreover, regulations preventing male sex offenders from working one to one with female staff logistically mitigates against their inclusion on the programme. Perhaps more significantly, and of concern to the DofE, is the risk such participants may pose to the reputation and credibility of the organisation and the Award. That is, the DofE was understood by participants, and those delivering the programme, as beneficial in conferring certain positive attributes upon those receiving the Award. Indeed, DofE recipients may be perceived, for the most part, as young people who have particular socially desirable qualities. Certainly, it was acknowledged by DofE representatives that conferring such attributes upon those convicted of sex abuse, may endanger both the public and, related to this, the standing of the organisation/Award.

Strategies for risk management employed by the secure estate establishments (including ROTL) have implications for the successful delivery of the programme, particularly in respect of DofE related activities (such as expedition and community volunteering activities) which take place outwith the institution. Securing ROTL on behalf of young people wishing to take part in external activities involves application by prison staff to the Youth Justice Board. Where the YJB grant ROTL, in respect of a

young person, then the final decision to authorise external activities lies with the prison governor. Application for ROTL is most evident in the case of the expedition section of the programme, but may also be sought on behalf of young people vis-à-vis the volunteering section of the DofE where the proposed activity may be based in the community.

That, only those who are granted ROTL are able to undertake the external expedition component of the Bronze Award, is an issue for DofE delivery in the secure estate. Some institutions taking part in the study, however, implemented the expedition within the prison walls to accommodate those young people ineligible for ROTL. The provision of a simulated expedition experience for these young people is an example of innovative practice necessary to deliver the programme within the constraints of the secure estate context. It also highlights the importance placed by staff on the provision of these types of experiences, which are perceived as outwith the norm, for young people within the secure estate.

In addition to perceived risk, other factors also affect selection of young people to take part in the DofE within the secure estate. For example, it was also evident that the DofE was not usually available to young people who were serving a sentence of less than six months. The reason given for this was that in order to secure the Bronze Award young people need to participate in the programme for at least six months. As we shall see later, completion of the DofE, or a section of it, was important to young people and hence staff were unwilling to include young people, who it was known from the outset would be unable to complete the programme during their stay at the institution. This is an interesting point because, irrespective of the length of sentence, there is little certainty that any young person in the secure estate, for a variety of reasons, may complete a discrete section of the programme. This is because young people may be moved to other institutions or may have their risk status reclassified, or issues not relating to the young people but happening as a function of wider events (such as prison disturbances) may prohibit completion. Notwithstanding this, the main point here is that the ability of the DofE to confer positive attributes is perceived by those delivering and

those receiving the DofE as dependent upon completion of the programme or an element of it. While, as will be argued, young people appeared to value the programme for its content, at the time of delivery, for the most part its perceived benefits, as will be discussed later, derived from future advantages it might bestow upon recipients.

The likelihood that young people in YOTs will complete a section of the DofE, which they started in the secure estate, depends on the ease of programme transfer across contexts. Certainly, respondents (in the secure estate, YOTs and DofE representatives) acknowledged that there is very limited communication between contexts delivering the programme both within the secure estate (between different establishments) and between the secure estate, YOTs and the community. Effecting seamless delivery within the secure estate and between the secure estate and Youth offending teams is a priority for the DofE who are currently engaged in wiring up their service so that participants can transfer between institutions and/or other contexts of delivery. This, it is envisioned, will enable more young people within the secure estate (particularly those on shorter sentences) to be considered eligible to participate in the DofE programme, in addition to increasing the chances of those transferring between institutions to complete discrete sections. Notwithstanding this, it is important to note that while the Government Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP) challenged the YJB, local authorities and their partner agencies to engage more determinedly with management of offenders (HM Government 2008), there is some way to go before seamless delivery of interventions across youth justice settings will be possible. In part this reflects the historical emphasis of government on punitive approaches to youth offending, as well as the tendency of the YJB to focus upon prevention and early intervention as opposed to rehabilitation.

To reiterate, prior perceptions about the DofE, expressed by both young people and those delivering the DofE in the secure estate, suggest that the programme is understood as in some senses privileged, in that it attracts more socially advantaged participants. Ironically, those participants who do participate in the DofE within the secure estate perceive themselves, and are perceived by those delivering the DofE, as privileged. Programme participants were keenly aware of the importance of not only

eligibility for ROTL, but also other constraints (such as length of sentence), including their own behaviour on the wing. These perceptions of privilege are linked to the constraints of secure estate institutions, and most relate to issues of risk. Hence while theoretically the DofE is open to all young people, irrespective of social background, a number of factors effectively constrain and define the participant groups.

Damage and Repair

Young people, who participated in the research, were acutely cognisant of the negative images portrayed about young offenders. As highlighted in the literature, public concern in the UK about anti-social behaviour of young people continues to increase (Liddle 1998; Muncie 2001; Margo 2008), partly as a function of the labeling of children and young people in the media (Rock 2007). Indeed, it has been argued that media focus, labeling and related deviance amplification, has had implications for 'demonization' of children and young people (Rock 2007). It is this process of demonization that Scraton (2009b) argues has led to a public negative reputation (associated with pathological malevolence) associated with children and young people. It is also important to emphasise again the role government has played in the amplification of moral panics surrounding youth deviancy, through a punitive approach to sentencing and policies which has effectively served to criminalise young people and children's behaviours. Here, it is noteworthy that despite the contention that community penalties can be more effective/desirable than custodial sentences (BBC 2001), the YJB has played a significant role in commissioning and purchasing hundreds of new custodial placements created at the beginning of this decade.

In the context of the present study, it is important to recognise the affect of such negative labels (and particularly those associated with incarceration) have on the recipients. It has been suggested that offenders may internalize these labels which in turn may lead to stable or career criminality (Roger Hopkins Burke 2005). Hence, labelling may prompt societal reaction, which in turn isolates the individual and may lead

to further deviance/offending. In other words those labelled may alter their behaviours in accordance with their new identity. Indeed as Rock (2007) suggested, the consequences of labelling affect not only how the individual regards him/herself and his/her position in the world, but also how s/he is treated by others.

That young people in the current study appeared well aware of negative labelling by others, as a function of their offending behaviour and incarceration, has been supported in previous research (see for example Wisniewska et al. 2006). Most of the young people in the study reported here were concerned about having a 'spoiled' or 'discredited' identity within society, and most particularly they were concerned about the implications of this identity for their future lives. Here they expressed fears about how stigma associated with their criminal past would affect their chances upon release, particularly in regard to employment opportunities. On the one hand they appeared to take on board their own deficiencies (linked to negative public perception of young offenders), and on the other they were concerned about the implications of these for the future (Gray 2007).

Hence, for the most part, young people in the focus groups were concerned about the implications of a spoiled identity for future employment opportunities. Here, they were cognisant of the difficulties they faced in future as a function of both having limited (if any) qualifications and the stigma associated with offending behaviour and imprisonment. Hence, they anticipated not only how prospective employers might dismiss their applications upon learning of their incarceration, but also (and linked to this) the absence of any qualification which might serve to offset their criminal pasts.

The findings from the study suggest that young people in the secure estate may seek out damage control strategies in order to repair their damaged identities, in preparation for the future. Certainly they suggest that the young people are cognisant of the barriers they face in 'making good' or reinventing themselves as responsible citizens. Before examining ways in which the DofE was identified by young people in the secure estate

as useful in terms of such 'making good' strategies, it is useful to turn to the literature on interventions, in the context of risk of crime and re-offending.

There are a wide range, of often interrelating, risk factors for crime. In adults, unemployment has been particularly associated with imprisonment, especially in the case of men (Lewis et al. 2003). Prior unemployment among prisoners has also been linked to lack of educational qualifications (SEU 2002), itself associated with past school behaviours, including truanting, absenteeism or exclusions (Liddle 1998). Other factors linked to offending include anti-social attitudes; few problem solving skills and forward planning skills; poor victim awareness; pro-criminal role models and associates; substance abuse and problematic inter-personal relationships (Graham and Bowling 1995). Many of these factors invoke a broad or holistic understanding of risk factors associated with offending, which encompasses wider social contexts which young people inhabit (Webster et al. 2006). In turn, this links back to the relationship between social exclusion, social capital and crime. This broader interpretation of risk factors (which includes protective behaviours) has, it is argued, led to a more socially inclusive perspective on offending which may potentially inform socially inclusive interventions (Case 2007:101).

Indeed, from this more holistic perspective, desistance to offending has been associated with factors which are largely the obverse of those implicated in the onset of offending. Hence, it has been argued that substance use cessation; receiving education, employment, development of personal relationships, victim awareness, thinking skills may serve to protect against the likelihood of re-offending (Graham and Bowling 1995).

The findings from the study reported here, indicate that the young people were eager to shed the stigma associated with their past behaviours (for further discussion of this issue see Rock 2007; Scraton 2009 and Muncie 2009). Moreover, the DofE was understood by many of the young people as a way of gaining new skills and experiences, equipping them for an alternative future away from a life of crime. The data

therefore suggest that the DofE was invested by young people with value, in so much as it might mend or repair these damaged identities, and facilitate their re-entry into and acceptance by mainstream society.

At this point it is useful to consider the types and skills offered by the DofE, in order to understand their potential for assisting young people to enhance the opportunities available to them, following release from custody. Here, the findings from the study suggest that the learning imparted by the programme falls into two main categories. That is, learning associated with the acquisition of specific work and/or educational skills, and learning which relates more to the acquisition of social competencies. Here, it is useful to understand DofE learning in terms of the dual concepts of 'technicality' and 'determinacy'. Technicality and determinacy are concepts originally identified by Fox (1957) and later developed by Polanyi (1958) Bucher and Strauss (1961) and Jamous and Pelouille (1970). It was Jamous and Pelouille (1970) who popularized the two concepts in their account of professional socialization. More recently, technicality and indeterminacy have been employed by Ritchie et al (2008) in their research into the implementation of community based health-promotion interventions.

According to Jamous and Pelouille (1970) 'technicality' constitutes that part of occupational work which involves documentation, and which at its extreme can be conveyed by a list of specifications graspable through memory and physical dexterity. Hence, learning which best represents 'technicality' might be associated with the acquisition of both traditional academic subjects (which involves the grasp and regurgitation of knowledge in any given subject area) and skills which are learnt and implemented in respect of any given vocational activity. In the current study, young people reported on the acquisition of both basic educational skills and vocational skills, across the different sections of the DofE. While it can be argued that acquisition of both education knowledge and vocational skills are possible through a range of standard educational and training modules offered by the secure estate, the way in which they are transmitted through the DofE, differs considerably from pedagogy associated with traditional learning styles. Before turning to styles of transmission, however, it is

important to note the DofE learning, which involves the acquisition of indeterminate, rather than technical competencies.

According to Jamous and Pellouille (1970), and in contrast to technicality, 'indeterminacy' best represents that part of occupational work which involves implied, inherent knowledge and which remains the personal property of the practitioner. Here, I would argue that the DofE focus on the acquisition and development of a range of social competencies, which approximates most closely Jamous and Pellouille's conceptualisation of indeterminate attributes. The findings of the study suggest that gaining the DofE necessitated focus group participants acquiring the skills and competencies that most other young people, and indeed most of us, take for granted. It is suggested here, that DoE programme provided a way in which these social skills might be acquired through: participation in different activities; having new experiences; developing trust; negotiating and sustaining relationships with peers and significant others in the secure estate. Indeed, it might be argued that these type of skills and competences comprise the building blocks of social capital which will be appropriate and necessary for those in the secure estate to acquire new life-styles, free from offending (Farrall 2002, 2004; McNeil 2005). Both staff and young people in the secure estate talked about increased self confidence, motivation, improved interpersonal relationships and development of trust, relating to programme participation. Certainly these findings support previous research highlighting the importance of dedicated custody based intervention programmes which increase key skills, self confidence, self worth and self motivation, and which are perceived as key to the prevention of further offending upon release from custody (Hunter and Boyce 2009).

Notwithstanding this, in order for young offenders to repair damaged identities it will be necessary for public attitudes towards young people, particularly in respect of fear of crime, to change. The public image of young people is, it has been suggested coloured by media amplification and by the responses of government and associated youth justice agencies to offending behaviour of young people and children. Here it is important that policies and practices, enshrined in, for example, the new scaled

approach to youth justice and youth rehabilitation orders, are prioritised over more traditional punitive approaches to youth justice (YJB 2009a & b).

Programme Content and delivery

That young people in the secure estate are likely to have experienced less exposure to formal education, and may indeed be resistant to structured learning, highlights the importance of knowledge transmission in relation to secure estate based interventions. Certainly the findings of the study indicated some resistance among young people to traditional pedagogies. Most of the young people in the focus groups were wary about formal education and traditional teaching and learning approaches, supporting Liddle's (1998) research findings that school experiences such as truancy and school exclusion can have a negative impact on a young person's belief in any form of education. Both secure estate staff and young people talked very positively about DofE programme content and style of transmission.

First it is noted that the context of transmission was important to young people. While, as will be discussed later, the gymnasium based context of the programme, apparent at most institutions visited did cause some problems for effective delivery, it was popular among the participants. The gymnasium appeared to reinforce an association between the programme and sport/leisure (rather than academia or skill training). This supports research carried out by the Audit Commission (2009) which linked the importance of physical activity in the prevention of offending by children and young people. Moreover, the gymnasium context appeared conducive to the development of less formal relationships with prison staff, than in other sectors of the prison.

Second, the majority of the young people who participated in study responded positively to the hands on, practical, learning style of the programme. This held even in the case of the acquisition of basic educational skills of reading and writing, leading one staff member to describe the DofE programme as a 'back door' route to schooling. Also

popular with young people, as noted above, was the physical activity element of DofE content which characterised the programme. Certainly, the findings support earlier research which has suggested that extracurricular activities such as sport and outdoor activities are valuable because offenders respond best to active and participatory programmes (McGuire and Priestley 1995).

While hand's on activities characterised the breadth of the DofE, it was the expedition element which most grabbed the attention of both participants of, and those delivering, the programme. Most young people, who had participated in an external expedition, described many of the experiences gained as new experiences to them. Activities which you or I might take for granted, such as visiting the countryside and camping overnight, were in many cases a first time experience for focus group participants.

The expedition entails learning across a broad range of subjects, involving knowledge and skill associated with different areas of study. By involving a wide range of practice based learning, the expedition can be understood as a problem (rather than disciplinary) based endeavour, which is driven by the imperative of successfully deploying wide range of knowledges and skills in order to achieve a given end. The types of knowledges and skills associated with the expedition, identified by the young people in the focus groups, included map reading and orienteering, setting up camp and preparation of food (involving planning meals and cooking over a camp fire).

Over and above these technical skills, the findings suggest that the DofE expedition is valued, both by both those delivering and those receiving the programme, for the more indeterminate aspects of learning that it imparts. For the young people in this study, these competencies associated with the expedition included, development and maintenance of good interpersonal relationships with peers and prison staff, acquisition of leadership qualities and increased self confidence/self esteem. Importantly, these skills involved in the acquisition of such competencies comprise something akin to what might be described as the glue of social capital.

Not only was the expedition element of the DofE associated by respondents with the development, and practical implementation of a wide range of skills and social competencies, for many young people it comprised a completely new type of experience. Harper (2001) has highlighted the importance of the acquisition of a wide variety of experiences, including specific cultural experiences, in enhancing young people's opportunities for change. Indeed, in the current study, these 'new experiences' were deemed by staff delivering the DofE as very important in the re-socialisation or rehabilitation of young offenders. As well as linking the expedition to the development of personal and social competencies of young people, staff talked about the expedition having a maturing affect upon participants. In terms of young people's behaviour, they specifically highlighted improved relationships between themselves and the young people, not only the gymnasium environment, and related to the DofE, but generally on the prison wing. Findings from a study by Graham and Bowling (1995), have suggested that the development of personal relationships can be linked to the likelihood desistance from further offending.

Moreover, staff suggested, that through these new experiences, afforded by the expedition, young people might anticipate that alternative futures, other than crime were accessible to them. Certainly, it appeared that for some young people in this study, the expedition component of the DofE was not only valued, for its own sake, as an 'extraordinary' experience, but became the end goal in a strategy of personal reinvention. This also supports the literature which suggests that young offenders, who intend to desist from crime, often devise plans and are optimistic they can make it work (Maruna 2000). Moreover, those who are successful in desisting from crime are usually effectively motivated by staff towards appropriate goals, behaviours and attitudes (Miller and Rollnick 2002). The DofE was perceived, by both staff and young people, as instrumental to attaining this goal because of what the certificate was understood to convey about, or confer, upon the recipient. Overall, the findings suggest that offering young disadvantaged people new experiences, using problem based learning which draws on a wide disciplinary base and facilitates development of both technical skills

and indeterminate competency, may be a potentially useful way to engage young people in rehabilitation interventions aiming to help them desist from future offending.

Making Amends

Another element of the programme which was highlighted by both staff and young people as key to the rehabilitation process were activities comprising the service/volunteering section of the DofE. Activities completed as part of this section of the DofE focused upon young people's service to others. Here, others might comprise young people's peers, older people, those with learning difficulties or anonymous recipients of charity fundraising events. The activities might form part of an organised national response (such as a Children in Need fund raising event), involve working one to one, or with a group, of community residents or involve performing a service on the prison wing. Moreover, these activities might be based in the institution or in the community.

The findings suggest that activities performed by participants within the institution on behalf of young people's peers was valued by staff and young people, in that they encouraged development of good interpersonal relationships between the young people and their peers, between the young people and staff, and fostered responsibility and trust. Moreover, young people highlighted the importance of these activities for keeping them out of trouble while in custody. As noted previously, DofE involvement was linked by staff to better behaviour of young people across the institution, and not just in the gymnasium where the programme was based. More interesting, however, was the young person's expressed enthusiasm for, and commitment to service activities which, in some capacity, served the outside world.

Generally, while these activities can be distinguished by those which took place in the prison and those in the community, young people's enthusiasm for them were irrespective of the context in which they took place. Within the prison grounds young

people described taking part in national charity events. Where these events involved, for example, cycling between two cities, young people in the secure estate cycled laps in the prison grounds, covering the same distance. Here young people appeared excited and enthused by their involvement in the wider event and talked proudly about the financial contribution to the charity which had been made by their efforts. Young people also talked about groups of people coming into the prison. A notable example is where young people with learning difficulties visited the prison where they interacted with the study participants. Here some of the focus group respondents talked about this as a new experience, describing it as both enjoyable and rewarding.

Those young people eligible for ROTL were able to carry out their service/volunteering related DofE activities in the community, for example cutting hedges and mowing lawns for older people, and, in one case, reading to a blind community resident. These activities, serving the community, were described by young people as rewarding in several ways. First they constituted activities outside the norm of daily prison life, and indeed for some provided an opportunity to go outside of 'the wire'. They were also understood, by many respondents as enjoyable and fun. In addition, they contributed to the completion of the volunteering/service section of the DofE. Most important, however, was that for some young people, the most positive aspect of these activities were that they provided them with the opportunity to give something back to the wider community, against which (in general terms) they had offended. Here, many young people talked about the importance of making good and making amends. While the young people's activities for the service/volunteering section of the DofE did not constitute reparation by assailant to victim, they were perceived as a contribution, or rather an offering, to a wronged community. In talking about the importance of 'giving back', young people highlighted the imperative of their re-acceptance by, and into, main stream society.

The types of activities which involved services to the wider community, irrespective of their context, can be understood as reflecting some of the principles underpinning the concept of restorative justice. To reiterate, restorative justice is usually understood to occur where young offenders are brought together with their victim; providing them an

opportunity to make amends for their actions, and to consider the impact of their behaviours on other people and the wider community. Restorative justice thus aims to resolve conflict and repair harm, encourages the perpetrators of harm to acknowledge the impact of their behaviours and provide them with an opportunity to make reparation. (Liebmann 2009).

It is important to note, however, that restorative justice interventions do not necessarily involve face to face interaction with victims, and it has been suggested that indirect restorative justice can be just as effective (YJB 2006c). Certainly this is very relevant for intervention work in prison based settings, including the juvenile secure estate and it has been argued that the benefits of restorative justice with young people in prison are similar as those that take place within the community (Williams 2005).

The findings of this study thus support the YJB contention that within the secure estate, restorative justice can potentially be used as a method of dealing with conflict within the prison environment and managing the behaviour of young incarcerated people (YJB 2006a). Certainly, previous research has described the successful application of restorative justice principles to the resolution of disputes between inmates and between staff and inmates (Williams 2005). The literature highlights how, within the prison environment restorative justice has been successful in tackling problems between individuals, preventing escalation to a gang or group level (RJC 2009). Indeed, one evaluation of a restorative justice project with young people reported a 19% reduction in violence since the introduction of restorative justice to the prison, with 95% of the inmates claiming to enjoy the work which they were undertaking (RJC 2009).

Williams (2005) has also made the important point that providing young people with the opportunity to engage in some sort of reparation activities may assist in the restoration of respect and dignity among prison inmates and thereby enhance the daily prison regime. The findings of the present study also suggest that on a personal level, such opportunities (particularly when involving the wider community) may have a positive

affect on self esteem, perceived self worth and general morale of young people in the secure estate.

Because service activities did not bring young offenders together with their actual victims, it cannot be understood to address the element of restorative justice which specifically focus upon victim needs (for example in relation to helping victims of crime to overcome their ordeal). However service activities may have an important function in addressing the negative public image of young people in general and young offenders in particular. To reiterate, young people in the study were very aware of stigmatisation relating to their offending behaviour, and attached importance to repairing their damaged identities. Indeed this was considered imperative to their future lives, and particularly, employment opportunities. In other words, in order to be accepted back into society, study participants were keenly aware of the importance of reparation.

Certainly, restorative justice interventions have been linked in the literature with reduced risk of re-offending. Hence, a Ministry of Justice (2008b) evaluation of three restorative justice programmes and the impact they may had on re-offending rates, indicated participants of the initiatives committed fewer offences (in terms of reconvictions) in the subsequent two years, compared to offenders who did not undertake restorative justice work (Ministry of Justice 2008b). While the study focused on the adult population only, the authors indicated implications for juvenile offenders also.

The service/volunteering element of the programme was highly valued by staff delivering the programme, and this support has been noted previously by Williams (2005), who argued despite limited resources within the secure estate there was a consistent willingness amongst staff to consider the use of restorative justice within the prison environment. Here, Williams makes an important point about organisational and logistical constraints relating to delivery of restorative justice interventions in the secure estate (including staff resources), and I will return to the issue organisational constraints more generally in the following section of the discussion.

Finally, in this section, it must be noted that the YJB (2006c) has previously expressed commitment to making restorative justice part of the sentence plans of all young people who offend. These plans involve the community and victims, entailing either direct or indirect restorative justice work (which include) participation in projects to benefit the local community. Much of this imperative has been directed towards youth offending teams, and in 2007 the YJB indicated that 86% of victims of youth crime referred to YOTs were offered the opportunity to participate in restorative processes (YJB 2007). However, since then, the level of restorative justice interventions within YOTs across England and Wales has reportedly fallen (Fox 2009). The finding of the study presented in this thesis, suggest that elements of restorative justice work can be carried out within the secure estate and may assist young offender strategies to attain re-integration, acceptance by the community and better life (and employment) opportunities. In order, therefore, for increased restorative justice to be realised within the secure estate, the rhetoric of the YJB around restorative justice must be translated into actual reality. Here, it is argued that this will not be achieved until better communication is facilitated between youth justice settings, and particularly between custody and the community.

Organisational constraints

The study findings indicate that there are wide differences in the way in which the DofE is implemented within secure estate institutions. While the study included a range of different types youth custodial establishments (including secure children home, secure training centre and young offenders institutes) within the secure estate, differences in programme implementation, related more to the model of programme organisation and delivery than to institutional differences per se. While in some of the participating establishments, the DofE was incorporated into routine prison education/training provision, in other establishments the DofE was implemented as a separate programme, run usually by a discrete section of the institution, in a dedicated time slot.

The findings of the study indicate that delivery of the DofE in secure estate establishments was perceived most effective where it was not confined wholly to one section of the institution, for example in the gymnasium (where it was usually based), but was more widely integrated across different sections of the establishment such as education and workshop based training. Where this was the case, DofE activities appeared to dovetail with other existing activities and programmes, harnessing a broader spectrum of expertise and spreading the responsibility for delivery over a wider staff group. In addition, integrated delivery across the prison meant that DofE activities need not necessarily be constrained to narrow designated time periods and could be included in the day to day routine of the institution throughout the day/week.

Where this model of integrated delivery was not apparent, responsibility for organisation and delivery of the programme fell wholly to a small number of staff. As the programme was most likely to be gymnasium based, the DofE was usually understood to be the responsibility of gymnasium staff. In most institutions DofE input did not count as mainstream work and hence was regarded as an 'add on', by staff delivering the programme, to their daily routine responsibilities. Many of the secure estate staff in the study reported working on the DofE out of hours, and on their days off, and providing unpaid input. In such cases, effective provision of the DofE in the secure estate appeared to rely overly on the goodwill and commitment of staff delivering the programme. Because staff input was often voluntary, the programme was, according to respondent accounts, sometimes understood as marginal vis-à-vis institutional work, by the wider staff group. This appeared to have negative implications for wider institutional understandings of the DofE, and also how staff delivering the programme were perceived by the wider staff group.

Integrated delivery of the programme most often signalled championship of the programme at the highest level of the institution. That is, where prison governors supported and promoted the DofE programme, the programme was more likely to involve staff members from across the institution. Certainly, where senior managerial staff supported the programme, and there was commitment to delivery from the

managers and from the staff themselves, this signalled support at the higher level. However, the findings from the study suggested that while there is significant knowledge about, and enthusiasm for the DofE in the secure estate, this is often confined to discrete pockets of individuals within the establishments and linked closely to those with hands on responsibility for delivering the programme.

Where this was the case, staff often struggled to deliver the programme, even where they provided unpaid input, outside of their routine work responsibilities. In turn, this had implications for when staff were on leave or signed off on the sick. In those institutions where delivery of the programme fell to a few staff members, located in one section of the prison, staff absence among this group impacted programme delivery. This is an important point about knowledge as a resource in the delivery of any (particularly) settings based interventions. Where staff resources are limited, and members holding the relevant knowledge and expertise leave, then this knowledge and experience is forfeited. Indeed, Ritchie et al. (2008) make this point in respect of the more 'indeterminate' knowledge which is forfeited when key people responsible for initiating and leading community intervention programmes leave. They argue, that when key knowledge is forfeited in this way then intervention programmes are likely to flounder. Conversely, where knowledge and experience crucial to the implementation of interventions is shared among a wide group, where unexpected changes occur in the composition of the group, all is not lost.

In the study reported here, when staff members delivering the DofE left, or were absent temporarily because of annual holiday or illness, the DofE programme resources were depleted. Indeed, on some occasions this meant that staff were unable to deliver the programme as planned, and the young people were prevented from completing DofE sections within the anticipated time frame. As will be noted later in the discussion, staff resources were a problem for DofE delivery across other sectors of youth justice services.

While the main focus of the study reported in this thesis was on young people's experience of the DofE in the secure estate, the research also explored some aspects of delivery in YOTs. It was deemed necessary to do this because one of the main problems encountered by DofE delivery in the secure estate is continuity across contexts. To reiterate, a key constraint upon programme delivery, highlighted by the study findings, was that the DofE imperative that young people complete a discrete section of the programme was rendered problematic in that there was little certainty that participants would not be released, or moved, or be subject to other circumstances which prevented completion. Because of this, the importance of providing seamless delivery across and without the secure estate was deemed necessary by staff delivering the programme, DofE representatives and YOT workers.

The findings indicate several issues relating to seamless delivery of the programme. First there was limited, if any, communication about the programme between secure estate institutions participating in the study, and between the secure estate and YOTS. This has important implications for young people's continuation with, and indeed completion of, the DofE. In turn this has implications for young people's engagement with the programme. Other factors relating engagement of young people with the DofE in YOTs, is that compared to the secure estate, these young people are not a 'captive audience'. Related to this, is that while the DofE is a voluntary programme, Youth Offending orders constitute statutory requirements. Where the two sets of activities are dovetailed, failure to maintain engagement has implications for young people meeting statutory requirements.

Second, the DofE was not available in most YOTS, and where there was some involvement, this was often not based in-house; rather the YOT signposted young people to community delivery. Third, where the DofE was delivered in YOTS, this varied greatly, according to whether or not the YOT had a DofE dedicated worker and the level of integration of the programme across the YOT. Fourth, for the most part, DofE in YOTs tended to focus on prevention and early offending. This is an interesting point because whereas within the secure estate the DofE necessarily targets

established offenders, in YOTs the programme can be targeted elsewhere (including prevention) according to the YOTs preferences.

Despite these limitations, many YOT representatives expressed keenness in becoming more involved with delivering the programme. The major barriers they highlighted in respect of DofE delivery were poor communication between the secure estate and YOTS, and limited staff resources to deliver the programme. YOT workers also highlighted a need for more information about, and training for, DofE implementation, and noted wide regional variations in access to DofE support.

DofE implementation is hampered by limited contact across the secure estate by staff delivering DofE, little contact between secure estate staff in general and the YOTs. Most importantly, there is a lack of systematic recording of young people's DofE participation in the programme across Criminal Justice Services, which means it is difficult for young people to easily pick up and continue with the programme in a different setting. This finding was supported by Lord Ramsbotham (2000) who expressed concern that the movement (or churn) of prisoners prevented the delivery of any structured or effective interventions. That, as the findings of this study suggest, completion of a discrete section of the DofE is very important to programme participants, addressing issues arising as a function of the movement of young people is key to optimising DofE outcomes.

Moreover, it is not just issues involving movement between secure estate establishments, and between the secure estate and YOTS that require addressing. Equally important, in the provision of seamless DofE programme delivery, is the transition of young people from criminal justice services into the community. The imperative of supporting young people through 'end to end' continuity 'through the gate' and into the community has been linked in the literature with successful reintegration following custody (see for example see Farrell and Calverley 2005 & Maguire and Raynor 2006). Such continuity post release is perceived as important for prevention of future offending behaviour (see Taylor et al. 1999 & Wood 2008).

It has been argued that integrated delivery of interventions often depends upon robust partnership working. In an evaluation of the early intervention programme 'On Track', Noaks (2008) identified key factors which could assist partnership working within a variety of settings. These included significance of the coordinator role, the stage of their appointment and provision of adequate resources and support for community based partnership groupings (See Noaks 2008). These factors are arguably among those pertinent to the successful development of the DofE within the secure estate, YOTs and the community.

All prisoners upon leaving custody have a range of needs, including accommodation and employment (Lewis et al. 2003). Previous research carried out by the DofE has suggested that young people are likely to be helped in finding and sustaining accommodation and employment by specific skills and attitudes acquired through their involvement in DofE activities (DofE 2008b; 2008c). Certainly the findings of the study reported here support the contention, in so far as young people, secure estate staff and YOT representatives described how the programme was beneficial in the acquisition of vocational skills and social competencies which were anticipated as useful for the future opportunities of young people. Moreover, young people placed particular emphasis upon how successful completion of the DofE might be perceived by others, particularly prospective employers. Here, they anticipated that if listed on a curriculum vitae, the DofE might help to offset prejudice, by evidencing subsequent achievement. Not only was it anticipated that the qualification would indicate acquisition of skills, but also that it would confer upon the applicant a range of positive personal attributes. This anticipation derived from young people's perception of the high status of the DofE and its general social acceptance. Again it must be noted that the future reintegration and social acceptance sought by young people in the study will depend in part on the social climate towards young people and, related to this, fear of crime. This, it is argued will in part reflect the way youth justice services respond to youth offending behaviour.

While it was beyond the scope of the study to make any evidenced based claims about desistance from crime, it is widely acknowledged that desisting from crime can be a lengthy process for young people, which is unlikely to be a linear and simple journey, and that relapses do occur (Burnett 2004; Raynor 2004; Vanstone 2004; Maguire and Raynor 2006). It has also been evidenced that young offenders who intend to desist, usually have a plan and are optimistic that this plan will work (Maruna 2000). Here it is argued, that in order to have a plan, young people must have a goal to work towards. Without a goal there can be no effective plan. The findings of the current study suggest that young people doing the DofE in the secure estate may, through the programme, have experiences which are new to them. Their participation in a programme which previously had been perceived as the exclusive domain of others, together with the experiences which participation affords, may, it is suggested, supply them with the perception of an accessible and alternative (to crime) future. The perceived existence of this 'future' and its accessibility via the DofE programme may provide the goal which can drive and sustain young people's desistance plans. Moreover, young people participating in the programme may be effectively motivated by staff towards appropriate goals, behaviours and attitudes (Miller and Rollnick 2002).

In conclusion, the findings of the study suggest that there are several aspects of the DofE programme that map well onto existing knowledge about re-socialisation of young offenders in the secure estate. Those aspects of the programme include the transmission of skills (educational and vocational) which comprise the more technical aspects of learning. In addition, they comprise the transmission of more indeterminate skills, associated with social and individual competencies. In combination, it is argued, this learning may be useful in acquisition of social capital necessary to encourage and support young people moving away from offending. While it is acknowledged that routine provision of education and training in the secure estate may also provide some of this (particularly in relation to skill acquisition) learning, it is the hands-on, applied and practical pedagogy, which is characteristic of DofE programmes) which appears to engage young people in the secure estate.

At the same time, it is recognised that there are considerable constraints on DofE programme delivery within the secure estate. While some of these constraints are found in a range of other types of institutions, most are more to do with the work of the specific function of the institution and are 'risk' related. It is acknowledged that any intervention implemented in the secure estate must endure these constraints and conform to institutional requirements. However, conformity to institutional requirements may be more problematic for the DofE programme than some other secure estate interventions. This is because the perceived value of the DofE derives largely from its status as a widely known and socially accepted accreditation. While this might equally apply to a range of standard qualifications (such as A levels, and vocational qualifications), the requirements of the DofE (including the expedition, and the specified time frame for completing discrete sections) are not accommodated easily within demands and conditions of the secure estate. Moreover, while those delivering the DofE within the secure estate are often highly innovative (for example, providing expedition experience within the wire) fundamental alteration of the DofE conditions is not possible because of the universal application of those conditions and requirements in other delivery settings. While implementation of most 'off the shelf' interventions requires adaptation for delivery in the secure estate, this is particularly problematic where flexibility threatens fundamental conditions of the accreditation. In other words, if the DofE in the secure estate was perceived as a different animal to the DofE delivered in other contexts, its perceived esteem in the eyes of those participating, and, related to this, its worth as a credible qualification in the eyes of significant others (including employers), would be damaged.

Related to this, the DofE presents itself as a socially inclusive programme, which is open to all young people from every walk of life. That the DofE is often associated with more advantaged socially privileged young people is an issue acknowledged by the DofE, and which they actively seek to dispel. Indeed, within the secure estate, young people come to the DofE with preconceptions that the programme is for 'posh' kids. Interestingly, however, those young people in the secure estate who take part in the DofE do not necessarily come to perceive it as more socially inclusive as a function of

their own participation. Rather they perceive themselves, along with others who take part, as privileged. Hence inclusion in the programme serves to reinforce the perception of exclusiveness among this group, rather than inclusiveness of the programme.

Finally, the study suggests that the success, or otherwise, of interventions which target re-offending among incarcerated young people must be understood in the wider context of the way in which society labels and responds to youth offending per se.

Future Research

The study has highlighted a need for future research in a number of areas. Perhaps the most obvious gap in understanding, relates the perceptions of young women taking part in the DofE programme within the secure estate. At the time of writing there were 169 females in secure accommodation in England and Wales (YJB 2009f). To reiterate, access to secure estate young women's institutions, approached in relation to the current study, was denied. Access was not granted to the secure training centre, which accommodates girls or any of the female Young Offenders Institutes (YOI) across England. Hence, an in-depth study of young women's experiences of the programme and their aspirations for the future might highlight any gender-related differences and provide useful data to contrast with the perceptions of the young men in the current study.

While the study presented here identified aspects of the DofE which are perceived as useful and beneficial by those delivering and receiving the programme, it was outwith the scope of this research to examine the impact of the programme on desistance. Hence additional research would be necessary to examine not only participant perceptions of the programme, but also what happens to these young people following their release from custody. Logistically, this might be difficult to accomplish because it is not usual for young people to be tracked following release, and indeed they may be

resistant to such a proposal. Currently young people released from custody would only be traceable if they were to reoffend and referred to YOTs or probation.

A third piece of future research, identified as important in the context of the present study, might focus upon wider societal perceptions about the DofE. To reiterate, many young people, taking part in the study reported here, anticipated that acquisition of the DofE would bode well for their future employment opportunities because of the status of the accreditation, and what it conferred upon those possessing it. In this thesis it has been argued that it is these perceptions which underpin young people's plans and their strategies to reach particular goals. However, there is currently no research evidence to substantiate the robustness of these perceptions. An interesting piece of research might therefore explore perceptions about the DofE among a sample of employers or others who are perceived as significant by those (within and outwith the secure estate) who are participating in the programme.

Appendix One

DofE Information

Level	Minimum period of participation by:	
	Direct entrants	Previous Award holders
Bronze	6 months	n/a
Silver	12 months	6 months
Gold	18 months	12 months
Sections	Aim	
Volunteering	To inspire young people to make a difference within their communities or to an individual's life and develop compassion by giving service to others.	
Physical	To inspire young people to achieve greater physical fitness and a healthy lifestyle through participation and improvement in physical act	
Skills	To inspire young people to develop practical and social skills and personal interests.	
Expedition	To inspire young people to develop initiative and a spirit of adventure and discovery, by planning, training for and completing an adventurous journey as part of a team.	
Residential (Gold Level Only)	To inspire participants through a concentrated involvement with people they don't know, who are usually from different backgrounds and bring alternative views to the challenges they will face	

Principle	How Principle is Achieved
Non-competitive	A DofE programme is a personal challenge; it is not a competition. Every participant's programme is tailor-made to reflect their own abilities and interests.
Achievable by all	A DofE Award is achievable by any young person, regardless of ability, gender, background or location.
Voluntary	Programmes may be offered within school, college, work time, custody or extra-curricular activity but young people choose to do a programme and commit their own time to undertake activities.
Personal development	The DofE is a programme of personal and social development. The value to young people is dependent on personal commitment, the learning process and the quality of the experience.
Personalised	Young people design their own programme. They start at whichever level suits their personal circumstances and they can take as long as they wish to achieve their Award.
Balanced	By undertaking activities focusing on at least four different aspects of development, young people will improve mind, body and soul.
Progressive	At each level of engagement, a DofE programme demands more time, commitment and responsibility from the participant.
Achievement focused	Participants are encouraged to set their own challenging objectives. By working to achieve them and showing levels of self-improvement they will achieve their Duke of Edinburgh's Award.
Demand of commitment	A DofE programme demands persistence and commitment. It is not completed with a short burst of enthusiasm. Participants are encouraged to continue with activities and maintain their interests even after achieving their Award.
Enjoyable	Young people and Leaders should find participation enjoyable,

	fulfilling and rewarding.
--	---------------------------

Appendix Two
Ethical Approval

January 2008

Dear Sarah

**Re: A Qualitative Study of The Duke of Edinburgh's Award and Young Offenders
in the Secure Estate**

I am writing to you in the capacity of Chair of the Glyndwr Research Ethics Committee (GRESOC). Thank you for submitting your PhD study proposal to GRESOC for ethical scrutiny. The committee has considered your proposal and is happy for you to proceed with the study as set out in the proposal.

If you wish to make any changes to your plan of work, during the course of your study, the committee must approve any amendments before you proceed further.

With best wishes

Professor Odette Parry
Chair of the Glyndwr Research Ethics Committee (GRESOC)

Information Sheet for Scheme Implementers

Research to evaluate the implementation of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award among young offenders in the secure estate

Background to the study

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award is a major international programme recognised and used by organisations working with young people throughout the world. Some 26 Young Offenders Institutions in the UK provide inmates with opportunities to undertake a range of Award activities, and it is estimated that some 200 young people in young offenders Institutions are likely to be engaged in the Award at any one time. This study has been commissioned by the Duke of Edinburgh's Award to examine the effectiveness of the Award, and ways it might be improved for the benefit of participants in the future.

What will be involved?

We are inviting young people in custody to participate in the study in a number of ways. We will be asking them to fill in a short questionnaire before and after taking part in an Award activity. We will also be holding group discussions with Award participants which focus on their experiences of taking part in the scheme. The group discussions will last up to an hour and will be tape recorded with participants' permission.

In addition to this we will also be interviewing people, like yourself, who manage and/or deliver the Award to young people in custody.

What is required of me?

On our behalf, we would like you to invite young people, who are currently doing the Award, to take part in the study (by completing the questionnaire and taking part in a group discussion). Information sheets for the young people are provided for this purpose. Participation of young people will be entirely voluntary and they may withdraw from the study at any time. Everything they tell us will be treated confidentially and we will not use their names in any of the research outputs.

We would also like you to take part in the study, by talking about your experiences of the scheme to one of our researchers. The interview will last approximately an hour and will be digitally recorded, with your permission. Your participation is voluntary and you

can withdraw from the study at any time. All information that you give us will be kept confidential and you will not be named in any of the research outputs.

What will the benefits of the study be?

For those taking part in an Award, then their participation in the study may count as one of the activities which the scheme requires them to carry out. Otherwise, taking part in the study may not benefit participants personally, but may assist in improving the scheme for the benefit of future participants.

What will we do with the findings?

The information will help the DofE improve the programme for future participants. It will also be used by the researcher (Sarah Dubberley) for her PhD on young people's experience of the DofE in custody. The study findings will be put into a report and also form the basis for some presentations and publications.

How can I get more information about the study?

You can contact the Sarah Hadley at the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, Professor Odette Parry who is leading the study or Sarah Dubberley who is the PhD researcher at the addresses below.

Information sheet for Young People

Research to explore the Duke of Edinburgh's Award within youth custody

Background to the study

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award is a major international programme recognised and used by organisations working with young people throughout the world. Some 26 Young Offenders Institutions in the UK provide inmates with opportunities to undertake a range of Award activities, and it is estimated that some 200 young people in young offenders Institutions are likely to be engaged in the Award at any one time. This study has been commissioned by the Duke of Edinburgh's Award to examine how the Award is currently delivered and it might be improved for the benefit of participants in the future.

What will be involved?

We are inviting young people in youth custody establishments, like yourself, to participate in the study in a number of ways. We will be asking them to fill in a short questionnaire before and after taking part in an Award activity. We will also be holding group discussions or individual interviews with Award participants which focus on their experiences of taking part in the scheme. In addition to this we will also be interviewing people who deliver the Award in youth custody establishments. The interviews (and the focus groups) will last about an hour and will be tape recorded with the young person's permission. Anything they say will be treated in the strictest confidence and it will not be possible to identify anyone who has taken part in the study: no names will be used. Participants may also withdraw from the study at any time.

How will the study benefit you?

If you are taking part in an Award, then your participation in the study may count as one of the activities which the scheme requires you to carry out. Otherwise your participation in the study may not benefit you personally but may assist in improving the scheme for the benefit of future participants

How will the information be used?

The information will help the DofE improve the programme for future participants. It will also be used by the researcher (Sarah Dubberley) for her PhD on young people's

experience of the DofE in custody. The study findings will be put into a report and also form the basis for some presentations and publications

How can I get more information about the study?

You can contact the Sarah Hadley at the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, Professor Odette Parry who is leading the study or Sarah Dubberley who is the PhD researcher at the addresses below.

Contact addresses

Interview Consent Form for Staff

Research to evaluate the implementation and impact of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award among young offenders in the secure estate

Please indicate that you have understood the verbal and written information by signing after the statements below. A copy of this consent form will kept by you and the research team.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, without affecting my legal rights.

I understand that my interview with the research team will be digitally recorded only with my permission.

I understand that any personal statements I make during this interview will be kept in the strictest confidence and all quotes and references will be anonymous in any reports or publications.

I understand that the researchers will write a report for the DofE's Award, and that this might be published or presented at conferences. I also understand that information from the research will be used in a PhD study being carried out by the researcher

I have read the information above and agree to take part in the study.

Respondent name:

Respondent signature: Date:

Interviewer name:

Interviewer signature: Date:

Interview Consent Form for Young People

A study exploring the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award in youth custody

Please sign at your name at the bottom of the page in order to show that you have understood what you have been told about the study and the written information below.

I understand that I don’t have to take part in the study if I don’t want to.

I understand that even if I agree to take part in the study I can stop taking part at any time I choose.

I understand that the discussion with the research team will be digitally recorded, but only if I give my permission.

I understand that anything I say to the researchers will be kept in the strictest confidence and they will not tell anybody that I have taken part.

I understand that information collected as part of the study will be used in a report and also in a PhD thesis written by the researcher, as well as for presentations at conferences and in publications.

A copy of this consent form will kept by you and also by the research team.

I have read the information above and agree to take part in the study.

Respondent name:

Respondent signature: ***Date:***

Interviewer name:

Interviewer signature: ***Date:***

Interviews with staff delivering the Award in the secure estate – topic guide.

Introduction

- 1) What is your role within this YOI?
- 2) How long have you been working here?
- 3). What is your role within the Award scheme?
- 4) What training do you have in working with YP and the Award in particular?
- 5). How did you get involved in the Award here?
- 6). Can you describe what the Award is about?

What the Award does for young people

- 7). In your experience, what are the main benefits of the Award for young people here?
(prompt)
gives young people new skills?
changes young people / young people's lives?
benefits within and outside the YOI?
- 8). Can you give some specific examples of how the Award programme operates here?
- 9). What do you think are the main incentives for young people participating in the scheme here?

10). What do you think are the most common barriers preventing young people from participating in the Award scheme here?

11) What are the main reasons for young people leaving/not completing the scheme?

Organisational/operational matters

12). How effectively does the Award scheme work here? Could anything be done differently to improve the effectiveness of the scheme? (probe time, resources, facilities, outside links, attitudes)

13). What measures have been taken to widen participation in the Award scheme here? For example publicity, information etc, what more could be done?

14). How effectively does the scheme/staff here link with the wider the Award in the community [projects board/staff/regional organizers/deliverers – as appropriate]?

15). In the direction / development of the scheme here are there any areas in which you might want to have more of a say?

16). To what extent, if at all, do young people themselves have a say in the development of the Award scheme here? (examples? what more could be done?)

17). In what ways if any do you work with other local/regional the Award projects? (examples?)

18). How is the scheme evaluated here?

What the Award has done for you

19) Please describe some of the benefits and drawbacks you have experienced from working with the Award scheme.

20). Is there any additional training and support you think would be useful, to support your work within the Award scheme?

Overall reflections

21). In your experience here, what have been the main achievements of the Award scheme?

22). In your experience here, what aspects of the scheme have worked least well, if any?

23). Are there any ways in which the Award scheme could be improved? (to meet young people's needs? to support your work?)

Focus groups with DofE's Award participants – Topic guide

Background:

How would you describe what the DofE's Award is about?

Before coming here did you have any previous experience of DofE?

Before getting involved in DofE, what did you think it would be like? (What sort of reputation did DofE have? What had you heard about it from friends/relatives?)

How did you first get involved in DofE? What information about it did you receive?

Why did you decide to get involved (were any incentives offered)?

The Award so far:

How long have you been doing the Award?

How much time a week do you spend doing it?

What stages have you completed (or tried) and what stage of the Award are you doing now?

What activities does this involve?

So far, what has been the best activity you have done as part of DofE? (Why?)

So far, what has been the least enjoyable activity you have done as part of DofE? (Why?)

Will you go on to the next stage (if not, why not)?

Will you continue being involved with the Award after you leave here?

Experiences of the Award:

From your experiences, what are the main benefits of DofE for young people?

In terms of your own experiences, can you give some specific examples of how the DofE programme has benefited you: (prompts)

Has given you new skills?

Has given you the chance to do things you would never have done before?

Has given you new interests?

Has changed the way you feel about yourself?

Has changed the way you think about things?

Delivery of the Award:

What other activities (including education) do you do here apart from the Award?

What's it like to do the Award here?

Who leads it? And how well is it delivered?

What kind of support do you get to do the Award?

What facilities do you have for doing the Award?

Is there anything that could be done to improve DofE here and make it a better experience [i.e. at this particular delivery organisation]? (What changes should be made?)

(Roughly) how many young people take part in DofE here [i.e. at this particular delivery organisation]?

What are the most common reasons for young people not getting involved in DofE? (What more could be done to encourage them?)

(Roughly) how many young people (if any) go on to complete the Bronze Award or higher here? What are the main reasons for young people leaving/not completing the scheme? (What more could be done to encourage them to persevere?)

Interviews with Duke of Edinburgh's Award staff – Topic Guide

Job title & training/background

Have you completed the Award?

What is your role within the Award generally (and specific to young offenders)

What measures have been taken to widen participation in the Award scheme here? For example publicity, information etc, what more could be done?

What is your relationship with YOT & the Secure Estate?

What provision is made for delivery of Award to Young Offenders both within YOT and the Secure Estate?

What support do you offer to those delivering programmes in prison and Yot eg staff, money, training etc

What are the main benefits of the Award to Young Offenders (does this differ from other young people)?

What do you think are the most common barriers preventing young offenders from participating in the Award?

How effectively does the Award scheme work with young offenders? Could anything be done differently to improve the effectiveness of the scheme? (probe time, resources, facilities, outside links, attitudes)

How effectively do the secure scheme/staff link with the wider Award in the community [projects board/staff/regional organizers/deliverers – as appropriate]?

Are there any issues arising in the transition from secure estate to the community?

In your experience, what have been the main achievements of the Award scheme?

In your experience here, what aspects of the scheme have worked least well, if any?

Are there any ways in which the Award scheme could be improved? (to meet young people's needs? to support your work?) Any changes/improvements you would make for future?

Letter to YOTs across England and Wales

Dear YOT Manager

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award have commissioned Glyndŵr University Wrexham, and Cardiff University to carry out research on the implementation and impact of the DofE among young people in the secure estate. This research includes a PhD study which is being carried out by the researcher. The research involves focus groups with young people in custody at a sample of different types of secure establishments in England and Wales which are delivering the DofE. At the current time, 51 Secure Units are delivering the DofE to young people. The study also involves interviews with staff who deliver the DofE at the institutions visited.

While the main focus of the research is on young people in prison, the research will also examine what happens after young people are released, and whether or not, and to what extent, they continue to engage with their DofE programme. At present, 67 Youth Offending Teams across England and Wales are actively running the DofE with young people.

In order to find out the experiences of those delivering the Award in YOTs the research team have developed a short, confidential, on-line questionnaire for Youth Offending Teams. The information from the questionnaires will help the Duke of Edinburgh's Award to improve the delivery of the programme within YOTs.

Each Youth Offending Team in England and Wales will be contacted by email which will give more information about the study and provide a link to the confidential on-line questionnaire. The information provided by the study will help us to know how to improve the DofE, for the benefit of young people. We look forward to your participation in this research. If you would like any further information about the study please contact Professor Odette Parry or Sarah Dubberley

Draft

Online Questionnaire – YOT & the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award

This questionnaire should be completed by the YOT manager. It should take less than 15 minutes to complete. The answers provided will be anonymised so that in any future publications or work it will not be possible to attribute any particular answers or comments to any person or the locality. Thank you for you participation.

How many YOT workers are there in your team?

Approximately how many young people are your team currently working with?

How would you describe your knowledge about the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award?

Very limited - limited - reasonable – good – very good

How would you describe the knowledge about the Award across the team?

Very limited - limited - reasonable – good – very good –don’t know

How many, (if any) YOT workers have received Award training?

Do you know how many young people in your YOT have successfully completed the Award (bronze, silver or gold) in the past 12 months?

Yes/no

If yes – how many (approx)

Do you know how many young people in your YOT are currently participating in the Award?

Yes/no

If yes – how many (approx)

Do you know how many young people in YOT had experience of the Award while in the secure estate?

Yes or no

If yes – how many (approx)

Generally, what is the gender ratio among young people in the YOT doing the Award

All male

All female

Mostly male

Mostly female

Equal number of males and females

Don't Know

Do you think the award appeals to some young people in the YOT more than others

Yes/no

If yes, what types of young people does it appeal to most

What types of young people does it appeal to least

Briefly describe how the Award is supported and delivered by your team?

Does your team have contact with those delivering the Award in the secure estate?

Yes./no

If yes what type of contact do you have and how often

In your opinion, what are the benefits/incentives for young people in the YOT doing the Award?

In your opinion, what are the barriers/drawbacks for young people in the YOT doing the Award?

How often do you have contact with Award representatives/staff?

What forms of contact do you have: (tick all that apply)

Web site/ email/ post correspondence / telephone/ in person

What type of support do you receive from the Award

Are there any changes/improvements to the Award you would like to see to enable more young people from the YOT to engage and successfully complete the Award?

Is there anything else about YOI, young people and the Award which you would like to add?

If you are happy for the researcher to telephone you to discuss further your experiences of the Award in your YOT please provide your contact details below

Your Name

Phone number

Email address

Thank you for completing this questionnaire your time and effort should help improve policy and practice

If you have any further questions please contact Sarah Dubberley on

Appendix Three

Table of respondents who participated in the research

<i>Interviews</i>	<i>Numbers of Interviews</i>
<i>Secure Estate Staff Interviews</i>	<i>N = 15</i>
<i>YOT Staff Interviews</i>	<i>N= 8</i>
<i>DofE Staff Interviews</i>	<i>N= 5</i>
<i>Total number of interviews</i>	<i>N = 28</i>

<i>Focus Groups</i>	<i>Numbers of Young People</i>
<i>Phase One</i>	<i>N=64</i>
<i>Phase Two</i>	<i>N=46</i>
<i>Total Number of focus groups participants</i>	<i>N=110</i>

<i>YOT Questionnaire Survey</i>	<i>Numbers answered</i>
<i>Completed questionnaires</i>	<i>N = 27</i>
<i>Email Response</i>	<i>N = 69</i>
<i>Total number of responses</i>	<i>N = 96</i>

Bibliography

Adams, K. (1997) 'Developmental Aspects of Adult Crime', in T.P. Thornberry (ed.) *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency: Vol. 6. Advances in Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers: 309 – 342.

Alderson, P. (1995) *Listening to Children: Children, Ethics and Social Research*. Ilford: Barnardo's.

Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2004) *Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people*. Barkingside, Barnardos.

Allen, R. (2006) *From Punishment to Problem Solving: A new approach to children in trouble*. London, Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.

<http://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/opus208/2006-punishment-to-problem-solving.pdf>

(accessed September 2009).

Allen, R. (2009) 'Reparation' in B, Goldson (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 291 – 292.

Alvesson, M. and Skoldberg, K. (2000) *Reflexive Methodology*. London, Sage Publications.

Anderson, S., Kinsey, R., Loader, I. and Smith, C. (1994) *Cautionary Tales: Young People, Crime and Policing in Edinburgh*. Aldershot, Avebury.

Andrews, D. A., Ivan Zinger., Robert D. Hoge, James Bonta, Paul Gendreau, and Francis T. Cullen (1990). 'Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Meta-Analysis'. *Criminology*, vol. 28:369-404.

Ashworth, A., Gardner, J., Morgan, R., Smith, A., Von Hirsch, A. and Wasik, M. (1998) 'Neighbouring on the Oppressive: The Government's "Anti-Social Behaviour Order" Proposals'. *Criminal Justice*, vol. 16, no. 1: 7-14.

Audit Commission. (2009) *Tired of Hanging Around*. London, Audit Commission.

Baker, K. (2007) 'Risk, Uncertainty and Public perception: Assessment of Young People Who Offend'. *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 38, no. 8: 1463 – 1480.

Barnardos (2008) *Locking up or giving up – is custody for children always the right answer?campaignbriefing*. Accessed http://www.barnardos.org.uk/locking_up_or_giving_up_final1_sept_08.pdf (30th September 2009).

Batchelor, S. and Burman, M. (2004) 'Working with Girls and Young Women' in G, Mclvor (ed) *Women who offend*. London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers: 266 – 287.

BBC (2001) 'Call to Jail Fewer Young Offenders', *BBC NEWS Online*. 23rd August 2001 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1505255.stm> (accessed March 2010).

Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders*. New York, Free Press.

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., Strauss, A. L. (1977) *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Bitel, M. and Campbell, A. (2005) *Passport to Possibilities: The Evaluation of the DofE's Award New Start Project*. The DofE and Partners in Evaluation Scotland. www.theaward.org/downloads/sco/Passport_to_Possibilities_Full_Report.pdf [accessed March 2008]

Blake Stevenson. (2001) *The Duke of Edinburgh's Award New Start Project*. Edinburgh, Blake Stevenson Ltd.

Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Boeck, T., Fleming, J. and Kemshall, H. (2006) 'The context of risk decisions: Does social capital make a difference?' *Forum: Quality Social Research*, vol. 7, no. 1, art 17. Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/55> (accessed 16th September 2009).

Boswell, G. (1995) *Violent Victims*. London, Princes Trust.

Bourdieu, P. (1973) Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction in R. Brown *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change: papers in the sociology of education (eds)*. London, Tavistock Publications Limited: 71 – 112.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Brewer, J. D. (2000) *Ethnography*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

British Sociological Association. (2002) *Statement of ethical practice for the British Sociological Association*.
<http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm> (accessed July 2008).

Brown, S. (1998) *Understanding Youth and Crime: Listening to Youth?* Buckingham, Open University.

Bucher, R. and Strauss, A. (1961) 'Professions in Process', *AGS*, Vol. 66; No. 4; 325

Burman, M. (2004) 'Breaking the Mould: Patterns of Female Offending' in G. McIvor (ed) *Women who Offend*. London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers: 38 – 65.

Burnett, R. (2004) 'To re-offend or not to re-offend? The ambivalence of convicted property offenders' in S. Maruna and R. Immarigeon (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Cullompton, UK: Willan publishing: 152-180.

Cann, J., Falshaw, L., Nugent, F. and Friendship, C. (2003) *Understanding What Works: accredited cognitive skills programmes for adult men and young offenders*. London: Home Office Research Findings 226. London: Home Office.

Case, S. (2007) 'Questioning the 'Evidence' of Risk that Underpins Evidence – led Youth Justice Interventions'. *Youth Justice: An International Journal*, Vol. 7, No 2: 91 – 106.

Case, S. and Haines, K. (2009) *Understanding Youth Offending: Risk Factor Research, Policy and Practice*. Devon, Willian Publishing.

Children's Rights Alliance for England. (2002) *Rethinking Child Imprisonment: A report on young offender institutions*. London, Children's Rights Alliance for England.

Clark, D. (2001) *Effective Regimes Measurement Research*. London, Home Office (Prison Service internal management paper – unpublished).

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of Mods and Rockers*, London, Paladin.

Cohen, S. (2002) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics (3rd Ed)*. London, Routledge.

Collins, L. (2006) 'Analysis of Longitudinal Data: The Integration of Theoretical Model, Temporal Design, and Statistical Model'. *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 57, 505 – 528.

Connolly, P. (1998) *Racism, Gender Identities and Young Children*. London, Routledge.

Cote-Arsenault, D. and Morrison – Beedy, D. (1999) 'Practical Advice for Planning and Conducting Focus Groups'. *Nursing Research*, vol. 48, Issue 5: 280-283.

Crawford, A. (2007) 'Crime Prevention and Community Safety' in M, Maguire., R. Morgan. and R, Reiner. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed), Oxford, Oxford University Press: 866 – 909.

Cross, N., Evans, J. and Minkes, J. (2003) 'Still Children First? Developments in Youth Justice in Wales'. *Youth Justice*, vol. 2, no. 3: 151 – 162.

Crotty, M. (1996) *Phenomenology and Nursing Research*. Melbourne, Australia: Churchill Livingstone.

David, M. and Sutton, C. (2004) *Social Research: The Basics*. London, Sage Publications.

Davis, J. (1998) 'Understanding the Meanings of Children: A Reflexive Process', *Children and Society*, vol. 12, no. 5: 336–348.

Denscombe, M. (2003) *The Good Research Guide*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) 'Part 2: Major Paradigms and Perspectives' in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications: 99 - 104.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998a) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. London, Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (1998b) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London, Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2005) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1997) *How we think*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.

Douglas, N. and Plugge, E. (2006) *Health Needs Assessment for Young Women in Young Offenders Institutions*. London, Youth Justice Board.

Dowling, M. (2004) 'Hermeneutics: an exploration'. *Nurse Researcher*, vol. 11, no. 4: 4 – 6.

Dowling, M. (2005) 'From Husserl to van Manen. A review of Different Phenomenological Approaches'. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, vol. 44, no.1: 131 – 124.

Draper, P. (1996) 'Nursing Research and the philosophy of hermeneutics'. *Nursing Inquiry*, vol. 3, no. 1: 45 – 52.

Earle, R. (2009) 'Referral Orders' in B, Goldson (ed) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 283 – 284.

Edwards, R. (2003) 'Introduction, social capital, families and welfare policy'. *Social Policy and Society*, vol. 2 , no. 4: 305 – 8.

Falshaw, L., Friendship, C., Travers, R. and Nugent, F. (2003) 'Searching for What Works: HM Prison Service Accredited Cognitive Skills Programme'. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, vol. 6, no. 2: 3 – 13.

Farrall, S. and Bowling, B. (1999) 'Structuration, Human Development and Desistance from Crime'. *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 39, no. 2: 253–68.

Farrall, S. (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance from Crime*. Devon, Willian Publishing.

Farrall, S. (2004) 'Social capital and offender re-integration: making probation desistance focused', in S. Maruna and R. Immarigeon (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Cullompton, Devon, Willan: 57 – 81.

Farrall, S. and Calverley, A. (2005) *Understanding Desistance from Crime: New Theoretical Directions in Resettlement and Rehabilitation*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Farrant, F. (2009) 'Resettlement' in B. Goldson (ed) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 296 - 297.

Farrington, D. (1996) *Understanding and Preventing Youth Crime*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Farrington, D.P. (1997) 'Human Development and Criminal Careers', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (2nd ed), Oxford, Clarendon Press: 511–84.

Farrington, D. (2007) 'Childhood risk factors and risk-focussed prevention', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan, and R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed), Oxford: Oxford University Press: 602 – 640.

Farrington, D.P., Ditchfield, J., Howard, P. and Jolliffe, D. (2002) *Two intensive regimes for young offenders: a follow-up evaluation*. Home Office Research Findings 163. London: Home Office.

Farrington, D.F. and West, D.J. (1993) 'Criminal, Penal and Life Histories of Chronic Offenders: Risk and Protective Factors and Early Identification'. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, vol. 3: 492-523.

Farrow, K., Kelly, G. and Wilkinson, B. (2007) *Offender in Focus: Risk, responsivity and diversity*. Bristol, The Policy Press.

Feasey, S., Williams, P. and Clarke, R. (2005) *An Evaluation of the Prison Fellowship Sycamore Tree Programme*. Sheffield Hallam University.

Feilzer, M., Appleton, C., Roberts, C. and Hoyle, C. (2002) *Cognitive Behavioural Projects in Youth Justice*. Centre for Criminological Research, University of Oxford.

Ferlander, S. (2007) 'The Importance of Different forms of Social Capital for Health'. *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 50, no. 2: 115 – 128.

Flick, U. (2002) 'Qualitative Research: State of the art'. *Social Science information*, vol. 41, no. 1: 5 – 24.

Flood-Page, C., Campbell, S., Harrington, V. and Miller, J. (2000) *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey*. Home Office Research Study 209. London: The Home Office.

Fox, C. (2009) 'Inspection of Youth Offending Teams 2003 – 2008'. *Probation Journal*, vol. 56: 286 – 288.

Fox, R. (1957) 'Training for Uncertainty' in R.K Merton., G.S Reader. and P.L Kendall. (eds) *The Student Physician*. Cambridge, Harvard University: 207 – 41.

Francis, V., Liddle, M., McAteer, L., Watts, E. and Wright, S. (2008) *Reducing Offending A Critical review of the International research Evidence*. Northern Ireland Office, Research and Statistics Services no 18. ARCS (UK).

Frude, N., Honess, T. and Maguire, M. (1998) *Crimepics II Manual*. Michael and Associates. www.crime-pics.co.uk/cpicsmanual.pdf (accessed April 2008).

Gadd, D. and Farrall, S. (2004) 'Criminal Careers Desistance and Subjectivity Interpreting Men's Narratives of Change'. *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 8, no. 2: 123 – 156.

Geertz, C. (1973) 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture' in *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gelsthorpe, L. (2005) 'Girls in the Youth Justice System', in Bateman, T and Pitts, J (ed) *The RHP Companion to Youth Justice*. Dorset, Russell House Publishing: 224 – 229.

Gelsthorpe, L. and Burney, E. (2007) *Parenting as crime control: a critique of government policy*. 7th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Bologna, European Society of Criminology.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R. (1987) 'Revivification for Rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s'. *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 4, no. 3: 349 – 407.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Glaser, B. (1999) 'The Future of Grounded Theory'. *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 9, no 6: 836 – 845.

Glaser, B. G. (1992) *Emergence vs. forcing: Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, Aldine.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1977) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine de Gruyter, New York.

Goetz, J. P. and LeCompte, M. D. (1981) 'Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction'. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, vol. 12: 51-70.

Goldson, B. (2002) 'New Punitiveness: the politics of child incarceration', in Muncie, J., Hughes, G. and McLaughlin, E. (eds) *Youth Justice: Critical readings*. London, Sage Publications: 386 – 400.

Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (2006) 'Rethinking Youth Justice: Comparative Analysis, International Human Rights and Research Evidence', *Youth Justice*, 6(2): 91-106.

Goldson, B. (2009) 'Bulger' in B, Goldson (eds) *The Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 41 – 43.

Goode, E. and Ben – Yehuda, N. (1994) *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Goodman, A. and Butler, N. (1986) *BCS70–The 1970 British Cohort Study: The sixteen year follow-up*. London, Social Statistics Research Unit, City University.

Gottfredson, M. and Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Graham, J. and Bowling, B. (1995) *Young People and Crime*. Home Office Research and Statistics Department. London, Home Office.

Gray, D. (2004) *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: Sage Publications.

Gray, D. (2009) *Doing Research in the Real World* (2nd Ed). London: Sage Publications.

Gray, P. (2007) 'Youth Justice, Social Exclusion and the Demise of Social Justice'. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 46, no. 4: 401 – 417.

Greater London Authority Research Group (GLARG). (2000) *Blocking the Fast Track from Prison to Rough Sleeping - A Report to the Rough Sleepers Unit*. London, Greater London Authority Research Group.

Guardian (2007) 'Reid defiant over prisons rows'. *Guardian online*, 26th January 2007. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jan/26/youthjustice.politics> (accessed April 2010).

Guba, E. G. (1990) *The Paradigm Dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Guba, E. G., Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) 'Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research' in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc: 105 - 117

Guba, E. G., Lincoln, Y. S. (1998) 'Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research' in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc: 195 – 220.

Hagan, J. and McCarthy, B. (1998) *Mean Streets: Youth Crime and Homelessness*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hagell, A. and Newburn, T. (1994) *Persistent Young Offenders*. London, Policy Studies Institute.

Haines, K. and Case, S. (2008) 'The Rhetoric and Reality of the 'Risk Factor Prevention Paradigm' Approach to Preventing and Reducing Youth Offending'. *Youth Justice: An International Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1: 5 – 20.

Hancock, L. (2006) 'Urban Regeneration, Young People, Crime and Criminalisation' in B, Goldson and J, Muncie (eds) *Youth Crime and Justice*, London, Sage Publications: 172 – 186.

Hansard. (2008) *House of Commons 10th June 2008*: Column 154; T2.
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm080610/debtext/80610-0003.htm#08061081000899> (accessed August 2009).

Harper, G. and Chitty, C. (2005) *The Impact of Corrections on Re-Offending a Review of What Works* (3rd Edition). London, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors291.pdf> (Accessed 5th August 2009).

Harper, R. (2001) *Social Capital: A Review of the Literature*. Social Analysis and Reporting Division, Office for National Statistics (online). Available at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/socialcapital/downloads/soccaplitreview.pdf> (accessed 16th September 2009).

Hayward, G., Stephenson, M. and Blyth, M. (2004) 'Exploring Effective Educational Interventions for Young People Who Offend' in Ros Burnett and Colin Roberts *What Works in Probation and Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 88 – 108.

Heath, S., Charles, V., Crow, G. and Wiles, R. (2004) 'Informed consent, gatekeepers and go-betweens', Paper presented to stream on 'The Ethics and Social Relations of Research', *Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology*, Amsterdam, August 2004.

Her Majesty's Government (1998) *Crime and Disorder Act 1998*. London, Office of Public Sector Information. Accessed http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/ukpga_19980037_en_1 (September 2008).

Her Majesty's Government (2008) *Youth Crime Action Plan 2008*. London, Her Majesty's Government.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2004) *Juveniles in Custody: A unique insight into the perceptions of young people held in Prison service*. London, HM Inspectorate of Prisons.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2006) *Young People in Custody 2004 – 2006: An analysis of children's experiences of prison*. London, HM Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board.

Hollin, C. (2008) 'Evaluating Offending Behaviour Programme'. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, vol. 8, no. 1: 89 – 100.

Home Office (1998) *Draft Guidance Document: Anti-Social Behaviour Orders*. London, Home Office.

Home Office (1999) *Crime and Disorder Act 1998. Anti-Social Behaviour Orders: Guidance*. London, Home Office.

Home Office (2005) *The impact of corrections on re-offending: a review of 'what works'*. Home Office Research Study 291, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, February 2005. <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors291.pdf> (accessed 9 August 2009).

Home Office (2010) *Anti-social Behaviour Orders*. London, Home Office. <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/anti-social-behaviour/penalties/anti-social-behaviour-orders/index.html> (accessed 4th January 2010).

Hopkins, B. (2009) *Just Care: Restorative Justice Approaches to Working with Children in Public Care*. London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Horner, S. D. (2000) 'Using focus group methods with middle school children'. *Research in Nursing and Health*, vol. 23, no. 6: 510-517.

Howard League for Penal Reform (1999) *Child Jails: The Case Against Secure Training Centres*. London, Howard League for Penal Reform.

Howard League for Penal Reform (2005) *Children in Custody*. London, Howard League Magazine, vol. 23, no. 4, Dec 2005.

Howard League for Penal Reform (2008) *Growing Up, Shut Up*. London, Howard League for Penal Reform.

Hughes, G. (2000) Understanding the Politics of Criminological Research in V. Jupp; P. Davies and P. Francis (eds) *Doing Criminological Research*. London, Sage Publications: 234 – 248.

Hughes, J. and W. Sharrock (1997) *The Philosophy of Social Research* (3rd ed), London and New York: Longman.

Hunter, G. and Boyce, I. (2009) 'Preparing for Employment: Prisoners' Experience of Participating in a Prison Training Programme'. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 48, no. 2: 117 – 131.

Jamieson, J., McIvor, G. and Murray, C. (1999) *Understanding Offending Among Young Offenders*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Jamous, H. and Pelouille, B. (1970) 'Professions or Self Perpetuator Systems: Changes in the French University Hospital System' in: Jackson, J. (ed) *Professions and Professionalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemshall, H. (2008) 'Risks, Rights and Justice: Understanding and Responding to Youth Risk'. *Youth Justice: An International Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1: 21 – 38.

Kemshall, H., Boeck, T. and Fleming, J. (2008) 'Social Capital and its impact on risk protection and resilience in young people' (online). Available at: http://www.pccrd.group.shef.ac.uk/reports/project_4.pdf (accessed 16th September 2009).

Kemshall, H., Marsland, L., Boeck, T. and Dunkerton, L. (2006) 'Young people, pathways and crime: Beyond risk factors'. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, vol. 39, no. 3: 354 – 70.

King, R. (2000) 'Doing Research in Prisons' in R. King and E. Wincup (ed) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 285 – 314.

Kitzinger, J. (1995) 'Introducing focus groups', *British Medical Journal*, vol. 311: 299-302.

Koch, T. (1995). 'Interpretive approaches in nursing research: The influence of Husserl and Heidegger'. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 21: 827-836.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed). Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London, Sage Publications.

Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (2001) 'Understanding Desistance from Crime', in M. Tonry (ed.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, vol. 26, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago: 1–69.

Lawrence, W., Sherman, D. C., Gottfredson, D. L., MacKenzie, J., Reuter, P. and Shawn D. Bushway. (1998) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. National Institute of Justice Research report U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/171676.pdf> (accessed 10/8/09).

Leonard, M. (2008) 'Social and Sub cultural Capital Among Teenagers in Northern Ireland. *Youth and Society*, vol. 40, no. 2: 224 – 244.

Lewis, S., Vennard, J., Maguire, M., Raynor, P., Vanstone, M., Raybould, S. and Rix, A. (2003) *The resettlement of short-term prisoners: an evaluation of seven Pathfinders*. RDS Occasional Paper 83. London: Home Office.
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/occ83pathfinders.pdf [accessed March 2008]

Liddle, M. (1998) *Wasted lives: Counting the cost of juvenile offending*. London: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) and The Prince's Trust.

Liebling, A. (2001) 'Whose Side are We on? Theory, Practice and Allegiances in Prisons Research'. *The British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 41: 472 – 484.

Liebmann, M. (2009) 'Restorative Justice' in B, Goldon (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 301 – 303.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Loeber, R. and Farrington, D. P. (1998) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. London: Sage Publications

Lofland, J. (1971) *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, California, Wadsworth.

Lofland, J., and L. H. Lofland (1984). *Analyzing social settings: A Guide to Qualitative observations and analysis*. San Francisco: Wadsworth.

Logan, C and Gaes, G (1993) Meta-analysis and the Rehabilitation of Punishment. *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 10, Issue 2: 245 – 263.

Maguire, M. and Raynor, P. (1997) 'The Revival of Throughcare: Rhetoric and Reality in Automatic Conditional Release'. *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 37, no. 1: 1-14.

Maguire, M. and Raynor, P. (2006) 'How the Resettlement of Prisoners Promotes Desistance from Crime: Or Does It?' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, vol. 6, no. 1: 17-36.

Martin, C. (2000) 'Doing Research in a Prison Setting' in V. Jupp; P. Davies and P. Francis (eds) *Doing Criminological Research*. London, Sage Publications: 215 – 233.

Margo, J. (2008) *Make Me a Criminal: Preventing youth crime*. London, IPPR.
www.ippr.org/members/download.asp?f=%2Fecomm%2Ffiles%2Fmake%5Fme%5Fa%5Fcriminal%5Fnew%2Epdf (accessed June 2008).

Martinson, R. (1974) 'What Works? Questions and answer about prison reform'. *The Public Interest*, vol. 35: 22 - 54.

Maruna, S. (1999) *Desistance and Development: The Psychosocial Process of 'Going Straight'*. The British Society of Criminology: March 2009. Selected papers from the British Criminology Conference: Selected Proceedings, vol 2.

Maruna, S. (2000) 'Desistance from Crime and Offender Rehabilitation: A tale of two research literatures'. *Offender Programs Report*, vol. 4, no. 1: 1 – 13.

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

Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (2004) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan.

Maruna, S. and Liddle, M. (2007) *Reducing Offending: A Critical review of the international research evidence*. Cambridge: ARCS Ltd.

Matza, D. (1964) *Delinquency and Drift*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Maxwell, J. (2005) *Qualitative Research Design: Interactive Approach*. London, Sage Publications.

May, T. (2001) *Social Research: issues, methods and process* (3rd ed). Buckingham, Open University Press.

Mayall, B. (2000) 'Conversations with children: working with generational issues' in: Christensen, P. and James, A. (ed.) *Research with Children: Perspectives and Practices*. London, Falmer Press: 120–135.

Mayer, C. (2008) 'Britain's Mean Streets'. *Time* in partnership with CNN, Wednesday March 26 2008. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1725547,00.html> (accessed September 2008).

McAdams, D.P. (1994) 'Can Personality Change? Levels of Stability and Growth in Personality Across the Life Span', in T.F. Heatherton and J.L. Weinberger (eds.), *Can Personality Change?* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McCormack, H. (2007) 'Morgan points finger at government over threat to board's independence', *Community Care: Online News*. Thursday 22nd March 2007. <http://www.communitycare.co.uk/Articles/2007/03/22/103866/Morgan-points-finger-at-government-over-threat-to-board39s.htm> (accessed April 2010).

McLaughlin, E., Muncie, J. And Hughes, G. (2001) 'The permanent revolution: New Labour, new public management and the modernisation of criminal justice', *Criminal Justice*, vol. 1, no.3: 301 – 18.

McGee, C. (1999) 'Researchers and gatekeepers: no common ground?' in Broad, B. (ed.), *The Politics of Social Work Research and Evaluation*, Birmingham: Venture Press: 45-58.

McGuire, J. and Priestley, P. (1995) Reviewing what works: past, present and future, in J. McGuire (ed), *What Works: Reducing Offending*. Chichester: Wiley: 3 – 34.

McGuire, J. (2000) *Cognitive Behavioural Approaches: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. London, HM Inspectorate of Probation, Home Office.

McNeill, F. (2002) *Beyond 'What Works': How and why do people stop offending?* Criminal Justice Social Work; Development Centre for Scotland. Paper 5: August 2002.

McNeill, F. (2005) 'Towards a Desistance Paradigm for Probation Practice', *Criminal Justice*, Special Issue 2005.

McNeill, F. and Batchelor, S. (2004) *Persistent Offending by Young People: Developing Practice*. Issues in Community and Criminal Justice, Monograph Number 3. London: National Association of Probation Officers.

Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mennell, S. (1974) *Sociological Theory: Uses and Unities*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Miers, D., Maguire, M., Goldie, S., Sharpe, K., Hale, C., Netten, A., Uglow, S., Doolin, K., Hallam, A., Enterkin, J. and Newburn, T. (2001) *An Exploratory Evaluation of Restorative Justice Schemes*. Home Office Crime Reduction Research Series Paper 9. www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/crrs09.pdf [accessed April 2008]

Miller, R. and Brewer, J. (2003) *The A-Z of Social Research*. London, Sage Publications.

Miller, S. I. and Fredericks, M. (1999) 'How Does Grounded Theory Explain?' *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 9, no. 4: 538-551.

Miller, W. R. and Rollnick, S. (2002) *Motivational Interviewing. Preparing People for Change* (2nd ed). New York, Guildford Press.

Millham, S. (1993) 'Speech to the Association of Chief Probation Officers AGM, March, 1993' as cited in J. Harding, 'Youth Crime: A Relational Perspective', in J. Burnside and N. Barker (Eds.), *Relational Justice*. Winchester: Waterside Press: 104 – 113.

Ministry of Justice (2008a) *Re-offending of Juveniles: Results from the 2006 Cohort*. London, Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin, September 2008.

Ministry of Justice (2008b) *Does restorative justice affect reconviction?: The fourth report from the evaluation of three schemes*. London, Ministry of Justice Research Series 10/08. June 2008. Accessed http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/docs/restorative-justice-report_06-08.pdf. (7th October 2009).

Moony, A., Stratham, J. and Storey, P. (2007) *The Health of Children and Young People in Secure Settings: Final Report to the Department of Health*. London, TCRU Institute of Education, University of London. http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/53/1/Health_children_in_secure_settings.pdf (Accessed 5th August 2009).

Morgan, R (2007) 'A New Direction' in *Safer Society: The journal of Crime Reduction and Community Safety*. No. 32, Spring, 2007, 5 – 8.

Moore, R. (2009) 'Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme' (ISSP) in B, Goldson (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 197 – 199.

Morgan, R. and Newburn, . (2007) 'Youth Justice' in M, Maguire; R, Morgan and R, Reiner (4th ed) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 1024 – 1060.

Mori (2005) *Young people and the media*. Young People Now. <http://www.ipsos-mori.com/Assets/Docs/Archive/Polls/young-people-now.pdf> (accessed august 2009).

Morrison-Beedy, D., Cote-Arsenault, D., Feinstein, N. F. (2001) 'Maximizing results with focus groups: moderator and analysis issues'. *Applied Nursing Research*, vol. 14, no. 1: 48-53.

Morrow, V. (1999) "'It's Cool, . . . 'Cos You Can't Give us Detentions and Things, Can You?!': Reflections on Researching Children', in P. Milner and B. Carolin (eds) *Time to Listen to Children*, Routledge: London: 203–15

Morrow, V. and Richards, M. (1996) 'The ethics of social research with children: an overview'. *Children and Society*, vol. 10: 90–105.

Morse J. (1991) 'Qualitative nursing research: a free for all' in Morse, J. (ed) *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*, London, Sage Publications: 126–145.

Morse, J. M. (1994) Designing Funded Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications: 220 – 235.

Morse, J. M. and Fields, P. (1996) *Nursing Research: The Application of Qualitative Approaches*. Cheltenham, Nelson Thomas Ltd.

Muncer, S., Campbell, A., Jervis, V. and Lewis, R. (2001) 'Ladettes, Social Representations and Aggression'. *Sex Roles*, vol. 44, no. 1 - 2: 33 – 44.

Muncie, J. (1999) *Youth and Crime: A Critical Introduction*. London, Sage Publication.

Muncie, J. (2001) Prison Histories: Reform, Repression and Rehabilitation, in E. McLaughlin and J. Muncie (eds.) *Controlling Crime: Crime, Order and Social Control*. London, Sage Publications: 157 – 200.

Muncie, J. (2004) *Youth and Crime (2nd ed)*. London, Sage Publications.

Muncie, J. (2009) *Youth and Crime* (3rd ed). London, Sage Publications.

Muncie, J. and Goldson, B. (2009) 'Secure Training Centres' in B, Goldson (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 319 – 320.

Muncie, J., Hughes, G. and McLaughlin, E. (2002) *Youth Justice: Critical Readings*. London, Sage Publications.

NACRO (2005) *A Handbook on Reducing Offending by Looked After Children*. London, NACRO.

NACRO (2006) 'Managing Risk in the Community in the Youth Justice System'. *Youth Crime Briefing*, June 2006, London, NACRO.

NACRO (September 2006) *Effective practice with children and young people who offend – Part 1*. London, NACRO.

Narey, M. (2007) 'Stop Demonizing Children'. *New Statesman* 19th April 2007.
<http://www.newstatesman.com/life-and-society/2007/04/demonising-children-poverty>
(accessed September 2009).

Neuman, W. (2006) *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (6th Ed). Harlow, Pearson Education.

Newburn, T (1998) 'Tackling Youth Crime and Reforming Youth Justice: The Origins and Nature of "New Labour" Policy'. *Policy Studies*, vol. 19, no. 3: 199 – 213.

Newburn, T (2007) *Criminology*. Devon: Willian Publishing

Nichols, G. and Crow, I. (2004) 'Measuring the Impact of Crime Reduction Interventions Involving Sports Activities for Young People'. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 43, no. 3: 267 – 283.

Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. (2004) *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*. London, Sage Publications.

Noaks, L. (2008) 'Holistic Approaches to Early Intervention: what works in delivering effective partnership'. *Research, Policy and Planning: The Journal of the Social Services Research Group*, vol. 26, no. 1: 3 – 14.

O'Mahony, P (2009) 'Risk Factors Prevention Paradigm and the Causes of Youth Crime: A Deceptively Useful Analysis?' *Youth Justice: An International Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2: 99 – 114.

Paley, J. (1997). 'Husserl, phenomenology and nursing'. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 26, no. 1: 193-197.

Parker, S. (2009) *Children and Young People in Custody – 2006 to 2008: An analysis of the experiences of 15 to 18 year olds in prison*. London, HM Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Accessed http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-prisons/docs/children_and_young_people-rps.pdf (30th September 2009).

Parsons, S. (2002) *Basic Skills and Crime: Findings from a study of adults born in 1958 and 1970*. BasicSkillsAgency. www.basicskills.co.uk/content/documents/?FileID=1673745706 [accessed March 2008]

Patton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd edition). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pezzin, L.E. (1995) 'Earnings Prospects, Matching Effects, and the Decision to Terminate a Criminal Career'. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, vol. 11: 29-50.

Pitts, J. (2001) *The Politics of Youth Crime: Discipline or Solidarity?* Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Polanyi, M. (1958) *Personal Knowledge*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Poole, K. and Jones, A. (1996) 'A re-examination of the experimental design for nursing research'. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 24: 108 – 114.

Porporino, F. J. and Robinson, D. (1992) *Can Educating Adult Offenders Counteract Recidivism?* Research Report, R-22, Ontario, ON, Correctional Service of Canada.

Prison Reform Trust (2009) *Bromley Briefings: Prison Fact File*. London, Prison Reform Trust. <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/uploads/documents/june2009factfile.pdf> (accessed March 2010).

Punch, S. (2002) 'Research with children: The Same or Different from Research with Adults?'. *Childhood*, vol. 9, no. 3: 321-341.

Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ramsbotham, D. (2000) 'Reflections of a Chief Inspector'. *Youth Justice*, vol. 1 no. 1: 17-27.

Raynor, P. (1998) 'Attitudes, social problems and reconviction in the STOP probation experiment'. *Howard League Journal*, vol. 37: 1-15.

Raynor, P. (2004) 'Opportunity, Motivation and Change: Some Findings from Research on Resettlement', in R. Burnett and C. Roberts (eds.) *What Works in Probation and Youth Justice*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan: 217 – 233.

Rex, S., Gelsthorpe, L., Roberts, C. and Jordan, P. (2004) *What's promising in community service: implementation of seven Pathfinder projects*. Home Office RDS Findings 231. London, Home Office.

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/r231.pdf (accessed April 2008).

Ritchie, D., Ginch, W., Parry, O., and Platt, S (2008) 'People pull the rug from under your feet': barriers to successful public health programmes. *BMC Public Health*, vol. 8: 173.

RJC (2009) *RJC Winter Forum: Restorative Justice in Prisons*. 21st January 2009, RJC. Accessed <http://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/Resources/Event%20Reports/RJC%20Report%20of%20Winter%20Forum%20-%20RJ%20in%20Prisons%20210109.pdf> (7th October 2009).

Rock, P. (2007) Untitled paper presented at a symposium to mark the retirement of Professor Stanley Cohen, LSE, London.

Roger Hopkins Burke. (2005) *An Introduction to Criminological Theory (2nd Ed)*. Devon, Willian Publishing.

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1995) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. London, Sage Publications.

Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Schlosser, J (2008) 'Issues in Interviewing Inmates: Navigating the Methodological Landmines of Prison Research'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 14, no. 8: 1500 – 1525.

Schutz, A. (1972) *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Schwandt, T. (1998) 'Constructivist, Interpretivist Approaches to Human Inquiry in Denzin, N and Lincoln', Y (Ed.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. London: Sage Publications: 221 – 259.

Scruton (2009) 'Moral Panic' in B, Goldson (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 233 – 235.

Scruton, P (2009b) 'Demonization' in B, Goldson (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 132.

Shalin, D. N (1986) 'Pragmatism and Social Interaction'. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 51, no. 1: 9 – 29.

Shape Coalition (2003) *A Vicious Circle: What the papers say about children in trouble with the law*. London, Children's Society.

Shover, N. (1993) 'The Later Stages of Ordinary Property Offender Careers'. *Social Problems*, vol. 31: 208-18.

Silverman, D. (2005) *Doing Qualitative Research (2nd Ed)*. London, Sage Publications.

Slater, D. (1997) *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Smith, C. and Wincup, E. (2000) 'Breaking in: Researching Criminal Justice Institutions for Women' in R. King and E. Wincup (ed) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 331 – 350.

Smith, R. (2003) *Youth Justice: Ideas, Policy, Practice*. Willian Publishing, London

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Prisoners*. London: (SEU) Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/upload/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_tas_kforce/publications_1997_to_2006/reducing_report.pdf [accessed March 2008]

Solomon E and Garside E (2008) *Ten years of Labour's youth justice reforms: An independent audit*. London, Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.

<http://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/youthjusticeaudit.html> (accessed April 2010).

Soothill, K. (2007) 'Changing patterns of offending over 30 years'. *Psychiatry*, vol. 6, Issue 11: 455-458

Soothill, K., Ackerley, E. and Francis, B. (2006) *Participation in crime among children and young adults: Changes over time*. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, NCRM Working Paper Series, Lancaster University.

Soothill, K., Francis, B., Ackerley, E. and Humphreys, L. (2007) *Changing Patterns of Offending Behaviour Among Young Adults*. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, NCRM Working Paper Series, Lancaster University.

Squires, P. and Stephen, D. (2005) *Rougher Justice: Anti Social Behaviour and Young People*. Devon, Willian Publishing.

Stephenson, M., Giller, H. and Brown, S. (2007) *Effective Practice in Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing.

Stevens, A., Kessler, I. and Gladstone, B. (2006) *A Review of Good Practices in Preventing Juvenile Crime in the European Union*. European Communities, report prepared for the European Commission. London: EU

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1997) *Grounded Theory in Practice (eds)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (ed), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. London, Sage Publications: 158 – 183.

Taylor, P., Crow, I., Irvine, D. and Nichols, G. (1999) *Demanding Physical Activity Programmes for Young Offenders Under Probation Supervision*. University of Sheffield. London: Home Office, Information and Publications Group.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2006). Report from United Learning Trust & Ratcliffe Hall Ltd.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2007) *Annual Review 2007: A record-breaking year*. <http://cidf7c4f6eb173691a.skydrive.live.com/self.aspx/Public/Annual%20Reviews/The%20Award%20annual%20review%202007.pdf> (accessed March 2008).

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2008) *Fact Sheets*. www.theaward.org/press/index.php?ids=1868&id=67 (accessed March 2008).

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2008b) *Policy Briefing - Youth Crime Action Plan*. London, DofE.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2008c) *Youth Crime Action Plan – Response from the Duke of Edinburgh Award*. London, DofE.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2009) *Restorative Justice: why it matters*. Windsor, The Duke of Edinburgh's Award.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2009b) *Sections: The Duke of Edinburgh's Award*. Windsor, The Duke of Edinburgh's Award. Accessed www.dofe.org (accessed 1st October 2009).

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2009c) *The Aspire Project*. Windsor, The Duke of Edinburgh's Award. Accessed <http://www.dofe.org/go/Aspire/> (October 2009).

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award (2009d) *Annual Review: Annual Statistics Collection*. Windsor, The Duke of Edinburgh's Award.

Thomas, G. and James, D. (2006) 'Reinventing grounded theory: some questions about theory, ground and discovery'. *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 32, no. 6: 767-795.

Titley, P. (1999) 'Supervision before and after release from prison' in *The Home Office, The Probation Service: Working to reduce crime and protect the public*. London, Home Office Communication Directorate.

Titcher, S., Meyer, M., Wodack, R., Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage publications.

Toch, H. (1987) 'Supplementing the Positivist Approach', in M. Gottfredson and T. Hirschi (eds.), *Positive Criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications: 138 – 153.

Trasler, G.B. (1979) 'Delinquency, Recidivism and Desistance', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 19: 314-22.

Tunnard, J., Ryan, M. and Kurtz, K. (2005). *Mapping Mental Health Interventions in the Juvenile Secure Estate*. London, Report for the Department of Health.

UK Children's Commissioners (2008) *Report to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child*. London, 11 Million, NICCY, SCCYP, Children's Commissioner for Wales.

Vanstone, M. (2004) *Supervising Offenders in the Community: A History of Probation Theory and Practice*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Van Voorhis, P., Spruance, L.M., Ritchey, P.N., Listwan, S.J. and Seabrook, R. (2004) 'The Georgia Cognitive Skills Experiment: A replication of reasoning and rehabilitation'. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, vol. 31, no. 3: 282-305.

Vennard, J. and Hedderman, C. (1998) *Effective interventions with offenders in reducing offending: an assessment of research evidence on ways of dealing with offending behaviour*. London. Home Office Research Study 187.

Webster, C., MacDonald, R. and Simpson, M. (2006) 'Predicting Criminality? Risk Factors, Neighbourhood Influence and Desistance'. *Youth Justice: An International Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1: 7 – 22.

Welsh Assembly Government (2009) *Youth Offending Team Guidance for Treatment of Offenders with Substance Misuse Problems; A Consultation Document*. Cardiff, Welsh Assembly Government.

<http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dsjlg/consultation/090505smtfyouth.pdf> (accessed 5th August 2009).

West, D. (1982) *Delinquency: Its Roots, Careers and Prospects*. London: Heinemann

White, R. and Haines, F. (2004) *Crime and Criminology* (3rd ed). Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Whyte, B. (2004) 'Effectiveness, Research and Youth Justice'. *Youth Justice*, vol. 4, no. 1: 3 – 21.

Whyte, B. (2009) 'Persistent Young Offenders' in B, Goldson (eds) *The Dictionary of Youth Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 260 - 261.

Williams, B. (2005) 'Restorative Justice and Incarcerated Young Offenders'. *Youth Justice*, vol. 4, no. 3: 191 – 203.

Wisniewska, L., Harris, L. and Oliver, C. (2006) *Respect? The voice behind the hood: young people's views on anti-social behaviour, the media and older people*. London: Youth Net and British Youth Council.

Wood, L. (2008) *Making Our Communities Safer*. Cardiff: Plaid Cymru Policy Development Unit.

Woolcock, M. (2001) 'The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes'. *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, vol. 2, no. 1: 11 – 17.

Worrall, A. (1999) 'Troubled or troublesome? Justice for Girls and Young Women' in Goldson, B (ed) *Youth Justice: Contemporary Policy and Practice*. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing: 28 – 50.

Worrall, A. (2002) 'Rendering Women Punishable: The Making of a Penal Crisis' in Carlen, P (ed) *Women and Punishment: The Struggle for Justice*. Devon, Willian Publishing: 47 – 66.

Youth Justice Board (2004) *Youth Justice – Annual Statistics 2003/4*. London, Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board (2005) *Strategy for the Secure Estate for Children and Young People: Plans for 2005/06 to 2007/08*. London, Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board (2006a) *A Summary of Research into Anti-Social Behaviour Orders Given to Young People Between January 2004 and January 2005*. London: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board (2006b) *Youth Resettlement: A framework for action*. London, Youth Justice Board. Stock Code B254.

Youth Justice Board (2006c) *Developing Restorative Justice: An Action Plan*. London, Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board (2007) *Youth Justice Board Annual Work Load Data 2006 – 2007*. London, Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board (2008) 'Youth Justice System: Custody Figures'. Available online: <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/Custody/CustodyFigures/> (accessed June 23rd 2008).

Youth Justice Board (2008a) 'News: 25,000 young lives reached through the Youth Inclusion Programme'. www.yjb.uk/en-gb/News/younglivesreachedthroughYIP (accessed Nov 2008).

Youth Justice Board (2008b) 'Wiring Up Youth Justice', www.wiringupyouthjustice.info/site/projects/connectivity [accessed Nov 2008]

Youth Justice Board (2009a) 'Youth Justice: The Scaled Approach'. London, Youth Justice Board. Accessed <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/YouthJusticeTheScaledApproach> (30th September 2009).

Youth Justice Board (2009b) *The Scaled Approach and the Youth Rehabilitation Order*. London, Youth Justice Board, Stock Code B428.

Youth Justice Board (2009c) 'What we do: Relative effectiveness within the secure estate (RESE)'. London, Youth Justice Board. <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjb/Whatwedo/Research/RESEstudy.htm> (Accessed 5th August 2009).

Youth Justice Board (2009d) 'About the YJB: Research study into young people's progress through the youth justice system'. London, Youth Justice Board. <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjb/Whatwedo/Research/JCSResearch.htm> (Accessed 5th August 2009).

Youth Justice Board (2009e) 'Youth Justice System: Secure Training Centres'. London, Youth Justice Board accessed <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/Custody/SecureTrainingCentres/> (30th September 2009)

Youth Justice Board (2009f) 'Youth Justice System: Custody Figures'. London, Youth Justice Board. Accessed <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/Custody/CustodyFigures/> (30th September 2009)

YJB (B307) *Custody*. London, Youth Justice Board, Stock Code B307.