



Barry, Monica Youth justice policy and its influence on desistance from crime. In: Youth Offending and Youth Justice. Jessica Kingsley Publishers. ISBN 978 18431 06890

<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/20229/>

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk>) and the content of this paper for research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. You may freely distribute the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk>) of the Strathprints website.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to The Strathprints Administrator: eprints@cis.strath.ac.uk

Youth Justice Policy and its Influence on Desistance from Crime

Monica Barry

Introduction

Tackling youth crime has become a prime concern of Government policy relating to children and young people. However, the arena in which such policy is played out remains predominantly within the confines of the youth justice system rather than in wider policy initiatives. As has been seen in other chapters in this book, this has resulted in the increasing criminalisation and stigmatisation of young people, with less emphasis on their status as ‘troubled’ and more emphasis on their label as ‘troublesome’. Although only a small minority of young people offend with any conviction, in both senses of the word, these young people are seen to justify the majority of youth justice funding, policy and practice initiatives. Thus a smaller group is being targeted for a wider and more punitive level of intervention, resulting in ‘substantial penal expansion and concomitant growth in the population of child prisoners’ (Goldson 2005, p.77).

Desistance for young people embroiled in the youth justice system is arguably made more difficult *because* of such intervention, not least because what young offenders feel may help them stop offending runs counter to the policy rhetoric. The rhetoric is about punishing or correcting the young

offender, whereas the young person's experience is of social and structural barriers to change and participation in society.

This chapter briefly explores the literature on desistance as well as current policy statements relating to reducing or preventing re-offending. It then draws out the views of young offenders about what helps and hinders them in the process of desistance, to further explore the tensions and dissonances between the commentaries of young people versus policymakers on youthful offending and youth justice.

The road to desistance

One cannot reduce offending, from an interventionist viewpoint, without first understanding what young people themselves think about offending, the desistance process and what the alternatives to offending actually are. Youth justice policy based on political posturing or media soundbites is unlikely to be effective in reducing offending amongst young people unless there is also some weight given to the theoretical and empirical research evidence about desistance. This section therefore outlines the broad theories of desistance before looking more closely at the extent to which youth justice policy reflects the research 'evidence'.

There are two types of desistance theory which relate to young people and these can be differentiated as follows: one type sees the desistance process as being initiated by the young offender him/herself; the other sees the desistance process as being initiated by social factors (namely policies and structural opportunities for meaningful integration of (ex-)offenders). Both are summarised below:

Desistance and human agency

There are two broad theories of desistance which function at the level of personal agency through their focus on the maturation and rationality of offenders. The first theory emphasises the inevitability of maturation in reducing or stopping offending behaviour in youth (Glueck and Glueck 1940; Rutherford 1986), but such theories tend to operate in a vacuum, devoid of external influences such as schooling, employment, relationships and the social status of young people in transition. Theories of maturational reform also imply that interventions to reduce offending may be counterpro-

ductive, given that young people will naturally grow out of crime. Nevertheless, young people are still disproportionately discriminated against because of their age and the assumption in policy circles, however misguided, that crime is *not* a natural and developmental phenomenon and that young people will *not* stop offending unless external measures are put in place to make them.

The second theory, Rational Choice Theory (Cornish and Clarke 1986), stresses the decision making capacities of individuals not only to start, but also to stop offending, the latter because of the possible 'burn out' or deterrence effect of the youth and criminal justice systems and/or a rational reassessment of the costs and benefits of crime, not least in the transition to adulthood. However, 'rational' decision making could arguably straddle both individual and structural theories of desistance since structural opportunities and constraints will undoubtedly influence rational choice.

The Rational Choice approach in its pure form has been manipulated by policymakers who argue that young people will not stop unless their cognitive skills are improved and their behaviour modified. This suggests a 'deficit' model of youth offending – that young people are solely to blame for their own behaviour because of their own failings. Government policy argues that such deficits can only be remedied by making young people more responsible for their actions and their consequences, referred to as the 'responsibilisation' model of youth offending (Gray 2005). Gray describes responsibilisation of young offenders as: 'challenging perceived deficits in their moral reasoning' (*ibid.*, p.938). Current practice thus focuses on criminogenic needs (principally though not exclusively concerned with deficient moral reasoning) which can be addressed through cognitive-behavioural intervention, and emphasises equality of *opportunity* rather than structural and economic redistribution *per se*. Not only are young people made solely responsible for their actions, they are also expected to take prime responsibility for the remedies. Bennett (2008) argues that offending behaviour programmes make individuals responsible for their own rehabilitation and desistance, and that where they fail to take such responsibilities, punishment will be justified.

Desistance and structural change

The structural factors which may influence desistance mainly include social bonds, employment and marriage. Hirschi (1969) defined social bonds as having emotional ties to others, an investment in relationships, access to legitimate activities and a commitment to the rule of law. Structural opportunities are less available for young people in the transition to adulthood who are confined to school and largely dependent on adults for their livelihood. Structural theories relating to relationships and other social bonds (rather than employment and marriage per se) have proved relatively successful in understanding gender differences in the desistance process amongst young people, in that young women with commitments to partners and children are more likely to desist from crime than young men. Graham and Bowling (1995) found that young women were more likely to make a successful and speedier transition to adulthood, with more opportunities for independent living and less peer pressure to offend. Young women may also have greater access to social and other forms of capital which may enable an earlier progress towards desistance (Barry 2006).

In respect of young adults, several theorists suggest that conventional opportunities such as marriage and employment are crucial factors in the desistance process (Sampson and Laub 1993; Shover 1996). However, many individuals are both married and employed but still persist in offending behaviour and, in respect of young people, relationships and employment can often exacerbate offending because of the transience and instability of such arrangements at that age. As a result of this anomaly it is often stressed that it is the *quality* of such bonds or opportunities rather than the bonds or opportunities themselves that is important in encouraging desistance (Rutter 1996; Sampson and Laub 1993). 'Turning points' – often linked to developing social bonds – may promote desistance by encouraging the revision of personal values about offending and conformity (Farrall and Bowling 1999; Leibrich 1993), although more often than not, such revised values come from within (e.g. the 'burn out' effect mentioned in the previous section or the powerfully felt importance of a new relationship or role) rather than from external influences such as the all-too-rare experience of being trusted with responsibilities or recognised for one's skills and abilities (Barry 2006; Maruna 2001).

The impact of the youth justice system on desistance

As has been suggested by Rod Morgan in the preceding chapter, the youth justice system in England and Wales now has a primary focus on punishment and containment, and as Goldson (2005, p.84) has pointed out: 'the priority role of staff is to maintain discipline, order and institutional security...the care principle is always relegated to a secondary status'. Punishment and discipline are approaches allied very much with desistance at the agency level rather than the structural level, focusing on responsabilisation and individualisation. There is usually an element, however tokenistic, of welfare within the youth justice system in the form of education, training and employment opportunities, but Kemshall (2002) has suggested that the individualisation of the social context of youth crime makes young offenders responsible for negotiating and seizing such opportunities themselves.

This individualisation of risk (Gray 2005) is evident in both the current Scottish and English action plans for youth crime (HM Government 2008; Scottish Government 2008). In Scotland, the policy document – *Preventing Offending by Young People: A Framework for Action* – accepts that the 'deeds' of young offenders can only be addressed in tandem with their needs and that youth justice provision on its own cannot deal effectively with youth crime. To that end it talks of investing in educational, cultural and leisure opportunities for young people through a partnership of children's, educational and youth justice services. Nevertheless, the emphasis remains on building the capacity of young people, their families and communities 'to secure the best outcomes *for themselves*' (para 3.6, emphasis added). With persistent young offenders, the Government wants to 'challenge and change that behaviour and provide the support that will *enable these young people to turn their lives around*' (para 3.18, emphasis added), again stressing the responsabilisation model of tackling youth crime, rather than making available to young people the structural opportunities and community-generated supports that might help them in that process.

The *Youth Crime Action Plan* for England and Wales (2008) combines a somewhat unhealthy and incongruent mix of seemingly proactive welfare measures with overt reactive and punitive measures. On the one hand, it offers 'support for those who *make an effort* to try to turn their lives around' (p.5, emphasis added), it suggests expanding youth work provision, and offers re-

settlement opportunities to those previously in custodial care. On the other hand, it talks of 'tough penalties' for those young people who are 'going astray' or who 'blight' their communities' (p.4), of challenging parents 'to meet their responsibilities' (p.4), of young offenders being seen to repay their communities, and 'making young offenders feel the consequences of their actions' (p.7).

In so doing, the Action Plan adopts a 'triple track approach' with three key objectives:

- enforcement and punishment
- non-negotiable support and challenge
- better and earlier intervention.

However, the emphasis in this Action Plan is very much on managing individual offenders rather than on addressing wider socio-economic constraints. It epitomises the deficit model of youth offending, where the carrot of 'support' is secondary to the stick of 'punishment', and where such support is 'non-negotiable' – an oxymoron par excellence. Such language may be lost on young offenders, but the tone of the argument will be all too familiar to them.

The following section illustrates this point by highlighting the views of young offenders themselves about what helps and hinders them in the process of desistance. This chapter illustrates the dichotomy between young offenders' views and those of policymakers by superimposing the views of young offenders in Scotland, which has a more welfare-oriented youth justice system, onto the policies currently emanating from England and Wales, which espouse neo-correctionalist principles (Cavadino and Dignan 2006). Because incarcerated or accommodated young people in Scotland are arguably treated more humanely than their counterparts south of the Border as a result of the different principles applied in both jurisdictions, their views about punishment, enforcement and coercion are all the more pertinent when set against the backcloth of the neo-liberal system in England and Wales.

Young offenders' views on the desistance process

Much desistance research, whether of the individual or the structural school, suggests a common outcome for young people, namely the social integration

that comes with improved status, responsibilities and rights associated with conformity in adulthood. However, for many young people, not least those who are 'looked after and accommodated' because of their troubled backgrounds or troublesome behaviour, the transition to adulthood and conformity is often elusive.

This section draws on the views of such young people, elicited through two research studies undertaken by Who Cares? Scotland in collaboration with the author (Barry and Moodie 2008; Cruickshank and Barry 2008). In total 103 young people were interviewed, participated in focus group discussions or completed questionnaires, comprising 73 young men and 30 young women between the ages of 11 and 21. The sample was drawn from residential units, residential schools, secure units and young offender institutions across Scotland, and the fieldwork was undertaken during the period November 2006–August 2007.

Whilst one of the studies focused particularly on persistent offending behaviour by young people who were, or had been, looked after and accommodated, the other study sought their perceptions and experiences more generally of residential and secure care, including offending and the use of sanctions for infringement of rules whilst looked after and accommodated. The following analysis is therefore taken from both studies where views and experiences of offending and punishment were noted.

In terms of desistance from crime in youth, the majority of respondents mentioned that they, or other young people, might be encouraged to stop offending if there were more constructive opportunities for them to occupy their time. These included leisure activities, education and employment opportunities, and as one 15-year-old young man suggested: 'something better to do than steal'. For the younger age group, leisure activities in their own communities to relieve boredom and to avoid admission to care were an essential ingredient in the desistance process, not least for young people who felt marginalised from mainstream activities:

There's no community centres. In any of the community centres you go in...they chuck you back out because you're a young one. You can only hang about the streets in groups of five and, even in groups of five, you get lifted. It's stupid... If there were more things in the community for us to do...if there was fighting classes like kick boxing or something,

then we could do it to each other, rather than go out and batter random people, but there's no. There's nothing for us to do. (15-year-old female)

There was nothing to do but hang about street corners... If you put in more football parks and youth clubs in your areas, that would help you sort out offending. That's what I would do a couple of days a week, sit in there and play pool instead of going out fighting. (15-year-old male)

The fear of escalating offending resulting in harsher penalties as they get older was also a prime concern for many young people, not least because young people under the age of 16 in Scotland tend to equate the Children's Hearings system with a more 'welfare' ethos, whereas once they reach the age of 16, they may be treated more harshly by the criminal justice system. However, definitions of 'persistent offending' have become more stringent over the years and have resulted in a higher number of young people escalating through the youth justice system as a result of such labelling, especially young people who are looked after and accommodated.

There are numerous reasons for and ways of measuring persistent offending based on seriousness, frequency, prevalence and legal definition of offending. The Home Office, for example, defines persistent young offenders as those who have been dealt with by the court on three or more occasions and who commit another offence within three years of last appearing before a court (Moore *et al.* 2006). In Scotland, the definition of persistent offending is five 'episodes' of offending within a six-month period which result in referral to the Children's Hearings system. A report produced by Edinburgh City Council (2007) recommended that the Scottish Government re-examine its current definition because of concerns that:

An individual who commits three or four serious episodes over a period of a year falls outwith the definition, but someone who commits five or more minor episodes will be included despite the fact that they may be considered to be at a much lower risk of future offending... The definition is more likely to include children in local authority care, as minor offences are more likely to involve the police rather than being dealt with by families in the home.

Several studies have suggested that children and young people looked after and accommodated are more likely to come to the attention of the police as a

result of 'incidents' occurring within the care environment. The Home Office (2004) highlighted the issue of residential care staff over-reporting to the police young people who were disruptive, thus potentially escalating their movement through the youth and criminal justice systems. Equally, Nacro (2005) has suggested that looked after young people's contact with the police is above average compared with young people generally, and that they are more likely to be reported, warned and prosecuted for relatively minor offences committed within residential care establishments. In Scotland Hill *et al.* (2005, p.21) identified a greater escalation of offending incidents for young people in residential care which were 'very specific to their living situation...compounded [by] cramped conditions in establishments or staff difficulties in managing young people with a variety of different needs'.

As will be seen in the following section, the use of sanctions for often minor misdemeanours in residential care can often result in young people being labelled as persistent offenders and dealt with accordingly. In focus group discussions many of the young people were critical of the Scottish Government's definition of persistent offending (PA Consulting 2004) because five episodes of offending in a six-month period were fairly easy to accrue within the residential care setting, which may result in more young people who are looked after being labelled as persistent offenders.

Nevertheless, a minority of young people felt that being in residential care created a disincentive to accrue more offences because it removed them from the bad influences of peers, drugs and alcohol, and also gave them time to think about their current circumstances and the consequences of offending:

I think these places [secure units and young offender institutions] give you time to reflect on your behaviour when you're sober, straight and have a clear head. You think: 'that's no the way things are done and you never go anywhere in life if you act like that', and I realise that now.
(17-year-old man)

Several young people also commented on encouragement given by professionals as being important in the desistance process, not least if such 'adults' were more willing to trust and respect young people. Positive relationships with professionals have been cited in other desistance literature (see, for example, Barry 2001; [AQ] McNeill, Chapter 8, this volume; McNeill 2006)

and yet the current approach within the youth justice system tends to downplay such constructive and reciprocal engagement between worker and client. The 'triple track' approach of the Youth Crime Action Plan is a case in point, where punishment, coercion and non-negotiated support are the overarching factors in the worker/client relationship. In the following section the views of these respondents are grouped under the three prongs of the current UK Government's initiative to tackle youth crime in England and Wales, as cited above, namely enforcement/punishment, non-negotiated support/challenge and better/earlier intervention.

Young people's attitudes to enforcement/punishment

There is some ambiguity in definitions of, and the resulting balance between, 'care' and 'control' in the lives of young people who are looked after and accommodated – not least if they are accommodated because of their offending behaviour. Children and young people have a right to be 'safe' when accommodated, but likewise the public have a right to protection from crime. Secure care is usually used for more troubled and troublesome young people who are at a high risk of posing a danger to themselves or others if left in their own communities.

Although many of the respondents said they felt safe in secure care, and that it was a justifiable response to their previous behaviour, many also suggested that the environment proved more 'controlling' than 'caring' when it came to the use of sanctions: namely, single separation and restraint. Single separation – where the young person is locked in his/her room to calm down – was said to result from being cheeky, causing damage or fighting with staff or other residents. On occasions, and presumably depending on the mental state of the young person, items would be removed from the room, including mattresses, televisions and writing implements, to ensure that the young person 'reflected' on the incident and apologised before being able to rejoin the group setting. However, this isolation tended to make young people more, rather than less, agitated, thus proving counterproductive in the longer term:

You are asked to go to your room. If you refuse the staff there will try and get you to your room. If they can't... you are dragged... How would you

feel with your room emptied and your toilet locked, stuck in a cell basically? You go off your head 'cos you can't get out. (14-year-old male)

It's a punishment. It should be a last resort, but some staff just stick you in your room right away... It doesn't work, it makes you worse. There is nothing to keep you busy, no TV, no radio, can't even draw. You get nothing, no power in your room... If the staff are in a good mood, you can be in your room for ten minutes. If the staff are in a bad mood, then you can be in your room for two hours. (14-year-old male)

Whilst some young people felt in retrospect that staff had encouraged them to calm down afterwards and that this had been effective, in many respondents' opinion the ultimate aim of single separation was primarily to admit defeat and to apologise to staff, and several commented that this was unfair and often counterproductive: 'Sometimes you don't agree with their views and this can kick you off again' (17-year-old male).

Restraint practices result where a young person is becoming increasingly aggressive and has to be held down by staff for their own protection and the safety of others in the unit. Restraint was often used prior to single separation, and again tended to be seen by respondents as a punishment which would exacerbate rather than diffuse a situation, not least if staff caused undue pain or anxiety for the young person being restrained: 'It definitely makes you worse being restrained. It takes you ages to calm down' (15-year-old female).

Four guys lying on top of you, it's not done right... It doesn't help you, it only makes matters worse... you're in your room after, pure raging, dying to get back out there and start again... Sometimes they take you down wrongly, they hurt you... carpet burns on the face and that. Then the staff say you've been self-harming, but it's not. It's those bastards and the way they put you down. (14-year-old male)

For many young people who are caught up in the youth justice system, there is a lack of clarity – not least for them, but also arguably for practitioners – about the balance required between care and control and enforcement and punishment. This is by no means the first study of young offenders' views which has elicited their criticisms about coercive or punitive measures which they perceive to be harsh or unjustifiable. Coupling these views with their equally common criticism that their views are not taken into account suggests

that the Government's triple track approach may prove counterproductive in effecting a change of attitude or behaviour amongst young offenders. The second element of this triple track approach – 'non-negotiable support' – is now explored below from a young person's perspective.

Young people's attitudes to non-negotiable support

Negotiation is a key factor in offenders' views of what constitutes a good, and more importantly, effective relationship with professionals (Barry 2007): being listened to, having their views taken into account, and even the increasing professional focus on self-assessment in risk of re-offending (Barry 2006), are all crucial elements of negotiation that encourage engagement between worker and client. The Children's Hearings system in Scotland prides itself on taking the views of young offenders into account when deciding on a course of action, and indeed the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child does likewise. Thus the focus of the current Youth Crime Action Plan on 'non-negotiable support' appears to be grossly at odds with existing policy and practice initiatives relating to young people in the youth justice system.

As mentioned above, many of the respondents in the two studies explored here felt that part of the problem within residential and secure care settings was that staff did *not* negotiate with, or listen to, young people in their care. The sanctions imposed on looked after young people were often deemed unfair and disproportionate to the original incident that resulted in such sanctions. Equally, in terms of single separation and restraint, many young people suggested that they had to apologise before such sanctions were lifted, irrespective of whether or not they felt such an apology was justified: 'It's a power thing, I think. If you don't say "sorry" or accept what you have done, then you won't get out of your room' (13-year-old female); '[Restraint] just makes us more angry... They are backing you into a corner... it's a natural instinct to lash out' (15-year-old male).

Sanctions apart, the non-negotiable way in which visits are organised caused a similar reaction amongst respondents, with some suggesting that they were not consulted about who was on their 'visitor list' and why. Whilst it was implied that a young person could 'negotiate' with his/her social worker to have an additional name added to the list, it was the social worker's

prerogative to refuse to allow certain people to visit: 'My best friends aren't allowed [on the list] because my social worker has decided that they are a bad influence' (15-year-old male).

Contact with the 'outside world' was an obvious source of comfort for many young people who were looked after and to be denied this contact only served to fuel their anger, resentment and frustration, not least if that contact was curtailed as a form of punishment.

Equally, school and programme work was also a non-negotiable aspect of being looked after and accommodated which many felt was inappropriate to their needs, and yet refusal to attend could result in sanctions being imposed:

[The staff] just looked at you as their work, there was a pay cheque at the end of it. They weren't listening to what you were saying... In therapy, that psychotherapist asks you questions and doesn't give you any advice back. It's a waste of an hour. (14-year-old male)

Where young people felt that they were not listened to or supported whilst in care, they did have recourse to a complaints procedure. Approximately 50 per cent of respondents in secure care had made a complaint, but only a quarter felt confident that their complaint had been taken seriously. Complaints were often ignored or dismissed by staff as unjustifiable, and many young people were cynical about the value of complaining: 'You can't win with a complaint...nothing ever happens' (14-year-old male).

When asked what advice they would give to other young people being looked after, the comments implied that negotiation was not an option and that submission to authority was more likely to succeed. Advice to other young people such as to 'keep your head down', 'do what you are told' and 'get on with it' was common, albeit sadly defeatist.

Young people's attitudes to better/earlier intervention

'Better' intervention, for many young people in the youth justice system means non-coercive and negotiated engagement with workers within a caring rather than controlling environment. Whilst the majority of respondents spoke positively about certain members of staff in residential and secure care, there was felt to be a lack of consistency of approach within

the staff group which left young people feeling discriminated against. There was also a concern that staff training and attitudes should be improved in order to ensure a more balanced response to the young people in their care. A lack of awareness by some staff of the care and exit plans for young people could also result in an inconsistent or inappropriate level of care.

In terms of earlier intervention, throughcare and aftercare arrangements were often seen as inadequate and 'too little too late' by young people who were looked after. The majority of respondents felt that the support they received was minimal or non-existent as a result of staff shortages and uncertainty about when a young person would be released from care. Greater opportunities on leaving care, such as education or employment, would greatly enhance these young people's chances of stopping offending and yet such opportunities were dependent on advance notice of a leaving date and the commitment and capacity of staff to negotiate constructive opportunities for young people in their communities.

Conclusions

Current UK policy relating to youth crime bears little resemblance either to the perceptions of young offenders about offending and desistance or to academic thinking on the subject. Government policy, notably in England and Wales but increasingly so in Scotland (Cavadino and Dignan 2006), very much reflects the emphasis on individual agency (both the deficit model and its concurrent responsabilisation strategies mentioned earlier) in the process of desistance. Structural factors are lost to agency factors, and agency factors themselves are manipulated to focus not on age and maturation but on the rational intentions of individual young people and the need to change their behaviour.

The research highlighted in this chapter suggests that the triple track approach adopted by the Youth Crime Action Plan will not work effectively because its doctrine runs counter to what young offenders themselves believe will most help both themselves and their communities. It would seem that whilst these young people's views and experiences of the desistance process fitted well with aspects of both the agency and structure debates in the academic literature on theories of desistance, their views and experiences

were much less compatible with the policy directives aimed at reducing offending amongst this population of offenders.

The young offenders in these two studies felt that their offending was indeed a 'phase' that they were going through in youth and from which they would emerge as law-abiding adults – hence reflecting desistance at the level of personal agency. They also suggested that they would not resort to offending if they had constructive and meaningful alternative lifestyles, thus reflecting desistance at the structural level. The problem is, however, that theories of desistance can only reflect the reality if young people are allowed to grow up in a non-stigmatising and non-discriminatory environment where maturational development and structural supports are acknowledged as being essential ingredients in the desistance process. But this is not the case. Young people generally, and young offenders in particular, are subject to a myriad of rules, sanctions, labels and interventions which they often see as unjustified, disproportionate and liable to exacerbate rather than alleviate their youthful behaviour.

The political rhetoric is that the youth justice system will reduce, if not stop, offending amongst young people. The reality is that it will systematically fail in this regard if it does not take into account the views of young people themselves about what helps them in the process of desistance. Carrying out research on children and young people who are looked after and accommodated is difficult at the best of times (McCrystal 2008), but when such young people are also 'offenders' there is a tendency on the part of the system to protect them from scrutiny, ostensibly because of such young people's right to privacy and non-stigmatisation. However, if young offenders in state care cannot describe their circumstances and postulate on their predicament, a key stakeholder view is lost. McCrystal argues 'that children and young people are dependent upon adults' perceptions of whether participating in research is in their best interest' (ibid. p.93), and this indeed begs the question whether it is in *adults'* best interest to have the users of youth justice services voicing their concerns. Nevertheless, without those concerns being heard and being taken on board, youth justice will remain a battle of wills between policymakers and young people in trouble.

The process of desistance can only be understood as a dual process of agency and structure. Agency comes from meaningful and constructive engagement by young offenders in a non-authoritarian relationship with

professionals. Structural opportunities equally need to be meaningful and constructive and negotiated with partners outwith the youth justice arena itself. Solomon and Garside (2008) question the extent to which the youth justice system in a vacuum can actually reduce youth crime, devoid of proactive and collaborative support and opportunities within other youth policy arenas, such as leisure, employment, education and housing.

The youth justice system can thus only be truly effective in helping young people stop offending – if indeed that *is* its main function – if it adopts a partnership approach not only between differing professional services, but also with young offenders themselves, so as to ensure that the support offered is truly negotiable, and that the interventions are appropriate and meaningful to young people rather than coercive and dogmatic.

References

- Barry, M. (2006) *Effective Approaches to Risk Assessment in Social Work: An International Literature Review*. Edinburgh: Stationery Office.
- Barry, M. (2007) 'Listening and learning: The reciprocal relationship between worker and client.' *Probation Journal* 54, 4, 407–422.
- Barry, M. and Moodie, K. (2008) '*This Isn't the Road I Want to Go Down*': *Young People's Perceptions and Experiences of Secure Care*. Glasgow: Who Cares? Scotland.
- Bennett, J. (2008) 'They hug hoodies, don't they? Responsibility, irresponsibility and responsabilisation in Conservative crime policy.' *Howard Journal* 47, 5, 451–469.
- Cavadino, M. and Dignan, J. (2006) *Penal Systems: A Comparative Approach*. London: Sage.
- Cornish, D. and Clarke, R.V. (1986) *The Reasoning Criminal*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Cruickshank, C-A. and Barry, M. (2008) '*Nothing Has Convinced Me to Stop*': *Young People's Perceptions and Experiences of Persistent Offending*. Glasgow: Who Cares? Scotland.
- Edinburgh City Council (2007) *Breaking the Cycle, A Review of Persistent Offending in Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Community Services Scrutiny Panel.
- Farrall, S. and Bowling, B. (1999) 'Structuration, human development and resistance from crime.' *British Journal of Criminology* 39, 2, 253–268.
- Gluck, S. and Gluck, E. (1940) *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York, NY: Common Wealth Fund.
- Goldson, B. (2005) 'Child imprisonment: A case for abolition.' *Youth Justice* 5, 2, 77–90.
- Graham, J. and Bowling, B. (1995) *Young People and Crime*. London: Home Office.
- Gray, P. (2005) 'The politics of risk and young offenders' experiences of social exclusion and restorative justice.' *British Journal of Criminology* 45, 6, 938–957.

- HM Government (2008) *Youth Crime Action Plan*. London: Home Office.
- Hill, M., Walker, M., Moodie, K., Wallace, B., Bannister, J., Khan, F., McIvor, G. and Kendrick, A. (2005) *Fast Track Children's Hearings Pilot, Final Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Home Office (2004) *Preventative Approaches Targeting Young People in Local Authority Residential Care, Development and Practice Report*. London: Home Office.
- Kemshall, H. (2002) 'Effective practice in probation: An example of "advanced liberal" responsibilisation.' *Harvard Journal* 41, 41–58.
- Leibrich, J. (1993) *Straight to The Point: Angles on Giving up Crime*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- McCrystal, P. (2008) 'Researching children and young people living in residential state care: Hurdles on the path to consent.' *Research Ethics Review* 4, 3, 89–94.
- McNeill, F. (2006) 'A desistance paradigm for offender management.' *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 6, 1, 39–62.
- Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Moore, R., Gray, E., Roberts, C., Taylor, E. and Merrington, S. (2006) *Managing Persistent and Serious Offenders in the Community*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Nacro (2005) *A Handbook on Reducing Offending by Looked After Children*. London: Nacro.
- PA Consulting (2004) *Scottish Youth Justice Baseline*. London: PA Knowledge Ltd.
- Rutherford, A. (1986) *Growing out of Crime: The New Era*. Winchester: Waterside Press.
- Rutter, M. (1996) 'Transitions and turning points in developmental psychopathology: As applied to the age span between childhood and mid-adulthood.' *International Journal of Behavioural Development* 19, 603–626.
- Sampson, R. J. and Laub, J.H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scottish Government (2008) *Preventing Offending by Young People: a Framework for Action*. Available at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/06/17093513/7> (accessed 29 May 2009).
- Shover, N. (1996) *Great Pretenders: Pursuits and Careers of Persistent Thieves*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Solomon, E. and Garside, R. (2008) *Ten Years of Labour's Youth Justice Reforms: An Independent Audit*. London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.