University of Southampton

SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, SOCIAL POLICY and CRIMINOLOGY

DISCLAIMER STATEMENT

I the undersigned confirm that this dissertation is all my own work.
Reference to, quotation from and discussion of the work of any other person
has been correctly acknowledged within the work.

Signature:

Name: SHAYLA WILSON

Student Number:

 Date: 25th April 2019

University of Southampton

Faculty of Social, Human and Mathematical Sciences

Department of Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology

Should third sector organisations forge formalised partnerships with the Youth Offending Services in order to facilitate diversion?

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of

BSc (SocSci) Social Policy and Criminology

By

Shayla Wilson

Date of submission: 25th April 2019

Word count: 9,926

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to everyone who helped the completion of this project.

I would like thank my dissertation supervisor, Dr Pamela Ugwudike, for her continued support, commitment and guidance throughout the year.

I would also like to express my deepest appreciation for my friends and family who have continually and unconditionally helped me throughout my degree.

It is this incredible support network that I have to thank for completing a dissertation I am proud of.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

First Time Entrants' rates are declining, though the overrepresentation of socially excluded young people amongst the numbers remains concerning. In recent years, diversionary practices have been adopted in certain areas across England and Wales, and most schemes have proven successful in terms of reduced custody rates, inciting desistance and reforming young people's lives through a holistic approach. Moreover, third sector organisations frequently demonstrate expertise in providing wrap-around services that mitigate structural disadvantages and behavioural patterns strongly correlated to youth offending. However, the geographical variation of diversion means that (in areas where diversion is not employed) many young people's needs are being mistaken as risks to society, which in turn, can lead to criminogenic methods of punishment and/or rehabilitation. In light of this, this research aims to critically explore the potential for these third sector actors to forge formalised collaborations with Youth Offending Services in order to enable and enhance effective diversion. Using Hampshire, and specifically Southampton areas as the focal point, a locality with little-to-no diversionary schemes imposed, this study draws on an internet-based documentary analysis, comprised of numerous websites and reports. The data collected and analysed, through codes and themes, highlighted that encouraging interagency work alongside a mutual child's rights ethos were the main reasons third sector organisations could be found compatible with criminal justice actors. Conversely, Hampshire Constabulary's apprehensions that emerged, together with external financial pressures were the primary obstacles to building an inter-sector partnership that arose from analysis. Overall, findings from this study suggest that third sector organisations should forge formalised partnerships with Youth Offending Services to facilitate diversion. Thus, future research should aim to explore how these deductions can be translated in reality, via partnership and policy implementation.

1.0 Introduction

The number of young people (defined within this study as those aged between 10 and 17) entering the formal youth justice system (YJS) is declining, but those that do, are overwhelmingly affected by structural inequalities and/or experiencing other challenges such as substance misuse. Existing research and scholarly literature show that the current youth justice climate varies geographically. For example, diversion – the process of diverting 'low-risk' youth prior to charging away from formal sanctioning (Wilson and Hoge, 2012) – has only been endorsed in certain localities. Labelling theory and academics such as McAra and McVie (2007) concede that formal system contact, and the 'criminal' label that follows is in itself criminogenic. Diversion is supported here for its abilities to 'treat' offenders' needs and protect the public, while removing young people from a potentially criminalising cycle. Yates (2012) similarly reiterates that criminal behaviour cannot be addressed in isolation from other challenges young people face, which lends to a welfarist, diversionary youth justice approach.

Additionally, third sector organisations (TSO) are defined within this study as agencies that are neither governmental or 'for-profit' businesses, specifically charities (Bridge, Murtagh and O'Neill, 2009). Numerous research findings have identified TSO competences in relation to general crime prevention, and providing targeted support services which alleviate the disadvantages evidently correlated to youth crime. However, the extension of TSO into the criminal justice system (CJS) has been far slower than other institutional realms. This may be due to the cavity among research which addresses this issue. Therefore, to investigate the possibility of enriching youth diversion, this study intended to explore whether third sector actors could be subcontracted and partnered with Youth Offending Services to carryout diversionary strategies, and subsequently tackle social exclusion. Youth Offending Services (YOS) are investigated here as they are the primary benefactors of youth justice. They are the

local multi-agency teams that coordinate a variety of youth justice services, held accountable to, and overseen by, the Youth Justice Board (Briggs, 2013).

To conduct this research, a qualitative, internet-based primary document analysis was employed, generating results via the use of inductively developed codes and subsequent emerging overarching themes. This enabled the development of a theoretical and conceptual framework, from which third and public sector organisations can begin to understand how partnerships may be formed (Rees, Mullins and Bovaird, 2012a). A sampling frame was generated through purposefully selecting documents relevant to, and experts in, this research area. To create a contextually comprehensive set of findings, Hampshire, specifically Southampton was focused on. A number of Southampton-based charities, as well as the police force and YOS websites and reports were amongst the sample. Additionally, documents on the Swansea Bureau and the Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme were used as comparative examples where diversion has been successfully enforced using a multi-agency strategy, in Hull this includes third sector partners.

Once the exploratory sample was produced, a thematic analysis was conducted whereby each document was thoroughly coded, organised within a codebook and then categorised according to the emergent themes, e.g. 'promoting interagency work' (see Appendix 7). These stages of analysis assisted in the following interpretation phase of this project. Within this stage of the research, the similarities, differences, and underlying discourses exposed through the coding process were systematically reviewed in relation to pre-existing empirical and theoretical knowledge. The key findings resulting from this procedure include: all documents are united by their joint appreciation for the benefits of interagency work. Accompanied by the generally-shared child's rights and community safety ethos, these were the major discoveries that suggested partnership among criminal justice and third sector agencies is plausible. On the other hand, the principal findings that inferred potential

resistance to the forging of a collaborative scheme, included the preoccupation with risk over need, the Hampshire Constabulary's institutional resistance to welfarism, as well as the inaccessibility of resources, and insufficient funds available to activate the partnership.

Vital to these findings was the data derived from the Swansea and Hull's programmes, because they served as examples of how a clash of ethos or goals can be resolved to produce an efficacious diversion scheme. In conjunction, the rigorous process of sampling and thematic analysis, combined with the interpretations facilitated by previous research, this study concludes that the benefits of diversion could be better extended by incorporating TSO into the youth justice process. Therefore, within the area of observation, one can suggest that these third sector actors should forge formalised partnerships with the respective YOS to enable this welfarist approach to youth offending.

2.0 Literature Review

This chapter critically engages with current theoretical and empirical findings regarding a number of youth justice processes, the agencies responsible for delivering them, as well as the underpinning policies. In turn, this section concludes by acknowledging a gap in the literature concerning multi-agency working between third sector organisations and Youth Offending Services in the delivery of diversion, which this dissertation intends to address.

2.1 The problem of First Time Entrants

First Time Entrants (FTE) are defined as "young people living in England and Wales aged between 10 and 17 years old who received their first reprimand, final warning, caution or conviction for a recordable offence" (Sutherland et al., 2017:1). In 2006/07 FTE peaked at 110, 784, and since then, numbers have fallen year-on-year (Sutherland et al., 2017). Scholars attribute the fluctuating statistics to parallel policing policies and practices that have predominantly represented either a welfare or justice rhetoric (Hazel, 2008). The former discourse regards children as influenced by/a product of their environment, and therefore must be treated rather than punished for their crimes (Adler and Wundersitz, 1994). By contrast, the justice discourse holds the young person fully accountable for their actions, and the role of the system is thus to determine the extent of their culpability (Adler and Wundersitz, 1994). Hitherto, the youth justice political climate has never wholly been informed by either welfare or justice models, due to the changing governments alongside their ideological assumptions surrounding young- and first-time offenders.

While FTE numbers are declining, conviction rates are increasing: from 2008-2018 FTE receiving a court conviction increased by 34% (Youth Justice Board, 2019). This is of particular interest to scholars who have shown that formal involvement in the CJS is a catalyst for future offending due to the social consequences of conviction, such as issues of

re-integrating into the community, attaining employment, and enduring the stigma that comes with being labelled as criminal (McAra and McVie, 2007; Martin and Webster, 1971; Weaver, 2011). Differential association lends support to this argument, theorizing that deviant conduct can be learned like any other behaviour through association with other criminal individuals/groups. So, juvenile detention centres or custody can act as 'schools of crime' that serve to inhibit from desistance (Patrick and Marsh, 2005). In fact, Davies, Croall and Tyrer (2015) highlight that recidivist rates for FTE leaving youth detention centres have been as high as 80%. In conjunction, this research explains a key issue for politicians, that is, ensuring that FTE do not become enmeshed in a criminal cycle, and offender needs are addressed, while simultaneously protecting the rights and interests of wider society (McAra and McVie, 2007).

2.2 Youth crime and social exclusion

Statistics can create the illusion that youth crime is an abnormal phenomenon, however, evidence suggests that the majority of youth crime are non-serious, summary offences, relatively characteristic of adolescent behaviour (Kelly and Armitage, 2015; Goldson, 2001). While Bateman (2017) notes the natural process of maturation means that many young criminals do not reoffend, others have shown that the persistent 'career criminals' are disproportionately affected by socio-economic disadvantage (Gelsthorpe and Morris, 2002). Social exclusion is a term that scholars use in association with people who become disconnected from other individuals, families, communities, or wider society for numerous reasons (Pierson, 2010). In McAlister's (2008) ethnographic study on young people in socially deprived areas, she identifies that youth face an unequal vulnerability to risk factors aligned with social exclusion – such as poor school performance, deficits in cognitive skills, living in low-income or 'disrupted' families – that limit their ability to integrate into society, and subsequently can lead them to delinquent behaviour. Other studies have recognised the

importance of creating opportunities for socio-economically deprived adolescents for fostering inclusion and integration (Gray, 2005). Experiences of social exclusion is significantly, but not causally, linked to youth crime. For example, the Social Exclusion Unit (2001) states that relative to 2% of the general population, 26% of prisoners have been in care as a child. Additionally, an analysis of YOS assessments, cited in Bateman (2017), demonstrates that between 2014-2016, 61% of children on admission were not engaged in education, a third had mental health problems and 45% suffered issues with substance misuse; illustrating the persistence and severity of the links between social exclusion and youth offending. To address the ties to social adversity, McAra and McVie's (2010) review of 10 years of fieldwork data, concluded that approaches to youth justice must acknowledge the most troublesome juveniles require the most support.

2.3. Youth crime and policy

Prevailing penal rationales are solely dependent upon the government in power at any given time. In the 1960's the Labour Party promoted their commitment to a welfarist YJS through policies such as the Children and Young Persons Act 1969, that reduced powers of juvenile courts, and favoured means of care and protection over formal sanctioning (Gelsthorpe and Morris, 2002). Since then, this penal welfarism has been systematically dismantled by neo-liberal ideologies (Muncie, 2006). Proceeding Conservative governments adopted responsibilisation initiatives emphasising 'governing at a distance', requiring active citizens to self-regulate, to reduce financial strains on the justice system (Kemshall, 2008). For example, the Criminal Justice Act 1982 made parents of young offenders liable to pay their fines for noncompliance of community sentences (Muncie, 1999).

Neo-liberalism was subsequently embraced by 'New Labour' following their re-election in 1997 in the form of managerialist techniques of target-setting and cost-efficiency, legitimised

as 'evidence based' (Muncie, 2006). This underscored the birth of a new penology of actuarialist crime management approaches that engaged with quantitatively identifying risk (Briggs, 2013). Driven by the 1996 Audit Commission that expressed the need for a more cost-effective and efficient YJS, ASSET (since re-modelled as Asset Plus) was among the first youth risk assessment tools that operated in a standardised manner to statistically determine the likelihood of reoffending, i.e. the risk they pose (Paylor, 2011). The risks included within the assessment were said to be justified by verifiable evidence. Though, in qualitative interviews with youth justice personnel, Briggs (2013), discovers practitioner resistance to use risk scales (0-4) when trying to accurately assess risk, as many believed risk was more multidimensional. Others have also critiqued the research used to inform 'evidence-based' policies and practices for frequently being partial or obscured for political convenience (Case and Haines, 2006). Building on this, Smith (2013) suggests that the evidence-base should be built from the bottom up, rather than being selected to advance political agendas.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was a crucial turning point in youth justice. The continued decentralisation of youth justice was seen through the introduction of Youth Justice Boards (YJB) (to monitor the operation of the YJS), and Youth Offending Services (YOS) (local multi-agency teams that coordinate provision overseen by the YJB) (Briggs, 2013). Also underscored by the 1996 Audit Commission, these teams became regulated by national standards and targets of the risk factor prevention paradigm (Paylor, 2011). The elevation of risk discourses also reflects the abolition of the 'doli incapax', making children as young as 10 entirely accountable for their crimes in an effort to prevent further transgression via early intervention (Goldson, 2001). Around the same time, restorative justice began to gain credibility in attempts to mediate youth offending habits by making delinquents "face up to the consequences of their actions" (Muncie, 2006:6). These methods advocate rehabilitation

that focuses on individual attitudes/behaviour through reconciliation with victims and accepting blame (McAlister and Carr, 2014). These interventions however, have been criticised for oversimplifying the offender victim dichotomy – data from qualitative interviews on the Youth Conference Service (introduced by The Justice (Northern Ireland) Act 2002) discovered that many young people involved were unable to recall the incident, e.g. because of substance misuse, and felt coerced into accepting culpability for an act that could not have been prevented given the circumstances (McAlister and Carr, 2014). Combining the results from the above qualitative research, it becomes apparent that the underlying causes of crime need to be more comprehensively integrated into youth justice strategies.

2.3.1 Moving towards a welfare model?

In 2008 the Youth Crime Action Plan explicitly set targets to reduce FTE and provided funding for diversionary practice (Bateman, 2017). Diversion is the process whereby lower-risk youth, pre-charge, are diverted from the formal justice system at the first point of contact, acknowledging them as children first, and offenders second (Wilson and Hoge, 2012; Hazel, 2008). Labelling theory forms its theoretical foundation, emphasising that after being labelled as criminal, the individual comes to internalise this deviant identity and act accordingly i.e. criminally, referred to as 'secondary deviance' (Evans, 2008; Newburn, 2017). This is echoed in McAra and McVie's (2007) assertion that system contact is criminogenic. So, in contrast to restorative interventions, diversion operates under the premise that young- and first-time offenders should be provided with opportunities to engage in programmes that alleviate the structural, socio-economic conditions that impact upon their behaviour, rather than using punitive blame-placing practices (Evans, 2008). As a cost-effective method for reducing prison populations, while maintaining public safety, academics are cautious that the Youth Crime Action Plan that promoted this welfarist-turn coincided with the economic crisis of

2008, and question whether (if and when the economy recovers) there will be a re-emergence of interventionist methods (Porter, 2011; Morgan and Newburn, 2012; Smith, 2014). Therefore, it is important that research is conducted to investigate whether diversion is in fact the more effective method for reducing FTE.

2.4 Current research on diversion

There is a wide range of research into different diversion programmes that have been implemented across the UK. Although, the devolution of youth justice into the hands of local actors has subsequently led to a "justice by geography" situation, whereby children are experiencing variations in practice across localities (Muncie, 2010:53; McAra, 2017).

The Hull Youth Justice Service (2010) is one of the diversion schemes to have developed in response to the Youth Crime Action Plan. Where children meet certain criteria (e.g. admit to low level offence, show some remorse, no previous conviction) they are offered voluntary participation in 'Challenge and Support'. This element is carried out by community-based teams who provide the children with access to a range of services that encourage positive behaviour. Reports from 2009-2010 show that of the 390 referred to Challenge and Support, 289 successfully completed it, only 9% of those later reoffended, and compared to the national reduction of FTEs (24%), the Hull diversion scheme was more effective (48.7%).

Haines et al. (2013) looks at the Swansea Bureau, a Welsh model of diversion, that uses a formal inter-agency approach to tackle the underlying causes of youth crime through a child-oriented approach. To explore the changes in decision-making upon FTE statistics and the impact they have for recidivism, Haines et al. triangulated secondary statistical data analysis of the changes and impacts on FTEs, with semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders in the Bureau process to analyse the perceived impact the model had. Secondary data analysis showed that since the Bureau's inception, the number of non-criminal disposals has increased

(demonstrating changes to local decision-making) from 110 in 2009/10 to 152 in 2011/12. In the year 2011/12 FTE notably decreased too, implying that the Bureau is effectively reducing levels of youth offending and not just delaying YJS entry. Statistical analysis also showed that between the years 2009-2011, reconviction (post-Bureau) rates for non-criminal disposals were considerably lower than other disposals. However, quantitative data is limited to the outcomes of such processes. Consequently, data can become blind to the processes producing these results. So, by using semi-structured interviews too, the researchers were able to explore why the Bureau was so successful. For example, a YOS Officer involved in implementing aspects of the Bureau said that one of the main reasons it was effective was because it allowed the children to have their say in constructing their 'treatment' to yield the best possible results. This type of in-depth data is not available in numerical information; though it can inform future diversion programmes of the effectiveness of such a model, it cannot explain why this is. Therefore, further research should be able to acknowledge the limitations of adopting a quantitative, outcome-based approach to generate more comprehensive results as done here.

Other studies have looked more broadly at various diversion programmes, pre- and post-charge, developed across numerous jurisdictions. Wilson and Hoge (2012) conducted a meta-analysis (aggregated study results to increase quantitative power) to examine the effectiveness of 73 diversion programmes on recidivism. Re-offending rates ranged from 2% to 81%, though, statistically their analysis showed that diverted youth were less likely to recidivate than those formally processed. Their analysis cautioned that in study's with greater design quality, diversion appeared to be no more effective than traditional youth justice measures regarding recidivism. Although, the authors note that the limited information on the original studies withheld them from adequately assessing programme treatment – a recurring

problem of meta-analyses where researchers find the initial data is only partly complete which can affect the validity of their results (Nobel, Jr, 2006).

Comparatively, Kelly and Armitage (2015) employ qualitative interviews with 71 youth justice practitioners, alongside documentary research to explore diversionary initiatives across two locations in England. Their data highlighted a continued influence of neo-liberal reforms among managers and other personnel's perceptions of diversion, believing it could never truly work without coercive conditions, despite advocating pre-court intervention for young people and their families. The qualitative approaches proved advantageous for unpicking social problems, and explaining why diversion has not been universally implemented, compared to Wilson and Hoge's (2012) quantitative data. Furthermore, by focusing on the processes of diversion, these authors discovered obstacles to creating a welfarist YJS, particularly the embedded scepticism of youth justice professionals. The scholars claim that the outcomes of diversion will depend on the specific practices used, the wider support services outside the YJS and connections between them. Future research then, should aim to explore alternative diversionary methods that mitigate the hurdles found here.

2.5 The third sector and crime prevention

Diversion has also taken the form of situational and social crime prevention techniques that are often adopted by TSO (Evans, 2008). The 'third sector' is a label given to organisations that are neither governmental or 'for-profit' businesses i.e. charities (Bridge, Murtagh and O'Neill, 2009). Only a small portion of TSO are oriented towards youth crime-related work, yet they often encounter young people who have been/are engaged in the YJS, because of the specialist, innovative care provision for conditions/needs that are intimately linked to criminal tendencies (Maguire, 2016). Moreover, these organisations roots in a local area is cited in Martin et al. (2016) as their distinctive method of forming mutually-trusting

relationships between service users and communities. In line with this (though potentially motivated by alternative reasons), the 2010-elected Coalition government continued to path the way for a 'mixed economy' of criminal justice by opening up youth justice provision to private and voluntary sectors on a 'payment by results' basis (Yates, 2012; Cox, 2010). Despite this, little research has been conducted on the realities of integrating the third sector into the CJS (Brandsen and Pestoff, 2006).

The lack of primary research may be due to the demanding nature of third sector work. Investigating the benefits of the third sector, Flanagan and Hancock (2010) conducted qualitative interviews with spokespeople from 8 non-governmental organisations, uniquely positioned to reach, and provide care for, socially excluded individuals/groups. They purposefully sampled team leaders, inviting 30 organisations to participate. Though, due to time constraints many were unable to partake, and consequently their sample size was small. Regardless, the use of a topic guide in the semi-structured interviews prompted more in-depth responses surrounding issues and facilitators in service provision. The most commonly referenced facilitator for engaging recipients was the manner in which they were treated; volunteers and employees aim to encourage clients by placing their views (and needs) at the forefront of service provision, rather than using coercive measures to entice them. Data collected based on the processes and available resources, led to the conclusion that the flexibility of service delivery is paramount to TSO. Nevertheless, authors grant that geographic variations cannot be accounted for in this study. Importantly, Haines at al. (2012) claims that the key to creating a fruitful youth justice scheme is its aptitude to align itself within the local circumstances. In future, analysing the work of TSO should be contextualised to more accurately inform knowledge bases.

Meek, Gojkovik and Mills (2013) collected qualitative interview data from offenders investigating their reasonings for partnering with TSO. Participants quoted staff resistance as

a common barrier to appropriate referrals, due to inaccessibility and the added workload, rather than disbelief in the programmes. The interpretative standpoint on data led the scholars to infer that greater cooperation between formal and informal sectors could serve to reduce criminal conduct, and that more research is essential to understand the best methods for doing so.

Alternatively, Weaver (2011) suggests that the potential for TSO to integrate into, and co-produce, criminal justice services is thwarted not by inaccessibility, but by numerous socioeconomic conditions. Weaver theorizes that the communities most disadvantaged and affected by crime (and therefore the communities who would stand to benefit most), may be the least capable of mobilising resources to foster positive outcomes. Thus, effective collaboration with formal criminal justice actors would require a transference, and reciprocity, of power to equip the third sector for its expansion into CJS strategies.

2.6 A gap in the literature

The wide range of literature addressed has illustrated the multiple, interacting conditions that affect individuals/groups of young people, and make them more susceptible to criminal behaviour. Acknowledging that the socially excluded adolescents make up a significant portion of FTE, points to the need for a YJS that addresses offending in relation to socioeconomic context. Furthermore, research suggests that diversionary policies and practices could be utilised more widely to reduce both FTEs and recidivism. Currently, the majority of available data focuses on the outcomes of welfarist programmes, rather than the processes, which limits academic understanding of the extent to which diversion has resulted in positive results for youth offenders and wider society. Many diversion schemes adopt a multi-agency approach to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of programme provision. Furthermore, TSO have been identified as theoretically advantageous in youth crime

prevention strategies due to their specialism in areas that are often linked to delinquency. Presently, little empirical research explores whether non-state agencies could effectively collaborate with youth justice actors and processes. Therefore, I deduce that to extend the known benefits of diversion, research should enquire into the possibility of TSO forging formalised partnerships with YOS, to deliver contextualised youth justice. For these reasons I propose to investigate the following questions:

- Could the work of third sector organisations be compatible with criminal justice agencies?

- How might the collaboration of third sector actors be met with resistance?

- Should third sector organisations forge formalised partnerships with Youth Offending services in order to facilitate diversion?

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Epistemological and theoretical position

To answer these research questions, I adopted an interpretivist epistemological position as it appreciates the differences of social, from natural, sciences, emphasising the importance of generating an empathetic understanding of the topic (Blaikie, 2004). The literature review demonstrated that positivistic 'explanatory' approaches to the study of diversion can limit a researcher's ability to understand the processes behind the numbers, and subsequently fail to identify why programmes have/have not been successful (Bryman, 2008; Wilson and Hoge, 2012). Furthermore, employing an interpretivist standpoint lends to a qualitative approach that seeks to not only explain, but comprehend social life, by encouraging the researcher to view the collected data from the participants standpoint, and assign meaning in relation to the research question(s) (Bryman, 2008). Moreover, qualitative research more appropriately facilitates the exploring of potential partnerships between TSO and YOS, as it can recognise the multiple and complex perspectives and problems of forging a working relationship (Flick, 2009).

3.2 Data collection

In order to support the bottom-up evidence-base that Smith (2013) advocates, I originally intended to employ semi-structured interviews with representatives from a range of TSO, to gain insight from front-line personnel dealing with young, socially excluded, people, and their views on collaborating with YOS to deliver diversion. The flexible and fluid nature of semi-structured interviews allows the interviewees to guide the conversation and collect detailed responses, while still guaranteeing the essential topics are addressed through the use of an interview guide (Mason, 2004; Bryman, 2008; see Appendix 5). I used a non-probability purposive sampling strategy to enable the selection of participants relevant to the

research topic (Rowley, 2012). I sent out emails to numerous TSO in Southampton, detailing the nature of the research, why they had been asked to participate, as well as attaching consent forms and participant information sheets, so to gain informed consent and adhere to the ethical standards of research practise (Gomm, 2004; see Appendix 3 & 4). Unfortunately, the busy reality of third sector work meant that I was unable to obtain any research participants.

To combat these preliminary issues, I decided to use qualitative documentary analysis instead. Bell and Waters (2014) recognise this methodology for its use when access to participants are blocked. Documentary analysis is the systematic procedure of analysing and interpreting documents, as primary data, to produce meaning and develop empirical knowledge (Bowen, 2009). To create my sample of documents I used a non-probability purposive approach, selecting a (fairly small) number of sources, based on their expertise and relevance to the study, to attain valuable data (Denscombe, 2014). In turn, I was able to generate an 'exploratory sample' that elicited information and insight into a relatively unexplored topic (Denscombe, 2014). This mode of sampling was pragmatically favourable for this project, due to the resource and time constraints. As established, diversion is not universally adopted across the UK, and Hampshire – specifically Southampton – is a locality of minimal diversionary practices (Muncie, 2010). So, in order to comprehensively answer my proposed questions, while maintaining a manageable workload, I specifically analysed 9 online documents (see Appendix 6). These were purposefully sampled through using a google search engine based on the knowledge gained during my exploration of current research, to ensure the sampling process was evidence-informed and researcher bias was eliminated (Bryman, 2008, Denscombe, 2014). These documents include: three Southampton TSO websites (No Limits, Youth and Families Matter, and Catch22), Hampshire Constabulary website, Southampton Youth Offending Service web page and Southampton

Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19. The benefit of utilising these documents is that they are an alternative avenue for investigating organisational cultures and representations of them, especially the strategic plan review as Noaks and Wincup (2004) note official reports expose the agencies priorities. This proved crucial for exploring the possibility of commissioning diversion and formalised partnerships with TSO. Another advantage of using the internet as a way of sourcing documents is that it enables researchers to access geographically dispersed samples (Hine, 2008). So, alongside these documents I looked at the Swansea Bureau and Hull Youth Justice Service web pages, and the Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10 (mentioned in the literature review), to serve as comparative examples of areas which actively enforce interagency work and a diversionary philosophy. Though images were widely used in all of the websites and web pages, the data collected and then analysed here was solely text.

3.3 Data analysis

A thematic approach was used to analyse these documents. Thematic analysis is the method of "identifying and analysing patterns of meaning in a data set", which produces overarching themes that encapsulate the most salient findings of the phenomena being studied (Joffe, 2012:209). These themes can be identified either at the manifest level, i.e. those directly observed in the data set, or at the latent level, i.e. underlying meanings and information (Boyatzis, 1998). This process begun with manual open coding which entails disaggregating, naming and categorizing segments of the data (such as phrases or whole paragraphs) to produce an 'analytic handle' through which themes emerged, and subsequent interpretation became possible (Boeije, 2010). A common issue in coding, that was experienced in this project, is the tendency to code at the descriptive rather than explanatory level to identify what is occurring in the text (Schwandt, 2001). Therefore, Aurini, Heath and Howells (2016) advocate manual coding for less experienced researchers, rather than using assistive

qualitative analysis software (e.g. NVivo); although it is time-consuming, it allows the investigator to become more familiar with the data and coding processes.

Codes were inductively developed, meaning that the theoretical ideas that emerged were drawn from the raw data, which is advantageous as it harvests more systematic, transparent qualitative findings, in contrast to deductive coding whereby the researcher imposes their own theoretical ideas upon the data (Joffe, 2012). This is especially relevant for exploring the possibility of formalised partnerships between youth justice agencies and TSO seeing as few studies have currently explored this field. Furthermore, to ensure reliability in coding procedures, young people, FTE, YOS, and TSO were defined and operationalised in the same way the introduction and literature review chapters clearly state (Stemler, 2001). Importantly, rigid, well-defined concepts are a crucial step in mediating the balance of subjectivity (characteristic of qualitative methodologies) and objectivity, and in retaining reliability (Ratner, 2002).

Following the initial coding, a codebook was created (see Appendix 7). This facilitated the organisation of codes (by themes) so that I could examine the links between the documents. The codebook also helps maintain transparency and reliability by providing an exhaustive list of features emerging from the documents that future enquiries can adopt (Aurini, Heath and Howells, 2016; Stemler, 2001).

3.4 Limitations

Though this methodology exhibits numerous benefits, it is not without is shortfalls. While the pragmatic sampling approach allowed for research-specific documents to be analysed, this method of generating, and size of, the sampling frame does not produce findings generalisable to all TSO and YOS (Denscombe, 2014). Furthermore, the vast number of internet-based documents available limits the researcher's ability to analyse all applicable

data sets, as such, this study may be accused of selective bias (Bowen, 2009). Subsequently, this also meant that theoretical saturation – the point at which no further codes or themes were generated through continued data collection – was not reached during the analysis process (Braun et al., 2019). Given more time, this limitation could be rectified through larger sampling frames. To best overcome these issues, while acknowledging the time and resource restrictions, I decided to focus on one main locality that enabled me to produce more comprehensive and valid results. Although, by doing so I was unable to thoroughly criticise each document, as the small sampling frame obstructed me from knowing whether these websites, such as Hampshire Constabulary's, were typical or exceptional of its type (Bell and Waters, 2014).

In comparison to the semi-structured interviews initially planned, the analysis of documents required myself as the researcher to infer from the data any possible obstacles to forging formalised partnerships, rather than explicitly gathering this information from employees in TSO. Unlike the interviews, the websites and reports were not produced to specifically address the research agenda (Bowen, 2009). This required more rigorous researcher reflexivity to determine the authenticity and credibility of the data, to ensure that any potential distorting effects of underlying attitudes or feelings were accounted for when discussing the findings and reaching conclusions (Macdonald, 2008).

3.5 Ethical considerations

In the originally proposed research methodology, ethical issues such as informed consent, safeguarding confidentiality of data, alongside assessing levels of risk for both the interviewer and participants (see Appendix 1), needed securing before conducting the study (Blumer, 2001). However, the alternative primary document analysis involved minimal ethical concerns and risk, vis-à-vis the use, collection and dissemination of data, as these

internet-based documents are publicly available. The inherent lack of a gatekeeper to obtain access to these websites and reports indicates there is no need to ascertain individual consent and anonymity in order to abide by the ethical guidelines that govern social research (Bowen, 2009; Wiles, 2013). Moreover, I did not analyse data that exposed private information of any agency or individual not already in the public domain.

4.0 Results

The data analysed (see Appendix 7) reveals that both TSO and policing bodies in Southampton and Hampshire are committed to multi-agency approaches. This signifies there is a potential for their collaboration to facilitate diversion. On the other hand, it also highlights the possible obstacles of creating an effective diversionary scheme through inter-agency cooperation, the financial influences that might impact the formation of formalised partnerships, and the multiple (sometimes competing) ethos' these institutions embody. This section comments on the data found and explains the themes that emerged out of the various sources examined.

4.1 Promoting interagency work

This was the most prominent theme that emerged, and arose in every document that was analysed. 'Promoting interagency work' relates to the belief in, and/or commitment to, the forging of partnerships in relation to the organisation's respective goals. For example, in the charity websites that were analysed, each organisation promoted different forms of interagency working. No Limits encourages external training and funding, e.g. from 'The King's Trust' to help "them develop the skills to carry on building their organisation". By contrast, Youth and Families Matter (a smaller TSO) promoted their connections to a local church which reflects their goals to develop community spirituality. Conversely, as a large charity, Catch22 illustrates greater affiliations with more formal and extensive partnerships in order to alleviate the risks and harms of substance misuse. The Hampshire 24/7 Substance Misuse Support service is a 'joint approach' also involving NHS partnerships. It "offers a designated CAMHS Link Practitioners", while also drawing on the expertise the organisation has gathered in relation to youth offending and support from other initiatives not in Hampshire areas.

Unlike these TSO, Hampshire Constabulary claim efficiency independent of partnership work, however, the data shows a recognition that partnerships help to increase the productivity of the police force. Though, encouraging alliances is predominantly aimed at businesses and companies due to the size of their workforces and the knowledge they hold. Notably, these partnerships are not at equal ranking with the police force. Police powers must be applied for "as long as they are relevant to their role" and to sustain this 'accreditation' they must complete certain courses, signalling a power and knowledge imbalance on those who do attain partnership status. Here, interagency work is centred around crime prevention, as opposed to community or individual welfare. The Southampton YOS web page and Youth Strategic Plan Review both show commitments to interagency work with pre-existing (predominantly formal) partnerships, such as Hampshire Constabulary, for the purposes of advancing the local authority's ambitions for the city.

Already-established diversion schemes, the Swansea Bureau and Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme (HYJDS) are both defined by their multi-agency service delivery, including formalised partnerships with their local police forces. The HYJDS also makes reference to partnerships with "East Riding Voluntary Action Services". Thus, interagency work is endorsed for its capabilities to deliver far-reaching children's services to help them "get their lives back on track".

4.2 Obstacles to effective partnership work and service delivery

Despite the salience of encouraged interagency work across all documents, several obstacles to creating effective and efficient service delivery through partnerships emerged from the data. Among two of the TSO, No Limits and Catch22, safeguarding confidentiality of young peoples' support services and their personal data was a priority in their work. This may prove problematic to an extent should these charities forge formalised partnerships with YOS, as

they may be obligated to divulge information they previously would not. However, No Limits website does state that "we won't talk about any details you tell us to anyone outside of No Limits, unless there is a serious a serious risk of harm to you or another person", indicating this may a hurdle easily overcome should the YOS agree to these conditions.

Issues of conditionality also arises in Hampshire Constabulary's website. As seen in the previous theme, Hampshire Constabulary promote provisional partnership on the basis that agencies meet the required criteria. These restrictions may limit the scope of applicable partners and/or be seen as a resistance on behalf of the police force to work collaboratively. Contrastingly, the Southampton YOS Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review is overtly cautious of developing new partnerships as erratic interagency work in the past has "impacted upon the effectiveness of integrated planning", consequently leading to a "re-modelling of processes being undertaken". Furthermore, the review highlights external obstacles, including: fiscal cuts that restrict "all partners and their resilience to maintain delivery of services", and incompatible "structural and operational frameworks" that prevent certain partners from mobilising or obtaining the resources to "operate innovatively and independently". Therefore, 'smaller' partners may find it increasingly difficult to activate themselves given the climate of austerity.

4.3 Influence of economic factors

Although financial concerns feature among the obstacles to effective and efficient partnerships, the influence of economic factors emerged as an equally important, supplementary theme. The Youth and Families Matter website explicitly states that "as a charity, we need to raise funds to continue the work we do". Similarly, No Limits illustrates a reliance on external financial support in order to maintain existence, stating "we'd love for you to get involved so that we can continue to deliver free information, advice, advocacy,

counselling and support across Southampton and Hampshire". By publishing this on their websites, both of these extracts demonstrate the need for TSO to appeal to the public to generate the funds required to sustain service provision.

In the HYJDS document, it is apparent that the Department for Education as well as the Youth Justice Board fund this initiative. However, where the charities voice financial concerns surrounding funding, the HYJDS data denotes that the difficulty is not in obtaining the funding. Instead, it is in assessing "the full cost benefit to the city of Hull, the wider partnership and central government", because much of the successes in reduced youth custody are hard to accurately measure in terms of money saved.

Saving money is established as a pivotal selling point in both the Hampshire Constabulary's website and Southampton YOS Youth strategic Review. In both documents, cost-efficiency is expressed in relation to sustainability as well as the public/tax-payers interests, for example "it's great value for money". This demonstrates a clear distinction between the priorities of Hull's diversion system and Hampshire/Southampton's criminal justice agencies. On the other hand, Hampshire Constabulary's website explicitly acknowledges that there is "a point at which further efficiency cannot be achieved without compromising the effectiveness of local services" when there is a preoccupation with cost-efficiency. Therefore, the force remains dedicated to attracting external funding and sponsorship in order to finance projects "we couldn't otherwise have undertaken".

4.4 Community safety ethos

Similarly, the public-oriented tone of the policing documents is also evident in the community safety ethos theme that most documents displayed. Throughout the YFM and Catch22 website, community safety is expressed in terms of well-being. Markedly, Catch22 (as a nation-wide charity) speak in terms of creating a "strong society", whereas YFM

explicit talk of "our local community". This suggests that the facilities and expertise YFM provide are not only limited to (potentially due to the size of the workforce and financial capabilities), but are the most valuable in, the area in which they operate; perhaps because they are better aware of the problems within it. Nevertheless, community safety is similarly articulated with regards to safeguarding the populations needs. Catch22 envisions this through building a "good place to live", while YFM more explicitly state how they propose to secure well-being: by offering "front line service delivering welfare to youth and families in our local community at the point of need".

Unlike these organisations, the Hampshire Constabulary website claims their entire purpose is to "deliver SAFER communities". An analysis of their institutional goals, e.g. to "reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour", suggests that community safety consumes both their aspired outcomes as well as their methods of service delivery. For example, this website also endorses interagency work in direct reference to "providing community safety" through their "Community Safety Accreditation Scheme". This is mirrored in the Southampton YOS Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review that promotes inter-sector collaborative work with the police "to work together to reduce crime" and "promote public safety".

While maintaining public safety is also at the forefront of the Hull Youth Justice Service web page, and Southampton YOS Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review, they equally prioritise the provision of services that are in the interest of the child in order to reduce youth crime. For example, the Strategic Plan Review states that Asset Plus should be reviewed "to make sure it is used effectively to reflect the child's views, create intervention plans that change behaviour and ensure the public are protected". Likewise, the Hull Youth Justice Service web page asserts that their key aims are to "reduce youth crime, protect the public, and safeguard young people". Taken together, these extracts display that community safety is one of several (rather than its principle) priorities.

4.5 Child's rights ethos

Briefly demonstrated above, this theme sometimes runs parallel to community safety rhetoric's. However, a child-centred philosophy appeared in all documents, except from the Hampshire Constabulary website; this in itself is noteworthy. Unsurprisingly, children and young people's rights is a central tenet of all TSO analysed. Reflecting their areas of speciality, each charity strives to secure the child's rights through increasing their accessibility. For example, YFM and No Limits' services are free of charge, and available via drop-in sessions. Moreover, as identified earlier, No Limits and Catch22 pride themselves upon ensuring confidentiality and "non-judgemental support", particularly with regards to substance misuse problems (a well-established youth crime correlated risk factor). These organisations also use referrals from other, highly qualified, service-providers to ensure complex needs are addressed through "developing a wraparound service responding to individual need". Their flexible approach to preserving children's rights is a key distinguishing factor among all of these charity's websites.

Conversely, the Southampton YOS web page and Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review refer more so to 'risk' as opposed to 'needs' when constructing their child's rights principles, specifically in relation to those children most likely to (re)offend. For example, they provide targeted interventions for "looked after children" who characteristically offend more than other young people, i.e. are riskier. Additionally, the YOS similarly aims to resolve substance problems, but as a method of crime prevention instead. Yet contradictorily, the review posits that the YOS "respect for children who offend as children first and foremost".

In the Swansea Bureau, the scheme is intrinsically based upon children's rights and needs. This is evident in the optional engagement with the scheme: "young person and parents/carers must voluntarily engage in the process". This voluntary element is also

witnessed in the HYJDS report. The inherent lack of coercion to engage with the schemes further supports their child's rights ethos. Furthermore, like the TSO, the Hull Youth Justice Service web page outlines their personalised intervention methods, revolving around the child's needs.

4.6 Promoting diversion

As previous literature shows, diversion is premised upon a child's rights ethos, though separate to this theme, the promotion of diversion (either explicitly or implicitly) is exhibited in almost all the analysed documents. In the YFM website, the needs-responsive discourse coupled with the services targeted at "supporting children with emotional and behavioural needs" is indicative of a diversionary philosophy, which serves to nurture rather than punish individual hardships. Catch22 is overtly engaged in diversionary schemes in some areas of England, such as Suffolk, and the promotion of diversion here is as much oriented towards "risk of reoffending" as it is individual need. As such, diversion is sanctioned to reduce FTE because "those who remain in the system tend to have far greater, more complex needs and higher rates of reoffending". Contrarily, the Southampton YOS Youth Justice Review Plan promotes diversion as a tool for reducing FTE by incorporating the "voice of the child" but for the purposes of 'speeding-up' the engagement process. This underlying rationale indicates that the YOS perceives diversion as a means to their aspired ends. The Southampton YOS web page similarly hints at this, through encouraging the alleviation of youth offending risks opposed to needs, reflecting their disproportionately community safety-based ethos.

Governed by a diversionary theory, the Swansea Bureau (expectedly) explicitly advertises diversion as an opportunity for young people to avoid formal prosecution; rather than as an avenue for accelerating intervention processes. The Hull Youth Justice Service web page and Diversion Scheme document correspondingly advocates diversion as a strategy for reducing

the number of unnecessarily enmeshed young people in the formal justice system. However, diversion is promoted as voluntary yet conditional, seeing as those who take part in the scheme "must also be willing to participate in reparative process". Thus, diversion here is entangled with restorative elements. This joint diversionary and restorative scheme exemplifies points raised in the literature review, that many youth justice processes are often informed by multiple and in some ways contradicting principles.

Therefore, the data derived from these documents uncover that where diversion is explicitly promoted (while generally adopted as a method for reducing FTEs) the underlying motivations appear mixed. The Swansea Bureau and Catch22 both connote diversion as a positive opportunity for the child, whereas the Southampton YOS documents imply that diversion also represents an avenue for achieving institutional goals.

4.8 Discussion

The mutually-expressed belief in interagency working across all documents suggests that if both the TSO and YOS analysed here can identify the benefits of collaborative approaches, then, should partnership be enforced, the Southampton policing agencies may be more likely to embrace the work of these third sector associates. This is especially evident where Hampshire Constabulary state that "innovation in partnership" plays a key role in their overall efficiency. While this is directed towards businesses, the mixed economy political climate cited in Yates (2012) and Cox (2010) would imply that this innovation could be extended to private and third sectors as a method of decentralising state power. On the other hand, the imbalance of power in Hampshire Constabulary's discourse, whereby partners are accredited "as long as they are relevant to the role", signifies a reluctance to open up multi-agency work to those the police view as inappropriate. In a study on a multi-agency crime prevention scheme, Rogers (2004) conducted interviews with key stakeholders in the

partnership. In this study, Rogers similarly identified power issues among the police who often felt as though they lacked control over partners, and subsequently retracted their support for the initiative. These findings complement this study's data as it illustrates how the rhetoric of the website may be translated in reality. Although, Maguire (2016) notes that TSO may not wish to form partnerships of equal status, as it could put their reputations within their communities at risk should the outcomes of the partnership be negative.

Nevertheless, the aspired innovation on behalf of Hampshire Constabulary, as well as Southampton's YOS, is clearly reflected in the work of No Limits and Catch22 who are distinguished by their flexibility in support provision. This would suggest that these organisations are suited to the role of facilitating diversion, as evidence found in the HYJDS document (who have adopted interagency working between TSO and YOS), specifically the ability to refer children to a range of appropriate services, is a crucial part of their effective partnership. This also mirrors the findings of Flanagan and Hancock (2010) cited earlier. Furthermore, the distinctive 'wraparound' personalised approach to youth care provision promoted throughout the TSO websites, can be seen as compatible with diversionary principles. As seen in Haines at al.'s (2013) study, the ability of YOS officers to construct 'treatment' according to the child's needs and wishes is quoted as a primary factor in successful diversion cases.

Despite the apparent compatibility of TSO and interagency work as well as diversion practices, fiscal cuts, a reliance upon funding and an absence of adequate resources are mentioned throughout Southampton policing and charity documents, and may serve as obstacles to forging partnerships. The continued prevalence of an austerity government that has caused widespread cuts – discussed by Yates (2012) – is expressed in the Southampton YOS Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review as a barrier to "all partners and their resilience to maintain delivery of services". Moreover, the results also show that all three TSO explored

rely on external funding to activate their services. These results combined imply that especially the smaller charities i.e. YFM and No Limits, might struggle (or be hesitant) to form partnerships with YOS as these financial cuts may prevent them from mobilising the resources to effectively carry out their roles in service delivery. Data from semi-structured interviews detailed in Rees, Mullins and Bovaird's (2012b) research report equally highlight insufficient resources as a significant barrier to effective multi-agency service implementation. Additionally, the 'payment by results' method of interagency work initiated by the 2010 Coalition government, meant that competitive commissioning (whereby private and voluntary agencies bid for partnerships with public services) was endorsed (Yates, 2012). Therefore, supplementary to my findings, which show the small local charities depend upon funding, they might not be financially able to compete with larger organisations and thus partake in partnership work with YOS, irrespective of their potential diversionary capacities.

Funding issues aside, the data also reveals a shared child's rights ethos between the TSO and Southampton YOS, insinuating that partnership is plausible. In the charity websites, this philosophy exhibits itself in multiple ways, for example, their commitment to service user's confidentiality and "non-judgemental support". Building on Martin et al. (2016), these aspects of the TSO work indicate that they are uniquely positioned, not only within the community as care-givers, but as agencies who can form trusting relationships which evidently assists effective service provision. Moreover, the focus upon safeguarding "the welfare of children and young people", and needs-responsive "support, training and education" mentioned in YFM and No Limits' documents also feature in the Swansea Bureau web page, a scheme which thrives in partnership. Although, as the results highlighted, there is weighted attention upon risk opposed to need in the YOS documents. This infers that while the child may remain at the forefront of service provision, the staff involved in delivering 'treatments' may perceive these young people as risks that require minimising, rather than

exhibiting needs that require addressing. As witnessed in the existing literature, the youth justice environment is disproportionately concerned with mitigating risk, e.g. through risk assessment tools, despite the evidence which indicates practitioners' reservations surrounding the adoption of narrow, quantitative definitions of risks in relation to young vulnerable people (Paylor, 2011; Briggs, 2013). My findings suggest that, as state-run organisations, they are influenced by the political culture of youth justice. Therefore, these TSO may experience difficulties in preserving their needs-based child's rights ethos when partnered with more powerful risk-based philosophies.

However, while Southampton's YOS and TSO both display a child-centred ethos, the Hampshire Constabulary appears solely committed to a community safety rationale. For example, they overtly aim to "reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour", implying that as a police force they adopt a strict view of criminals, including young offenders. Though it is the YOS who deal with young offenders, the police are often the first actors to engage with the adolescents, and if they operate under more punitive preconceptions of young criminals, they may be reluctant to refer these individuals to any diversion scheme, whether it be a partnership between YOS and TSO or not. Haines et al.'s (2012) diversion pilot scheme study, also in areas with little-to-no systematic diversion, perhaps illustrates how these observed issues may be translated in practice. Interviews with police officers accentuate institutional reservations to refer young people to these schemes, chiefly because they saw diversion as too informal to adequately resolve youth crime.

Notably, my results also spotlight the Hull Youth Justice Service's aims to simultaneously protect the public and safeguard child welfare. In an area that commissions diversion (including the police) and evinces both ethos' identified in my analysis, these findings suggest that it is possible to form formal partnerships without compromising any one set of beliefs or responsibilities.

In order to facilitate diversion, the schemes in both Swansea and Hull promote involvement in the process as voluntary and non-coercive. Contrary to findings from Kelly and Armitage's (2015) interviews, diversion among these sites has been made possible without an element of coercion. However, as the literature review demonstrates, youth justice strategies are often informed by various rhetoric's. My findings correspondingly show that the HYJDS implicitly promotes diversion, as well as restorative justice, for example the web page states: "they must also be willing to participate in a reparative process". This conditional involvement in Hull's scheme perhaps outlines the differing youth justice cultures in Wales, where diversion has more openly been adopted under a child's rights ethos, and England, where diversion appears to have been elevated as a politically convenient alternative to custody (Haines et al., 2013; Porter, 2011; Morgan and Newburn, 2012; Smith, 2014). Within the YOS Strategic Plan Review analysed, there is evidence to support this claim, particularly where the incorporation of the child's voice in the intervention process is promoted for its abilities to speed up "the process of engagement". However, the Southampton YOS web page does state their aims in reducing "the number of young people in the criminal justice system", which the literature review communicates is central to labelling theory that forms the fundamentals of diversion (Evans, 2008; Newburn, 2017). Though due to the nature of this research, it is not possible to conclusively say whether these goals represent a belief in the argument that system contact is criminogenic (McAra and McVie, 2007). The YOS web page also makes hints at diversionary principles via claims to "reduce the factors which place them at risk of offending". Importantly, these factors such as drug/alcohol misuse and educational issues are all cited in existing literature as challenges strongly correlated to youth offending (Bateman, 2017). This infers that if Southampton's YOS is able to successfully combat these risks/needs through interventionist methods, they might be equipped to deliver effective diversion. Similarly, references to social exclusion is a salient feature among the all TSO websites.

Interestingly, Catch22 already explicitly works collaboratively to deliver diversion, though not in Southampton/Hampshire areas. These insights, accompanied with existing theoretical and empirical knowledge, suggest there is considerable potential for other charities to extend their expertise in areas of social exclusion into the YJS to facilitate diversion.

5.0 Conclusion

The primary issue at hand is whether TSO *should* be involved in facilitating the delivery of diversion. However, an important aspect of reaching a conclusion is investigating the potential compatibility and barriers of forging formalised partnerships with YOS. Considering the findings in relation to the empirical, theoretical and policy evidence addressed in the literature review, the documentary analysis methodology has proven advantageous in answering the initial research questions. Notably, much previous research is able to corroborate these discoveries, and identify the practicalities of forging formalised third- and public-sector partnerships, how obstacles have arisen in previous attempts, and the successes of effective collaborations.

With regards to the question 'could the work of third sector organisations be compatible with criminal justice agencies?', the findings from this research have shown that there is a shared goal among the TSO and YOS documents analysed in the form of a diversionary, child's rights philosophy that may be beneficial for facilitating effective, localised diversion. Additionally, evidence from the Swansea Bureau and HYJDS reveal that multiagency approaches to diversion (between formal and informal agencies) are not only possible, but effective in terms of the outcomes for the child and reducing the number of FTE. Also, the results from this project provide further support to previous studies such as Flanagan and Hancock (2010), as they similarly highlight the institutional flexibility and personalisation of third sector work as a distinctive and effective aspect of these organisations – an explicitly expressed goal of Hampshire Constabulary's service provision. The combination of these findings and inferences, signal that TSO and criminal justice agencies would be compatible should partnerships be pursued. Then again, utilising the findings to answer the research question, 'how might the collaboration of third sector actors be met with resistance?' exposes multiple areas of friction. For example, the above discussion of results illustrates that

resistance may take the form of austerity pressures, and the incompatible risk rhetoric that penetrates the YJS. Additionally, resistance may stem from an institutional preconception that diversion is 'too soft', similarly found in Haines et al.'s (2012) empirical study. The intrinsic clash of ethos between Hampshire Constabulary and the TSO, as well as evidence from Rogers (2004) earlier research, also signifies that the formalised partnership may struggle in practice without the full support of the police. Plus, while interagency is valued among all organisations analysed, one can postulate from previous literature that TSO may hesitate to forge partnerships with any criminal justice agency, as it exposes them to greater accountability, thereby risking their reputation (Maguire, 2016).

Though these results and conclusions cannot be generalised to all YOS nor TSO, as stated in the methodology chapter, one can logically deduce from the data (and subsequent interpretations) that in the interests of the young offenders, diversion represents a positive route to reducing FTE rates and safeguarding the welfare of these adolescents. Furthermore, as uniquely positioned, flexible, child-centred agencies, the TSO from this study exemplify how taking advantage of local actors to enhance youth justice strategies, could serve to produce contextually effective diversion schemes. Even while acknowledging the predicted monetary and conflicting institutional values as barriers to the development of these partnerships, the data (coupled with previous empirical and theoretical findings) would advise that in the Southampton area, TSO do forge formalised partnerships with YOS to facilitate diversion in the interests of the children, and wider community.

Resultingly, the implications of these conclusions could be vast, permeating all areas of youth justice. Following these discoveries, one can hope that policymakers will see that financially, the initial investment in these partnerships could be perilous given the unstable economy, but the evidence from the existing schemes and literature points to long-term victories, consequent to addressing (rather than punishing) the challenges large portions of young

people face. For practitioners in Southampton's YOS and Hampshire Constabulary, the conclusions suggest that these organisations should be less apprehensive of forging new partnerships. Instead, by embracing the shared principles amongst these public, and third sector bodies, these organisations may be more capable of achieving the innovative, cost-efficient services they strive towards.

5.1 Recommendations for future research

To build upon the knowledge gained from this preliminary research, further enquiries should adopt this methodology across each jurisdiction in the UK, alongside primary qualitative interviews with representatives from voluntary organisations and YOS. In doing so, scholars will be able to more extensively explore the practicalities of creating a localised diversion-based YJS by outsourcing the expertise of TSO. This would enhance the validity and representativeness of the data, and produce a compelling evidence-base. It would also enable policymakers to produce informed youth justice procedures (irrespective of financial considerations), principled on the welfare of the child, and the alleviation of structural inequalities that persist in juvenile sanctioning practices today.

Reference list

Adler, C. and Wundersitz, J. (1994) 'New Directions in Juvenile Justice Reform in Australia', cited in, Hazel, N. (2008) *Cross-national comparison of youth justice*, London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales pp. 23-24

Aurini, J. D., Heath, M. and Howells, S. (2016) *The How to of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications

Bateman, T. (2017) *The State of Youth Justice 2017: An overview of trends and developments*, National Association for Youth Justice. http://thenayj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/State-of-Youth-Justice-report-for-web-Sep17.pdf [Accessed on: 01.09.2018]

Bell, J. and Waters, S. (2014) *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First Time Researchers, 6th ed.* Berkshire: Open University Press

Blaikie, N. (2004). Interpretivism in Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A. and Liao, F. T. (eds) *The SAGE encyclopaedia of social science research methods*, California: Sage Publications pp. 509 – 510

Blumer, M. (2001) 'The Ethics of Social Research', in Gilbert, N. (eds) *Researching Social Life*, London: Sage Publications pp. 45 – 57

Boeije, H. (2010) Analysis in Qualitative Research, London: Sage Publications

Bowen, G. A. (2009) Document analysis as a qualitative research method, *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9 (2), pp. 27 – 40

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998) *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*, London, Sage Publications

Brandsen, T. and Pestoff, V. (2006) Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services: An introduction, *Public management review*, 8(4), pp. 493 – 501

Braun, V. et al. (2019) Thematic Analysis, in Liamputtong, P. (eds) *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, Singapore: Springer pp. 843 – 860

Bridge, S., Murtagh, B. and O'Neill, K. (2009) *Understanding the Social Economy and the Third Sector*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Briggs, D. B. (2013) Conceptualising risk and need: the rise of actuarialism and the death of welfare? Practitioner assessment and intervention in the youth offending service, *Youth Justice*, 13(1), pp. 17 – 30

Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Case, T. and Haines, K. (2006) Risk Management and Early Intervention: A Critical Analysis, in Goldson, B. & Muncie, J. (eds) *Youth crime and justice, 2nd ed.,* London: Sage Publications pp. 100 – 114

Cox, P. (2010) Towards a Mixed Economy of Youth Justice, *Essex Human Rights Review*, 7 (1), pp. 40 – 49

Davies, M., Croall, H. and Tyrer, J. (2015) *Criminal Justice, 5th ed.,* London: Pearson

Denscombe, M. (2014) *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research Projects, 5th ed.*, Maidenhead: Open University Press

Evans, R. (2008) Diversion, In Goldson, B. (eds) *Dictionary of Youth Justice*, Oxon: Willan pp. 147 – 149

Flanagan, S. M. and Hancock, B. (2010) 'Reaching the hard to reach' – lessons learned from the VCS (voluntary and community sector) A qualitative study., *BMC Health Services Research*, 10 (1), p. 92

Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, *4th ed.,* London: Sage Publications

Gelsthorpe, L. and Morris (2002) 'Restorative youth justice, The last vestiges of welfare?' in Muncie, J., Hughes, G. & McLaughlin, E. (eds) *Youth Justice: Critical Readings*, London: Sage Publications pp. 238 – 250

Goldson, B. (2001) A rational youth justice? Some critical reflections on the research policy and practise relation, *Probation Journal*, 48(2), pp. 76 – 85

Gomm, R (2004) *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction.* Basingstoke: Palgrave

Gray, P. (2005) The Politics of Risk and Young Offenders' Experiences of Social Exclusion and Restorative Justice, *The British Journal of Criminology*, 45 (6), pp. 938 – 957

Haines, A. et al. (2012) *Evaluation of the Youth Justice Liaison and Diversion (YJLD) Pilot Scheme: Final Report*, Liverpool, University of Liverpool

Haines, K. et al. (2013) 'The Swansea Bureau: A model of diversion from the Youth Justice System', *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 41 (2), pp. 167-187

Hazel, N. (2008) *Cross-national comparison of youth justice*, London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales

Hine, C. (2008) 'The Internet and Research Methods', in Gilbert, N. (eds.) *Researching Social Life, 3rd ed.*, London: Sage Publications pp. 304 – 320

Hull Youth Justice Service (2010*) Hull Youth Crime Diversion Scheme: Annual Report July 2009-July 2010*, Hull, Hull Youth Justice Service

Joffe, H. (2012) "Thematic Analysis", in Harper, D. & Thompson, A. (eds) *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell pp. 209 – 223

Kelly, L. and Armitage, V. (2015) Diverse Diversions: Youth Justice Reform, Localized Practices, and a 'New Interventionist Diversion'?, *Youth Justice*, 15(2), pp. 117 – 133

Kemshall, H. (2008) Risks, Rights and Justice: Understanding and Responding to Youth Risk, Youth Justice, 8 (1), pp. 21 – 37

Macdonald, K. (2008) 'Using Documents', in Gilbert, N. (eds.) *Researching Social Life, 3rd ed.*, London: Sage Publications pp. 285 – 303

Maguire, M. (2016) Third Tier in the supply Chain? Voluntary Agencies and the Commissioning of Offender Rehabilitation Services, in Hucklesby, A. and Corcoran, M. (eds) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 43 – 70

Martin, C et al. (2016) Paved with Good Intentions: The Way Ahead for Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Sector Organisations, in Hucklesby, A. and Corcoran, M. (eds) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 15 – 42

Martin, J. P. and Webster, D. (1971) *Social Consequences of Conviction*, London: Heinemann

Mason, J. (2004) Semistructured interview, in Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A. and Liao, F. T. (eds) *The SAGE encyclopaedia of social science research methods*, California: Sage Publications p. 909

McAlister, S. (2008) Predictable Pathways? Negotiating Risk in the Context of Marginalisation and Social Exclusion*, Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 20 (1), pp. 14 – 28

McAlister, S. and Carr, N. (2014) Experiences of Youth Justice: Youth Justice Discourses and their Multiple Effects, *Youth Justice*, 14(3) pp. 241 – 254

McAra, L. (2017) Youth Justice, in Liebling, A., Maruna, S. & McAra, L. (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 938

McAra, L. and McVie, S. (2007) Youth Justice? The impact of system contact on patterns of desistance, *European Journal of Criminology*, 4 (3), pp. 315 – 345

McAra, L. and McVie, S. (2010) Youth crime and justice: Key messages from the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime, *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 10(2), pp. 179 – 209

Meek, R., Gojkovic, D. and Mills, A. (2013) The Involvement of Nonprofit Organizations in Prisoner Reentry in the UK: Prisoner Awareness and Engagement, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 52(5), pp. 338 – 357

Morgan, R. and Newburn, T. (2012) Youth crime and justice: rediscovering devolution, discretion and diversion? In Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 5th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 490 – 530

Muncie, J. (1999) Institutionalised intolerance: youth justice and the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, *Critical Social Policy*, 19(2), pp. 147 – 175

Muncie, J. (2006) Governing young people: Coherence and contradiction in contemporary youth justice, *Critical social policy*, *26*(4), pp. 770 – 793

Muncie, J. (2010) Illusions of difference: Comparative Youth Justice in the Developed United Kingdom, *The British Journal of Criminology*, 51(1), pp. 40 – 57

Newburn, T. (2017) *Criminology, 3rd ed.,* Oxon: Routledge

Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. (2004) *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*, London: Sage publications

Nobel Jr, J. H. (2006) Meta-analysis: methods, strengths, weaknesses, and political uses, *Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine*, 147 (1), pp. 7 – 20

Patrick, S. and Marsh, R. (2005) Juvenile Diversion: Results of a 3-Year Experimental Study, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 16 (1), pp. 59 – 73

Paylor, I. (2011) Youth Justice in England and Wales: A Risky Business, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 50(4), pp. 221 – 233

Pierson, J. (2010) *Tackling Social Exclusion, 2nd ed.,* Oxon: Routledge

Porter, R. (2011) Diversion Programs, in Gideon, L. & Sung, H. (eds) *Rethinking Corrections: Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Reintegration*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 129 – 155

Ratner, C. (2002) Subjectivity and Objectivity in Qualitative Methodology, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3 (3). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/829/1801 [Accessed on: 17.02.19]

Rees, J., Mullins, D. and Bovaird, T. (2012a) Third sector partnership for public service delivery: an evidence review, *Third Sector Research Centre*, Working Paper 60

Rees, J., Mullins, D. and Bovaird, T. (2012b) Partnership working, *Third Sector Research Centre*, Research Report (88)

Rogers, C. (2004) Separated by a common goal: Some problems of interagency working, *Community Safety Journal*, 3 (2), pp. 5 – 11

Rowley, J. (2012) "Conducting research interviews", *Management Research Review*, 35 (3) pp. 260 – 271

Schwandt, T. A. (2001) *Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry, 2ⁿᵈ ed.,* London: Sage Publications

Smith, R. (2013) *Youth Justice: Ideas, policy, practise*., New York: Routledge

Smith, R. (2014) 'Re-inventing diversion', *Youth Justice*, 14 (2), pp. 109 – 121

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *Preventing social exclusion*, London: Cabinet Office
http://www.bristol.ac.uk/poverty/downloads/keyofficialdocuments/Preventing%20Social%20Exclusion.pdf [Accessed on: 10/10/19]

Stemler, S. (2001) An overview of content analysis, *Practical assessment, research & evaluation*, 7 (17), pp. 137 – 146

Sutherland, A., et al. (2017) '*An analysis of trends in First Time Entrants to the youth justice system*', Ministry of Justice

Weaver, B. (2011) Co-Producing Community Justice: The Transformative Potential of Personalisation for Penal Sanctions, *British Journal of Social Work*, 41 (6), pp. 1038 – 1057

Wiles, R. (2013) *What are qualitative research ethics?* London: Bloomsbury

Wilson, H. and Hoge R. (2012) The Effect of Youth Diversion Programs on Recidivism, A Meta-Analytic Review, *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 40(5), pp. 497 – 518

Yates, J. (2012) What Prospects Youth Justice? Children in Trouble in the Age of Austerity, *Social Policy & Administration*, 46 (4), pp. 432 – 447

Youth Justice Board (2019) *Youth Justice Statistics 2017/18 England and Wales*, Ministry of Justice

Appendix 1

Risk assessment form

Researcher's name:	Shayla Wilson

Supervisor's name:	Pamela Ugwudike

Degree course:	BSc Social Policy and Criminology

Part 1 – Research activities

What do you intend to do?

I intend to investigate whether third sector organisations should collaborate with criminal justice agencies, such as the police, in order to deliver youth justice services in order to reduce the number of First Time Entrants. To do so, I intend to conduct semi-structured interviews with a small sample (between 2-6 participants) from third sector organisations. They will take place over the phone or through skype and be recorded providing they give me consent to do so. This will be followed by document analysis of several websites including the third sector organisations and the Hampshire Constabulary.

Will your research involve collection of information from other people?

I will be talking with people working within third sector organisations that deal with young disadvantaged people. I will be discussing whether they believe the organisation could and should collaborate with criminal justice agencies such as the police to divert and reduce the number of First Time Entrants. The interview questions will not ask for any personal details/experiences, they will be opinion oriented.

If relevant, what locations are involved?

All of my data collection will take place from a private space over the phone. The interviews will not be face-to-face.

Will you be working alone or with others in the data collection process?

I will be working alone when collecting my data.

Part 2 – Potential risks to YOU as the researcher

Please specify potential <u>safety issues</u> arising from your proposed research activity.

As the interviews will be conducted over the phone there are potential risks in me giving out my personal telephone number in order to conduct the interviews. However, I do not believe that any risk resulting from me doing so will be high as I am not giving out any other personal details such as my address.

What precautions will you take to minimise these risks?

I will ensure that my dissertation supervisor is aware of the organisations/participants that have my personal contact details. Furthermore, if any risks are to arise from me sharing my telephone information, I am able to change my contact number so they no longer have access.

Please specify potential distress or harm to YOU arising from your proposed research activity. (

Because of the nature of my questions and the environment in which the interviews will take place, I do not believe there will be any reason for my research to cause me distress or harm.

What precautions will you take to minimise these risks?

Part 3 – Potential risks to YOUR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Please consider potential safety risks to participants from taking part in your proposed research activity?

I do not believe there will be any safety risks to my participants as the interviews will be scheduled to take place over the phone. Moreover, I will ensure that the participants will use their work email and/or phone number in any correspondences that take place so that they are not at any personal risk.

What precautions will you take and/or suggest to your participants to minimise these risks?

Please specify potential harm or distress that might affect your participants as a result of taking part in your research.

The only potential distress this research could have on my participants is the time it takes to conduct the research because of their busy work schedules. This distress however, should be minimal because I intend on keeping the interviews relatively short. The identities of the participants will remain anonymous through using pseudonyms in my transcriptions, and my work will only be shared with the university.

What precautions will you take and/or suggest to your participants to minimise these risks?

I will make my availability flexible and reassure them that the interviews can be conducted at a time that is most convenient for them. I will also remind them of their right to withdraw at any point, should they that taking part in the research will put any strain on their lives or any other reason. I will also make clear that they will no longer have their right to withdraw after the 31st of January 2019.

Part 4 – Potential wider risks

Does your planned research pose any additional risks as a result of the sensitivity of the research and/or the nature of the population(s) or location(s) being studied?

No. In the discussions, I will not be asking the participants to give opinions on their organisation which would have the potential to impact their relationship with employers/the reputation of the organisation. The questions will not specifically address the young people impacted by their work, rather, they will be directed towards areas such as: whether they personally think the organisation(s) should or should not collaborate with the police in youth justice provision, and if they believe there would be any obstacles to overcome in doing so. The topic of discussion is not sensitive because it relies on personal opinion and is a fairly uncontroversial subject. Furthermore, my research will be conducted within the ethical guidelines to ensure that I do not cause any harm to either my discipline or university, and the relationship between myself and the participants will be strictly professional.

What precautions will you take to minimise these risks?

CONTINUED BELOW …

Part 5 – International Travel

If your activity involves international travel you must meet the Faculty's requirements for Business Travel which are intended to:

1. Inform managers/supervisors of the travel plans of staff and students and identify whether risk assessment is required.
2. Provide contact information to staff and students whilst travelling (insurance contact details, University contact in case of emergency etc.)

Full details are provided in the Faculty H&S Handbook in the **Business Travel** section. Selecting **Business Travel** from the Contents list will take you straight to the relevant section.

Departmental H&S risk assessment attached (for Part 2/3)	NO	(Delete as applicable)
Business Travel and Risk Filter Form attached (Part 5)	NO	(Delete as applicable)

ERGO2 approval email

UNIVERSITY OF
Southampton

ERGO II – Ethics and Research Governance Online https://www.ergo2.soton.ac.uk

Submission ID: 46263
Submission Title: Should third sector organisations be incorporated into the Youth Justice System to divert and reduce the number of First Time Entrants?
Submitter Name: Shayla Wilson

Your submission has now been approved by the Faculty Ethics Committee. You can begin your research unless you are still awaiting any other reviews or conditions of your approval.

Comments:

- Many thanks for your submission. Good look with your research.

-

Click here to view the submission

Tid: 23011_Email_to_submitter___Approval_from_Faculty_Ethics_committee__cat_B___C_ Id: 100009
slvr1pf6@soton.ac.uk coordinator

Appendix 3

Participant information sheet

Study Title: Should third sector organisations be incorporated into the Youth Justice System to divert and reduce the number of First Time Entrants?

Researcher: Shayla Wilson
ERGO number: 46263

You are being invited to take part in the above research study. To help you decide whether you would like to take part or not, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please read the information below carefully and ask questions if anything is not clear or you would like more information before you decide to take part in this research. You may like to discuss it with others but it is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

This research project is my final year dissertation as part of my BSc Social Policy and Criminology degree. I am doing the research to investigate how the youth justice system can change in order to reduce the number of First Time Entrants. I am looking specifically at those who come from socially disadvantaged backgrounds and whether the work that third sector organisations, such as yours, do, should be incorporated into the justice system to deliver better youth justice provision and prevent them from entering the system. I expect to find out whether third sector organisations collaborating with agencies such as the police, has the potential to reduce First Time Entrants and work to divert disadvantaged youths away from the formal criminal justice system.

Why have I been asked to participate?

I have specifically approached you because of the organisation you work for. Every day your organisation is dealing with troubled young people, and as research shows, there is a distinct correlation between the social background of young people and their likelihood of ending up in the criminal justice system. I want to investigate whether the service you and your colleagues provide for these young people should be incorporated into formal youth justice provision. By taking part in this study you will help me to gain a better understanding of the work you do and how it impacts upon young people's lives.

What will happen to me if I take part?

By agreeing to take part in this study you will be expected to answer several questions in an interview that should take around 30 to 45 minutes. These interviews will be conducted through either telephone or skype conversations, and in order to collect all data for analysis I wish to record the interviews. It is important I have all the data possible so that I can conduct a thorough analysis. I will be transcribing what is said in the interview and in my analysis, I will be looking for themes across the interviews I collect with all of the participants. I will be

using parts of transcription within my writing to illustrate points and improve the strength of my analysis. For this reason, recordings will be a requirement of your participation, but these will not be shared with anyone but myself and my dissertation supervisor, and can be properly disposed of after transcription. I will require specific consent from you in order to record the interviews.

You will not be expected to participate in any other activities after the interview, however, should you wish to know the outcomes of my study, I am able to contact you after with my findings. I will not be able to do this, however, until April 2019 when my dissertation is due for submission.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

There will be no direct benefit to you for participating in the study. However, you will be helping me and my discipline to understand better the work of third sector organisations with young people who face social adversity. You will also help me research whether the youth justice system could potentially be improved through forming partnerships with criminal justice agencies, such as the police.

Are there any risks involved?

There will be no risks to you in partaking in this study. I will not be asking you for personal experiences with any of the young people you have dealt with that may cause any distress. The questions will be based solely around the objectives of my research, and asking for you professional opinion on them.

What data will be collected?

The data collected will be your professional opinion on a number of questions linked to the research topic. To do this I will use a semi-structured interview methodology carried out by myself.

No personal details will be required from you during this process. Your signed consent forms will be kept in my possession, and all data will be stored on my personal laptop which is password secure so only myself will have access to it. I will need to keep your contact details such as your work email address during my research but it will be removed after completion. I will not share your contact details with anyone other than my dissertation supervisor.

Will my participation be confidential?

Your participation and the information we collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential.

Only members of the research team and responsible members of the University of Southampton may be given access to data about you for monitoring purposes and/or to carry out an audit of the study to ensure that the research is complying with applicable regulations. Individuals from regulatory authorities (people who check that we are carrying out the study correctly) may require access to your data. All of these people have a duty to keep your information, as a research participant, strictly confidential.

In order to ensure your participation is kept confidential the consent forms will be stored electronically on my laptop which will be password secure. As I am recording the interviews, I will ask you not to mention your name or any other personal details in the interview.

Furthermore, the transcriptions following the interviews will not use your name, they will be pseudonyms so you cannot be identified. After the interviews are transcribed I will delete the recordings from the device they were recorded on and on my laptop, so that no copies of them will exist.

My dissertation supervisor will be the only person, other than myself, to have access to your details and the recordings, however, this is purely for my student research and will not be used for anything other than my dissertation.

Do I have to take part?

No, it is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide you want to take part, you will need to sign a consent form to show you have agreed to take part.
If at any point before the interview takes place you wish to no longer take part, please feel free to email me.

What happens if I change my mind?

You have the right to change your mind and withdraw from the study up until the 31st of January 2019 without giving a reason and without your participant rights being affected, after such time you will not be able to withdraw.

If you wish to withdraw from the study, contact me using my email address:
If, during the interview, you wish to terminate your participation, the recording will stop and we can then discuss whether the information obtained before your withdrawal will remain in the study. If you are not comfortable with us keeping the information obtained prior to your withdrawal, contact myself and it will be disposed of.
If at the point of withdrawal, the data cannot be removed, in accordance with the GDPR exemption for research, we will keep the information about you that we have already obtained for the purposes of achieving the objectives of the study only.

What will happen to the results of the research?

Your personal details will remain strictly confidential. Research findings made available in any reports or publications will not include information that can directly identify you without your specific consent.

The results of the study will be written up in my dissertation and given to my supervisor. The University of Southampton will be the only people to read my dissertation and it will not be published elsewhere. I will not be sharing a copy of my dissertation, but I am happy to talk with you after the research has ended about my results.

Where can I get more information?

If you have any questions concerning this sheet about the study, your participation or the dissemination of my work you can contact me by email at:

What happens if there is a problem?

If you have a concern about any aspect of this study, you should speak to the researchers who will do their best to answer your questions.
If you remain unhappy or have a complaint about any aspect of this study, please contact the University of Southampton Research Integrity and Governance Manager (023 8059 5058, rgoinfo@soton.ac.uk).

Researcher: Shayla Wilson

Data Protection Privacy Notice

The University of Southampton conducts research to the highest standards of research integrity. As a publicly-funded organisation, the University has to ensure that it is in the public interest when we use personally-identifiable information about people who have agreed to take part in research. This means that when you agree to take part in a research study, we will use information about you in the ways needed, and for the purposes specified, to conduct and complete the research project. Under data protection law, 'Personal data' means any information that relates to and is capable of identifying a living individual. The University's data protection policy governing the use of personal data by the University can be found on its website (https://www.southampton.ac.uk/legalservices/what-we-do/data-protection-and-foi.page).

This Participant Information Sheet tells you what data will be collected for this project and whether this includes any personal data. Please ask the research team if you have any questions or are unclear what data is being collected about you.

Our privacy notice for research participants provides more information on how the University of Southampton collects and uses your personal data when you take part in one of our research projects and can be found at
http://www.southampton.ac.uk/assets/sharepoint/intranet/ls/Public/Research%20and%20Integrity%20Privacy%20Notice/Privacy%20Notice%20for%20Research%20Participants.pdf

Any personal data we collect in this study will be used only for the purposes of carrying out our research and will be handled according to the University's policies in line with data protection law. If any personal data is used from which you can be identified directly, it will not be disclosed to anyone else without your consent unless the University of Southampton is required by law to disclose it.

Data protection law requires us to have a valid legal reason ('lawful basis') to process and use your Personal data. The lawful basis for processing personal information in this research study is for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest. Personal data collected for research will not be used for any other purpose.

For the purposes of data protection law, the University of Southampton is the 'Data Controller' for this study, which means that we are responsible for looking after your information and using it properly. The University of Southampton will keep identifiable

information about you for at least one month after the conferment of my award, after which time any link between you and your information will be removed.

To safeguard your rights, we will use the minimum personal data necessary to achieve our research study objectives. Your data protection rights – such as to access, change, or transfer such information - may be limited, however, in order for the research output to be reliable and accurate. The University will not do anything with your personal data that you would not reasonably expect.

If you have any questions about how your personal data is used, or wish to exercise any of your rights, please consult the University's data protection webpage (https://www.southampton.ac.uk/legalservices/what-we-do/data-protection-and-foi.page) where you can make a request using our online form. If you need further assistance, please contact the University's Data Protection Officer (data.protection@soton.ac.uk).

Thank you.

Consent form

Researcher name: Shayla Wilson
ERGO number: 46263
Participant Pseudonym:

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (11/12/18, version 3) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.	
I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study.	
I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw up until the 31st of January 2019 for any reason without my participation rights being affected.	
I understand that taking part in the study involves audio recording which will be transcribed and then destroyed for the purposes set out in the participation information sheet.	
I understand that I may be quoted directly in reports of the research but that I will not be directly identified (e.g. that my name will not be used).	
I understand that should I withdraw from the study then the information collected about me up to this point may still be used for the purposes of achieving the objectives of the study only.	
I understand that if I withdraw from the study I am able to ask the researcher to dispose of any data collected before this point.	
I understand I will not be able to withdraw after January 31st 2019.	

Name of participant (print name)……………………………………………………

Signature of participant………………………………………………………………

Date……………………………………………………………………………   56

Name of researcher…SHAYLA…WILSON………………………………………………

Signature of researcher ……………………………………………………………….

Date…………………………………………………………………………………..

Appendix 5

Interview guide

- How do you think the work you do now could help prevent potential young offenders from entering the system?
- What obstacles do you think you (as an organisation) would face if you collaborate with criminal justice agencies to provide this service?
- If you already collaborate with criminal justice services to provide this service, what are the main obstacles to effective service delivery?
- What resources are needed to facilitate effective collaboration?
- What do you think are the pitfalls in joining forces with criminal justice agencies such as the police?

Appendix 6

Links to full documents

Hampshire Constabulary website

https://www.hampshire.police.uk/

Southampton Youth Offending Service web page

https://www.southampton.gov.uk/health-social-care/families/youth-offending-service/

Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19

https://www.southampton.gov.uk/images/2018-19-strategic-plan-review-2017-20_tcm63-404235.pdf

Youth and Families Matter website

http://www.youthandfamiliesmatter.org.uk/

No Limits website

https://nolimitshelp.org.uk/

Catch22 (Hampshire 24/7 Substance Misuse Support) website

https://www.catch-22.org.uk/services/hampshire-247-substance-misuse-support/

Swansea Bureau web page

https://yjresourcehub.uk/effective-practice/library-of-effective-approaches/item/320-swansea-bureau-children-first-offenders-second.html

Hull Youth Justice Service webs page

http://www.hull.gov.uk/children-and-families/advice-and-support-young-people/about-hyjs

Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10

https://cmis.hullcc.gov.uk/CMIS/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=xoXy6zzhkxM98OMSxRRXWk%2Bu5LD%2FURlHpdEWV8q9RyeoCaF3cT%2F92Q%3D%3D&rUzwRPf%2BZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3D%3D=pwRE6AGJFLDNlh225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2FLUQzg

A2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3D%3D&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlg%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&kCx1An

S9%2FpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2BAJvYtyA%3D%

3D=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&FgPlIEJYlotS%2BYGoBi5olA%3D%3D=NHdURQburHA%3D&d9Qjj0ag

1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=

ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3D

Codebook

Theme:	Source:	Code:	Extract(s):
Promoting interagency work	Youth and Families Matter website	Encouraging involvement	- Why not join Youth and Families Matter on some challenges?
		Associated businesses/organisations	- In association with Testwood Baptist Church - Primary-aged partner schools
	Hampshire Constabulary website	Encouraging business sponsorship	- (under Business Sponsorship) There are many opportunities which include non-financial support
		Prided upon partnership and technological innovation	- We are independently recognised as efficient, with innovation in partnership and technology playing a key part
		Intra-agency work	- well-developed partnership with Thames Valley Police - benefit from close working with criminal justice partners
		Conditional partnership	- companies can apply for any number of more than 40 powers available for their staff, as long as they are relevant to their role - all accredited persons (Aps) are vetted by the police to non-police personal vetting level 1.5 and must complete a CSAS course run by an approved training provider
		Recognising the benefit of interagency work in crime prevention and community welfare	- by involving your organisation you are helping the police to combat crime as well as caring for the welfare of your staff and customers and the community in which they live and work
		Recognising the multiple effects of crime and the benefits of forging partnerships	- however, we all know that the cost of crime is not purely financial. Jointly funded partnerships mean additional resources to fund services and equipment that helps us in our daily tasks
		Acknowledging the benefits of external funding and sponsorship in delivering quality services	- funding and sponsorship can help us to deliver innovative and creative solutions that enhance the quality of service we provide by financing project that we couldn't otherwise have undertaken
		Encouraging business partnerships to benefit the police force	- Alternatively, you could provide people and expertise. Examples of this include loaning staff to offer their expertise to special projects or

			allowing employees to become special constables
	Swansea Bureau website	A service defined by interagency work	- The Swansea Bureau was established in 2009 through a partnership approach between Swansea Youth Offending Team, South-Wales Police and supported by the wider Community Safety Partnership
	No Limits website	Reliance upon volunteers and other partnerships	- We rely on the support of volunteers, local partnerships and dedicated staff who help thousands of young people a year.
		Emphasising the importance of interagency work	- As well as receiving £30,000 in funding No Limits had access to a training programme host by The King's Fund that provides training, development and networking opportunities. Feedback has shown that this opportunity is as important to the winning charities as the funding as it helps them develop the skills to carry on building their organisation.
		Striving to alleviate mental and physical disadvantage among young people	- Our mission is to: "To help relieve and prevent suffering caused by mental or physical ill-health or by social or economic circumstances amongst young people by establishing, maintaining and developing an information, advice and counselling service for the individual and/or group"
	Southampton Youth Offending Service web page	Explicit promotion of interagency work	- Set up under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, each youth offending service must consist of representatives from probation, social care, health, education and the police to deliver co-ordinated youth justice services. - In Southampton, our key partners are: Southampton Children and Families Service, Hampshire Constabulary, National Probation Service, Southampton City Clinical Commissioning Group
	Hull Youth Justice Service website	A service defined by interagency work	- The Hull Youth Justice Service (HYJS) is a multi-agency service working in partnership with – Hull City Council, Humberside Police, Humberside Probation Trust, NHS Hull, One Hull Strategic Partnership, Hull Citysafe, East Riding Voluntary Action Services (ERVAS)

		Working with education and community actors to help young people achieve positive outcomes	-	We work with the families of young people who offend, along with schools and other community services to help young people achieve positive outcomes and get their lives back on track
	Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10	Explicitly promoting interagency work	- - -	The diversion scheme is managed in partnership by Hull Youth Justice Service, Hull Citysafe, Humberside Police and the Crown Prosecution Service. The scheme was established with active participation and support of all the main partners The main objective of the Challenge and Support intervention is to ensure that the young person is engaged with the full range of universal children's service
		Using risk and need assessment to refer young people to appropriate services	-	5 workers, jointly managed by the ASB team and the Youth Justice Service, offer a city wide service. Based on assessments of risk and need, they refer to local universal or specialist services
	Catch22 website	Delegating team members to provide support services	-	We offer a multi professional team with a designated worker in each district of Hampshire supported by our partnership with Inclusion Recover Hampshire, and Parent Support Link
		Facilitating partnership through offering expertise	-	Our joint approach offers a designated CAMHS Link Practitioners, and we offer expertise to our wider partnerships such as youth offending, children's services, youth support, education and offer specific joined approaches for children at risk of criminal exploitation and wider health risks such as smoking cessation, nutritional and sleep management
		Formalised partnership with Youth Justice Services	-	The service has formalised joint working arrangements with the Youth Offending Team and other agencies to ensure young people receive wraparound care plans and support
	Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice	Promoting partnership work to achieve positive outcomes	-	The Youth Offending Service will continue to strive for positive outcomes by developing and supporting restorative practices both within the Services and with our partners as part of the Local

	Strategic Plan Review 2018/19		Authority's exciting ambition to become Child Friendly Southampton
		Promoting interagency work for educational and economic purposes	- Work with partners to respond to recommendations arising from the 2016 National Review of Youth Justice to improve education and economic outcomes – the YOS and the YOS Management Board continue to monitor strategic developments at local and national level and incorporate these into the development of local strategies to tackle education and economic outcomes
		Explicitly promoting interagency work in a restorative way	- Contribute to the city's ambition to become a Restorative City by further developing restorative practice in schools and with other partners; in order to provide innovative, outcome focussed opportunities for children – 20 schools are either part of the Restorative Practice Network or about to join. The scope of the city's ambitions has extended following the Restorative Conference in autumn 2017 and the commitment of team's and agencies to the city's Restorative Charter
		Explicit promotion of interagency work to reduce reoffending	- Development of effective multi-agency processes and strategies to tackle the continuing concerns around County Lines and Children at Risk of Criminal Exploitation
		Promoting the importance of partnership work	- Partnership working is at the heart of the success of the Youth Justice System in Southampton
Obstacles to effective partnership work and service delivery	Hampshire Constabulary website	Conditional partnership	- companies can apply for any number of more than 40 powers available for their staff, as long as they are relevant to their role - all accredited persons (Aps) are vetted by the police to non-police personal vetting level 1.5 and must complete a CSAS course run by an approved training provider
	No Limits website	Safeguarding confidentiality and well-being	- We won't tell anyone what you have told us, unless you or another person are at risk of harm. You can find out more about our confidentiality policy and how we handle data and information here. - We won't talk about any details you tell us to anyone outside of No

			Limits, unless there is a serious risk of harm to you or another person
			- Offering caring, supportive, confidential environments where young people can explore issues which are affecting their lives
Catch22 website	Safeguarding confidentiality and well-being	-	Our service has a wide range of substance misuse interventions offering young people a confidential and non-judgemental support regarding the use of drugs and alcohol to enable informed choice, harm reduction, improved health and wellbeing.
Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19	Damaging impact of erratic interagency work	-	Ensure that resources are targeted at the most prolific children who offend and those at risk of involvement in serious youth crime by reviewing the Priority Young People strategy with partners. - Engagement with partners has been sporadic and non-attendance at meetings has impacted upon the effectiveness of integrated planning. As a consequence a re-modelling of processes is being undertaken to streamline planning and intervention by making use of forums already in place and to revise the definition of children in cohort subject to the strategy, particularly in light of increased concern about young people's exposure to knife crime and Child Criminal Exploitation.
	Impact of fiscal cuts to maintaining effective interagency work and service delivery	-	Austerity affecting all partners and their resilience to maintain delivery of services. Difficulty in maintaining existing levels of service delivery and having adaptability and capacity to tackle emerging trends and negative impact upon performance
	Inability of partners to mobilise resources due to national constraints	- - -	Conflicting structural and operational frameworks National & local autonomy Some partners are less able to operate innovatively and independently due to national constraints; impacting upon the ability of the Board to collectively deliver effective systems to maintain performance
	Damaging impact of limited resources in facilitating effective and	-	The reduction of resources both within the YOS and across partner agencies means that new ways of

64

		efficient interagency work	undertaking statutory activity will need to be considered and developed in order to drive improvement of performance forward
Promoting diversion *Explicit or implicit*	Youth and Families Matter website	Responding to young people and their family's needs	- We offer front line service delivering welfare to youth and families in our local community at the point of need
		Supporting vulnerable children	- Supporting children with emotional and behavioural needs
	Swansea Bureau website	Explicitly promoting diversion	- Provide young people the opportunity to be diverted out of the criminal justice system - By acknowledging their wrong-doing, the young person is able to make amends and be diverted out of the criminal justice system
		Explicitly operating under a model of diversion	- Since its establishment the Bureau has extended as a model of pre-court diversion across most parts of Wales, operating to the same model as that originally developed by Swansea YOT
	Southampton Youth Offending Service web page	Reducing risk factors linked to youth crime	- We work to reduce the factors which place them at risk of offending including: Addressing their alcohol and drug use, Engaging them back into school, Working on their thinking skills
		Implicit promotion of diversion	- Southampton Youth Offending Service provides support and interventions to a range of individuals. There are mostly people aged 10 to 17 who have committed criminal offences. - Preventative work to reduce the number of young people in the criminal justice system
	Hull Youth Justice Service website	Using risk and need management to deliver diversion	- If a young person is convicted by a Court and placed under statutory supervision, we assess their individual risks and needs, and create a tailored support plan (also called an intervention), we also complete assessments and offer interventions in diversions and pre-court disposals.
	Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10	Promoting diversion as a voluntary avenue for young people	- Where a diversion to the Challenge and Support is considered suitable, the decision is taken voluntarily by the young person and his/her parents or carers
		Implicit promotion of restorative justice and diversion	- Children and young people who admit to a low level offence, have no previous convictions, and show

			some remorse may volunteer, with parental agreement, take part in the Challenge and Support scheme instead of being formally charged and dealt with by the justice system. They must also be willing to participate in a reparative process.
		Aiming to reduce First Time Entrants and young people engagement in the formal youth justice system	- To reduce unnecessary formal criminal prosecutions and thus reduce the numbers of children and young people entering the youth justice system - To reduce the use of remand and custodial sentences by the youth courts
	Catch22	Developing services to address the needs and risks of young people	- From October 2018, we launch our new service dedicated to offering support for children aged 8 – 17 years, offering support and advice. The work will be a mix of group and 1:1 support, delivered in community settings using a wide range of age appropriate interventions to endure that the immediate presenting needs of the child are addressed in a timely manner with due regard taken to identify, monitor and manage risk in relation to safeguarding concerns and to demonstrate confidence in escalating referrals to statutory agencies where appropriate
		Explicit promotion of diversion	- Our services cover the spectrum of youth justice, from crime diversion and prevention through to intensive supervision and surveillance and reparation
		Explicit aim to reduce First Time Entrants	- We aim to prevent first-time entrance into the criminal justice system, intervene when young people have committed an offence and support young people already subject to youth justice.
		Aiming to reduce First Time Entrants though risk and need management strategies	- The number of First Time Entrants to the youth justice system has fallen by 75% since 2003/04. Today those who remain in the system tend to have far greater, more complex needs and higher rates of reoffending. To face up to these new challenges a greater emphasis is needed on understanding both what leads young people to offend and

				which interventions work best to reduce the risk of reoffending.
	Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19	Explicitly promoting diversion to reduce First Time Entrants and speed-up intervention processes	-	Review the Southampton Joint Decision Making Panel following feedback from August 2017 HMIP Thematic Inspection to ensure that youth diversion arrangements continue to be robust.- The service delivery model has been redesigned and the new process has now been implemented; this increases the capacity of the panel to incorporate the 'voice of the child' into the process before deciding on an appropriate intervention and also speeds up the process of engagement once the intervention has been issued by the police
		Treating young people as children first and offenders second	-	Respect for children who offend as children first and foremost
		Extending diversion practices	-	Priorities: Reduce First Time Entrants into the youth justice system Key actions: contribute to the Southampton Gateway Project, to extend the benefits of diversion and out of court disposals for young adults (18 to 24) Lead agency: Hampshire Constabulary
Influence of economic factors	Youth and Families Matter website	Reliance on fund raising	-	As a charity, we need to raise funds to continue the work we do.
	Hampshire Constabulary website	Incentivising business sponsorship for both the police force and the business	-	This is not a way of getting businesses to pay twice for policing. These opportunities are strictly business which could provide you with tangible but also attractive return.
		Prided upon cost efficiency	- -	we are independently recognised as efficient £80m of efficiency has been delivered since 2010, and the force was graded 'outstanding' for short- and long-term financial sustainability in 2015
		Impact of reduced expenditure	-	While being efficient and operating at a lower cost is good for taxpayers, there is a point at which further efficiency cannot be achieved without compromising the effectiveness of local services. For

				us this point will be reached by 2021 unless the residents of Hampshire receive a fair national funding formula
		Acknowledging the benefits of external funding and sponsorship in delivering quality services	-	funding and sponsorship can help us to deliver innovative and creative solutions that enhance the quality of service we provide by financing project that we couldn't otherwise have undertaken
		Promoting cost efficiency in the interest of the public	-	Our cost to the public is the second lowest in the country, which means it's great value for money, but we need to try new approaches to keep within our budget
	No Limits website	Displaying a reliance on, and encouraging, financial support	-	We wouldn't be able to transform the lives of some of the most vulnerable children and young people without our supporters, and we'd love you to get involved so that we can continue to deliver free information, advice, advocacy, counselling and support across Southampton and Hampshire
	Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10	How the scheme is funded	-	Part funded by Department for Education grant, and through the Youth Justice Board
		Issues in assessing cost benefit of the scheme	-	There is a real difficulty in establishing the full cost benefit to the city of Hull, the wider partnership and central government achieved through the overall reduction in youth crime, savings in processing criminal prosecutions to court, and the savings in costs of custody
	Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19	Promoting cost efficiency in the interest of the public	-	Southampton Youth Offending Service is committed to contributing to a fair and effective Criminal Justice System which will provide justice for victims and local communities, rehabilitation, punishment and positive opportunities for children and value for money
			-	Provision of a quality service which is effective, efficient and gives value for money
		Impact of fiscal cuts to maintaining effective interagency work and service delivery	-	Austerity affecting all partners and their resilience to maintain delivery of services. Difficulty in maintaining existing levels of service delivery and having adaptability and capacity

			-	to tackle emerging trends and negative impact upon performance
Community safety ethos	Youth and Families Matter website	Promoting community well-being	- - -	To serve in and work to improve the well being of the community in which we are based. We offer front line service delivering welfare to youth and families in our local community at the point of need enabling the development of relational and personal skills, promoting safety and facilitating positive contributions to others in our community
		Promoting relational and personal development in order to enhance community well-being	-	YFM's vision is to see the growth of well-being in our community, relationally, emotionally, practically and spiritually. In practise this means we support individuals – enabling the development of relational and personal skills, promoting safety and facilitating positive contributions to others in our community
		Community safety values	- -	Promoting safety Children & young people who feel safe
	Hampshire Constabulary website	Collaborating organisations to provide community safety	-	The community safety accreditation scheme (CSAS) is aimed at public and private sector organisations that contribute to providing a safer community
		Prioritising community safety	- - - -	We've retained a strong neighbourhood policing approach Our purpose is to deliver SAFER communities Public and private sector organisations that contribute to providing a safer community community safety projects
		Goals	- - - -	Tackling cyber-crime Tackle the increased reporting of crimes such as child sexual exploitation and domestic abuse Reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour Reduce fear of crime and increase public reassurance
	Catch22 website	Promoting community well-being	- -	For over 200 years we have designed and delivered services that build resilience and aspiration in people and communities Our vision is a strong society where everyone has a good place to live, a

			-	purpose and good people around them.
	Hull Youth Justice Service website	Tailoring intervention to safeguard young people and the wider community	-	The key aims of HYJS are to reduce youth crime, protect the public, and safeguard young people. We help young people stay out of trouble by offering tailored intervention to suit individual needs.
	Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Justice Strategic Plan Review 2018/19	Promoting intervention that is right for the child and safeguards the public	-	Review the implementation of Asset Plus to make sure it is used effectively to reflect the child's views, create intervention plans that change behaviour and ensure the public are protected
		Aiming to prevent youth crime through interventionist methods to increase public safety and well-being	-	Our purpose is to prevent young people offending and once in the Criminal Justice System to accurately assess and offer high quality interventions to young people to reduce crime and to protect victims, in order to increase public safety in Southampton
		Prioritising public safety	-	Regard for the safety of the public as a priority
		Promoting police role in public safety	-	2. Strengthen partnerships to work together to reduce crime, promote public safety and create vibrant, inclusive communities
Child's rights ethos	Youth and Families Matter website	Aiming to address the needs of children and their family's	- -	The project aim is to help the increasing needs of children, young people and families through support, training and education. For young people aged 14-19
		Providing services to young people struggling in education	-	Teaching emotional and social skills to vulnerable children who don't access classroom learning very well
		Providing targeted support services for young people suffering from mental and physical disadvantage	-	We run after school drop in every Tuesday from 3- 5pm. It takes place at Testwood Baptist Church and is for young people aged 14 – 19. It's an open access drop-in but also provides targeted support around issues such as sexual health, drugs and alcohol, education, bullying and self-esteem
	Swansea Bureau website	Acting in the interests of the child	- -	The Bureau is underpinned by a children's rights, restorative justice and needs-led theory base The Bureau process comprises five distinct stages; Arrest and bail, the assessment of young people, assessing the needs of victims, a Pane where the Bureau Co-ordinator, a Police Sergeant and a community

			representative discuss and agree provisional decisions concerning an appropriate outcome for each young person, which may also include intervention programmes and finally attendance at the Bureau clinic where the young person and their parent/carer also attend and agree the final outcome of the young person. - Our staff can assist in signposting to health and substance misuse services, education and training support, and advice on employment and housing
		Promoting voluntary engagement	- Young person and parents/carers must voluntarily engage in the process
	No Limits website	Safeguarding confidentiality and well-being	- We won't tell anyone what you have told us, unless you or another person are at risk of harm. You can find out more about our confidentiality policy and how we handle data and information here. - We won't talk about any details you tell us to anyone outside of No Limits, unless there is a serious risk of harm to you or another person - Offering caring, supportive, confidential environments where young people can explore issues which are affecting their lives
		Promoting children and young people's rights	- Next Steps workers aim to increase knowledge of rights, options and services available to young people who are facing a time of transition - Enabling awareness of their rights and responsibilities and promote children and young people's rights
		Promoting equality and inclusion	- All of our services are free to young people - All young people have an equal right to use No Limits and an equal right to respect. We welcome all young people at the Advice Centre no matter who you are or where you are from and we have made sure that our Advice Centre is accessible for young people no matter what your level of ability
		Promoting social inclusion and reintegration	- If you are leaving a Youth Offending Institute, our Next Steps service can help you to make decisions about your life including where you want to live, whether you would like to go

				into education, employment or training, accessing benefits and managing your money, and any other issues affecting you.
		Providing flexible, personalised support services	-	Next Steps are specialist one to one support workers who can help you achieve your goals. They will work with you on a one to one basis and can work with you at home, in the community or in our drop-in centres
			-	We offer quick and easy access to specialist help through our drop in provision, backed up by our specialist services
		Placing children at the forefront of their support provision	-	We aim to involve children and young people in the planning, delivery and evaluation of all our services
		Working to ensure the welfare of children	-	All our services strive to safeguard the welfare of children and young people to the highest standard.
	Southampton Youth Offending Service webpage	Reducing risk factors linked to youth crime	-	We work to reduce the factors which place them at risk of offending including: Addressing their alcohol and drug use, Engaging them back into school, Working on their thinking skills
	Hull Youth Justice Service website	Tailoring intervention to safeguard young people and the wider community	-	The key aims of HYJS are to reduce youth crime, protect the public, and safeguard young people. We help young people stay out of trouble by offering tailored intervention to suit individual needs.
	Hull Youth Justice Diversion Scheme annual report 2009/10	Promoting diversion as a voluntary avenue for young people	-	Where a diversion to the Challenge and Support is considered suitable, the decision is taken voluntarily by the young person and his/her parents or carers
		Promoting child welfare through children's services referrals	-	The main objective of the Challenge and Support intervention is to ensure that the young person is engaged with the full range of universal children's service
	Catch22 website	Providing specialist intervention for substance misuse	-	Country-wide service offering specialist, targeted and family support for children and young people effected by substance misuse
		Targeted support for young people	-	A country wide, community engagement based service offering targeted and specialist treatment to young people aged 25 years and under

		Safeguarding confidentiality and wellbeing	-	Our service has a wide range of substance misuse interventions offering young people a confidential and non-judgemental support regarding the use of drugs and alcohol to enable informed choice, harm reduction, improved health and wellbeing.
		Adequately and proportionately responding to identified vulnerability and needs of the child	-	Where there is identified vulnerability and complex need, consultation is offered with a Consultant Psychiatrist and health professional, developing a wraparound service responding to individual need
		Developing services to address the needs and risks of young people	-	From October 2018, we launch our new service dedicated to offering support for children aged 8 – 17 years, offering support and advice. The work will be a mix of group and 1:1 support, delivered in community settings using a wide range of age appropriate interventions to endure that the immediate presenting needs of the child are addressed in a timely manner with due regard taken to identify, monitor and manage risk in relation to safeguarding concerns and to demonstrate confidence in escalating referrals to statutory agencies where appropriate
	Southampton Youth Offending Service Youth Strategic Plan Review 2018/19	Promoting intervention that is right for the child and safeguards the public	-	Review the implementation of Asset Plus to make sure it is used effectively to reflect the child's views, create intervention plans that change behaviour and ensure the public are protected
		Showing commitment to reducing offending by looked after children	-	Work collaboratively with Pathways, Looked after Children's Team and Virtual School Head to improve offending and re-offending outcomes for Looked After Children in Southampton – offending by Looked after children has been falling in Southampton and during Quarter 4 no CLA offended; a very impressive statistic. The rate of CLA offending has been falling year on year and Southampton now lies below comparator Local Authorities and National averages; a reversal of the statistics from 4 years ago when the opposite was true.

		Providing targeted intervention for children more likely to reoffend	- Deliver action plan to improve offending and re-offending outcomes for Looked after Children in Southampton
		Treating young people as children first and offenders second	- Respect for children who offend as children first and foremost
		Promoting sustained support and supervision in the interests of the child	- We are a service that aspires to provide the best for our children and young people: we want them to achieve and succeed and we recognise that they will need robust support and supervision along the way in order to achieve this