

A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF YOUNG PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCES OF TRIAGE AS A RESTORATIVE
DISPOSAL IN YOUTH JUSTICE

Rebecca Charlotte Jane Forde

Presented as part of the requirement for the award of the Master of Science Degree

in Forensic Psychology

at

University of Gloucestershire

December, 2013

ABSTRACT

The research aimed to explore Triage, a restorative disposal available for young people (aged 10-17) who have committed a low-level offence. Triage has been found to be associated with reduced reoffending and First Time Entrants (FTEs) into the youth justice system, but little is known about the process and impact of Triage from the perspectives of the young people themselves. This qualitative study explored young people's experiences of Triage, focusing on aspects of the scheme that promoted change. Ten semi-structured interviews were conducted with young people (aged 14-17) who had participated with the scheme in Cardiff or the Vale of Glamorgan. Thematic analysis yielded three themes: effective engagement in promoting change, reflection of incident and moving forward. The themes captured the process in which young people engage with Triage; of central importance was the relationships they form in promoting change, and their strategies to affirm a non-offending ideal, allowing them to move forward with their lives. In light of this, relevant organisations should emphasise those desistance strategies that young people prioritise. The strength of research lies in the fact that young people are so often absent from justice discourse, however, additional research is required in order to explore these findings further.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	7
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	14
CONCLUSION.....	25
REFERENCES.....	27
APPENDIX.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Participant characteristics	8
II	Thematic coding	11

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an increased emphasis to reduce the number of First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the youth justice system and to reduce reoffending (Nacro, 2009). Although it is difficult to ascertain the true extent of youth crime, as a result of reporting tendencies and low detection rates (MOJ, 2013a); it is evident that youth crime remains a high priority. For example, in 2011/12 there were 1,360,451 arrests in England and Wales of which 210,660 were young people aged 10-17, accounting for 15.5% of all arrests, indicating an over-representation of young people in the criminal justice system (Ministry of Justice [MoJ], Home Office [HO] & Youth Justice Board [YJB], 2013). Moreover, research demonstrates that those convicted at a young age tend to become the most persistent offenders (Farrington, 1996), demonstrating the importance of an increased focus on young people when developing crime prevention strategies (Crawford, 1998).

Thus the following research seeks to explore Triage, a restorative disposal available for young people who have committed a low-level offence. The aim of Triage is to divert young people, aged 10-17, away from formal sanctions and towards restorative justice disposals; whilst aiming to tackle underlying issues such as substance misuse and to encourage Education, Training or Employment (ETE) opportunities. Currently Triage's success is measured by the extent to which they reduce subsequent FTEs into the youth justice system and reduce further reoffending. However, as the scheme is relatively new, it is difficult to attribute causality with a degree of certainty. Further, very little is known about the impact of Triage from the perspective of the young people themselves. The research therefore examined the experiences of a group of young people who had offended and subsequently engaged with Triage, with the aim of recognising their perception of the scheme. In order to consider the aims of Triage, it is important to do so in the backdrop in which Triage was implemented, as a means of diversion and guided by the principles of restorative justice. The introduction has therefore been divided into four main parts. The first, a review of the statistics involving young offenders followed by a review of the research surrounding diversion and restorative justice, and finally an overview of Triage.

FTEs are classified as young people, resident in England and Wales, who received their first reprimand, final warning or court conviction (YJB, 2011). Figures indicate a sharp reduction in the numbers of FTEs in the past 10 years; in 2011/12 there were 36,677 young people formally entering the youth justice system; this is a decrease of 20% from 2010/11 and a decrease of 59% from 2001/02 (MoJ, HO & YJB, 2013). However, whilst the cohort of young people entering the youth justice system has sharply reduced in recent years, the overall re-offending rate within this cohort has risen (MOJ, 2013b). Furthermore the proportion of people who re-offended in 2010/11 was highest for young people, as compared to young adults (18-20, 31.5%) and adults (21+, 24.2%). As a result, the young people coming into the criminal justice system are, on balance, more challenging to work with, as reflected in the higher predicted rate of re-offending and average number of offences (MoJ, HO & YJB, 2013).

The high level of re-offending among young people, leads to the suggestion that alternatives are required. Barnardo's (2010) suggest that criminal justice interventions fail to instil a sense of personal responsibility and are ineffective at tackling the multiple factors associated with youth crime. Criticism has also been made that the justice system for children in England and Wales is not sufficiently distinct from the adult system, and is at odds with the principles of the Convention on

the Rights of the Child (UNCRC); as a result too many children are criminalised and brought into the youth justice system (UK Children's Commissioners, 2008). Monaghan, Hibbert and Moore (2003) argue that an effective child-centred system needs to be established to ensure that children in trouble with the law are treated as children first. Similarly, the UK Children's Commissioners (2008) emphasise the need to ensure that the rights of children are promoted and their voices heard.

EFFICACY OF DIVERSION

Researchers have suggested that early criminalisation has harmful consequences (e.g. Glover & Hibbert, 2009) and being drawn into the formal proceedings of courts and criminal records at an early age can actually increase the likelihood of reoffending (Knuutila, 2010). Thus diverting first time offenders from the youth justice system may be an important step towards the preventing the development of an offending career (Nacro, 2002). Research has also demonstrated the beneficial effects of diversion. Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino and Guckenburg (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of 29 randomised controlled experiments. The study included 7,304 young people over a 35-year period either diverted with or without services as compared to those formally processed by the youth justice system. In every instance, official processing had a negative effect on crime measures of prevalence (-.11), incidence (-.23) and severity (-.14); thus indicating that formally moving young people through the youth justice system has a negative crime control effect as compared to diversionary tactics. However the results were not uniform across every study and a larger negative effect size was found for those diverted with services such as education or restorative conferencing as compared to those offered nothing.

McAra and McVie (2007) also found that those young people who were placed on supervision were significantly more likely to be involved in serious offending one year later than their matched counterparts who had been diverted. In other words, their formal intervention hindered their desistance process. Thus indicating the damaging impact of system contact, with interventions serving to amplify rather than diminish offending. McAra and McVie (2007) suggest the youth justice system is 'criminogenic', with the negative consequences becoming greater the further into the system the young person is propelled. McAra and McVie (2010) have therefore argued for the importance of developing interventions that are proportionate to need, but operate on the principle of maximum diversion. This requires the intervention to be calibrated depending on their level of risk posed, and is tailored towards their specific needs. In line with such findings, the Home Office (2006) issued revised guidelines encouraging a greater use of diversion, they also emphasised the need to prioritise restorative justice processes, as a means to help the young person confront the consequences of their offence.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Only recently has restorative justice achieved widespread prominence in England and Wales (Johnstone & Van Ness, 2007). This is due primarily to the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) which incorporated elements of restorative justice as part of youth justice in the UK (Dignan, 2007). Although there remains debate as to what constitutes restorative justice; one commonly accepted definition is: "a process whereby parties with a stake in a specific offence collectively resolve how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future" (Marshall, 1999. p.5). The key principle here is a greater focus on repairing relationships through a healing process that is designed to meet the needs of the victim and which seeks to 'reintegrate' the

offender, whilst also encouraging the offender to take responsibility for their actions (Haines & O'Mahony, 2006). Thus the Labour government adopted principles of restorative justice when it stated that the three principles underpinning their reform of the youth justice system were 'restoration', 'reintegration' and 'responsibility' (Dugmore & Pickford, 2006).

The aim of Restorative justice is to respond to crime through a conversational and dialogic approach (Daly, 2005); that is based on the offender accepting personal responsibility and repairing the damage they have done, instead of merely receiving punishment (Knuutila, 2010). Restorative justice aims to give both victim and offender a voice during this process for them to express their views and emotions (Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather & Platow, 2010). It is also evidenced to work when there are collective victims, including corporations (e.g. shops) and communities (e.g. schools or parks; Sherman & Strang, 2007). For this reason, there are a range of contexts in which restorative justice can be deployed, and varying degrees to which such processes can be incorporated within the criminal justice system (Dignan, 2007). As a result restorative justice is often considered as an "encompassing concept which has diverse implications that are theoretically driven from a number of key principles" (Haines & O'Mahony, 2006 p.111).

THEORY OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

The theoretical grounding for restorative justice is mainly attributed to Braithwaite's (1989) theory of reintegrative shaming. Reintegrative shaming involves disapproving of the criminal act while treating the offender as a good person, thereby avoiding any permanent labelling of the offender as a criminal. Braithwaite (1989) suggests that an individual is more likely to reoffend if they are condemned to permanent stigma as a criminal. This paradigm also fits Tyler's (1990) theory of procedural justice; Tyler (1990) suggests that when offenders believe they have been treated fairly by the criminal justice system, they will be more likely to comply with the law, whereas those who perceive sanctions as unfair are more likely to resist the law. According to Sherman et al. (1998) this is in accordance with the research findings that offenders accord a higher level of procedural justice during restorative justice procedures as compared to those assigned to court. Sherman (1993) also suggests that procedural justice of experienced punishment is essential for the acknowledgement of shame, which conditions deterrence. Thus, by implication, crime can be reduced by police and courts treating people with fairness and respect. Sherman (1993) stipulates that restorative justice is therefore effective as it centres on persuasion rather than punishment, with the aim of persuasion to enhance moral support for voluntary obedience of the law. This is in accordance with previous research that has indicated the positive impact of restorative practices at multiple levels as compared to formal sanctions (Bazemore & Elis, 2007).

Sherman and Strang (2007) reviewed the evidence in the UK and internationally for the use of Restorative Justice and argued that fostering remorse may be more effective in bringing about behavioural change than the use of fear as a deterrent. Johnstone and Van Ness (2007) propose through such practices crime can be controlled more effectively, whilst also providing a meaningful experience of justice for victims of crime and genuine accountability for offenders alongside their reintegration into law-abiding society. Shapland et al. (2008) conducted an evaluation of three restorative justice schemes. They found that those offenders who participated in restorative justice committed statistically significantly fewer offences in the subsequent two years than offenders in the control group. The study also found that the communication with the victim had significantly

affected the likelihood of offender's subsequent reconviction. Specifically, those offenders who wanted to meet the victim and were more actively involved were subsequently more likely to desist from future offending. Shapland et al. (2008) suggested a possible theoretical interpretation of this finding relates to the value of restorative justice events promoting desistance in offenders. They referred to this discussion as 'desistance talk' because it allows examination and discussion of how to resolve offending-related problems and provides additional support for their decision to desist.

TRIAGE

Following the acknowledgement that "the likelihood of re-offending increases the further a young person gets into the criminal justice system" (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2007, p.139). It was announced that pre-court restorative approaches to youth offending would be piloted from April 2008, in order to establish a more appropriate way to deal with low-level first offences. Triage, alongside other schemes was therefore set up as part of the Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP, 2008). The aim of Triage is to divert young people away from formal sanctions and towards restorative justice interventions and other services (Home Office, 2012). Triage interventions are only offered however, if the young person involved admits to the offence, indicates remorse and voluntarily agrees to take part (Wood et al., 2011). The offence should be of a gravity score of 3 or less (less serious offence) and otherwise warrant a reprimand or final warning disposal (Moore, Sellen, Crompton & Hallingberg, 2012). If the young person is accepted for Triage, they will not receive a criminal record.

Upon agreeing to Triage involvement, young people receive a holistic assessment looking at multiple aspects of their lives, with the aim of developing an agreed action plan. This is done in partnership; in order to involve the young person in target setting and to increase their ownership of plans (Hart & Thompson, 2009). The assessment is usually conducted on the same day as arrest, providing a swift progression away from custody (YJB, 2008a), whilst ensuring the incident is still fresh in the young person's mind (Soppitt & Irving, 2011). The young person will have access to a range of appropriate services, such as counselling, education and training support as identified during the assessment. The link was developed based on the evidence that a high proportion of young people involved in the youth justice system have poor educational attainment (e.g. Communities that Care, 2005 & Farrington et al., 2006), substance misuse problems (e.g. Nacro, 2013) and emotional or mental health needs (e.g. Healthcare Commission, 2009). This indicates the need for schemes to proactively engage with the causes of offending behaviour in order to reduce their future risk of offending behaviour (Knuutila, 2010). The action plan also includes a suitable reparation activity which may comprise: a letter of apology, a restorative meeting with the victim, a direct apology or a practical activity. The aim is to provide a meaningful activity to the young person as a way of paying back for the harm caused by the offence (YJB, 2008b).

The exact number of young people going through Triage schemes in England and Wales is unknown (MoJ, HO & YJB, 2013), although the Home Office (2012) reported that in January 2011 there were approximately 55 schemes operating across England and Wales. Triage is still in its early stages of development, and as such, research on Triage remains scarce. Nevertheless the research that does exist provides positive findings. Wood et al. (2011) for example, evaluated Triage in Liverpool; they found that the majority of young people felt sorry for what they had done and had found the Triage activities useful, however of the 250 questionnaires, only 12 were returned; it is therefore highly

likely the sample is biased towards those that complied with the scheme. In Newcastle Upon Tyne (Soppitt & Irving, 2011) Triage was reported to be a highly effective intervention, through the early identification of risk leading to a swift and effective response. When interviewed the young people felt Triage had been a valuable experience, and expressed remorse for their offence, they also reported they did not intend to reoffend in the future. However, concerns were raised that young people only agreed to Triage to avoid going back to the police. Similar concerns have previously been highlighted regarding the voluntary nature of restorative justice schemes as young people may be motivated to participate, due to a fear of alternative sanctions (Karp, Sweet, Kirshenbaum & Bazemore, 2004), thereby undermining the voluntary nature of the scheme (Gelsthorpe & Morris, 2002).

The Home Office (2012) also evaluated the impact of Triage schemes in 5 different areas. Triage was highly valued for its early intervention and diversionary approach by many of the stakeholders interviewed. It was also found that the rate of post-Triage convictions (5-7%) were lower than the national average (21.3%) for FTEs to the youth justice system in 2008. Whilst these figures do indicate a reduction in offending subsequent to Triage involvement, caution is required when drawing conclusions regarding the effect of Triage. The reductions took place against the backdrop of a sharp national reduction in the number of FTEs; it is therefore uncertain if any trends shown can be directly attributed to the Triage. Longer term analysis is therefore required to establish this association. The Home Office (2012) also reported variation across the schemes; each having been implemented to meet local needs. It is therefore important to also evaluate Cardiff Triage on its own merit.

Cardiff's Triage team was a pilot operational from November 2009, based within Cardiff's Youth Offending Service. It has since become part of a voluntary organisation; Media Academy Cardiff (MAC) and the scheme has recently been extended to include the Vale of Glamorgan. The team was set up with restorative justice as a key principle, and this has acted as the central pillar of their practice (Cardiff Triage, 2013). In order to also maintain a victim-led approach, Cardiff Triage utilise a dedicated restorative justice worker, whose role is to contact victims where appropriate. During their discussion the offence will be discussed, encompassing its effects on the victim and how the harm can be repaired. This information will then be reported back to the young person. It is envisaged that this victim-led approach will create an opportunity for the young person to reflect on their behaviour and the impact of crime on themselves and others (Wood et al., 2011). During a 6 month evaluation of Triage (Cardiff Triage, 2010) the high victim engagement of 77% was praised as compared to the national standard of 25%, although it was recognised that direct restorative justice continues to be a challenge for young people. When evaluating Cardiff Triage, Moore, Sellen, Crompton and Hallingberg (2012) reported the successful integration of a range of services that work together towards reducing crime; stipulating that Cardiff Triage demonstrated early opportunities for realigning resources towards a robust, proactive and preventative model. Cardiff council (2013) also reported the scheme to be successful in preventing children from coming into the criminal justice system; recognising the large proportion of young people who remained engaged throughout the scheme (95%) and the low level of subsequent re-offending (5.5%). However they also identified the need to obtain more detailed findings from the young people involved, in order to evaluate the scheme further.

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Despite the proliferation of restorative justice schemes in recent years, there remains little evaluative research in the UK (Haines & O'Mahony, 2006) and notably very few studies consider the young person's perspective (Choi, Green & Gilbert, 2011). Thus the real voice of young offenders is seldom heard (Suthers, 2011). This is at odds with studies that have shown that young people can be valuable informants by providing insights into the services that are likely to be most effective (Hart & Thompson, 2009). Involving young people therefore enables Triage to help ensure they are meeting the needs of young people, whilst acknowledging their right to have their views taken into account (Suthers, 2011). Thus the research aimed to examine the experiences and perspectives of young people involved with Triage. A qualitative approach was deemed most appropriate as it is rooted in the idiographic, allowing much more detail to be extracted through the individual's account (King & Horrocks, 2010). The focus was on understanding how young people experience the Triage process, their experiences and perspectives were also assessed in relation to the underpinning principles of restorative justice, a central pillar of the scheme. This was achieved under the direction of the following two research questions:

1. How do young people perceive and experience Triage?

Due to the broad scope of the research, an overall impression of the scheme was aimed for as perceived by the young person; this was their opportunity to highlight any elements they consider important.

2. How do the young people's experiences throughout Triage relate to the underpinning principles of restorative justice?

The aim was to explore the extent to which the principles of restorative justice were visible and experienced throughout the scheme. This is defined in terms of the young person's perception about the repair of harm (restoration); the degree to which they emphasised with the victim and expressed an understanding of how people are affected (responsibility); the potential for reintegration and the extent to which the scheme was perceived as voluntary.

By working in collaboration with young people, the aim was to find out directly from those involved, the issues that affect them and to achieve a fresh perspective (Save the Children, 2010). This potentially can help improve the services provided by Triage, as it may highlight those aspects valued by the young people themselves. The research may also contribute to the broader literature on young people who have offended by attempting to identify those aspects of diversionary tactics and restorative justice that prove to be of importance.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

The young people were actively recruited via purposeful sampling, as it was believed that young people who had been involved with Triage would be able to provide an information-rich account, thus by focusing in-depth on a select few would illuminate the questions under study (Patton, 1990). A maximum variation sampling strategy was adhered to, in that a wide variation of young people was aimed for to best exemplify the range of perspectives (Burman, 2002). In order to maximise variation the following diverse characteristics were identified: age, gender, location, offence type, engagement, status and commencement with the scheme. The Triage workers were encouraged to approach young people across all types of characteristic variability; this was done ad hoc during their daily interactions. Following this stage nineteen young people preliminarily agreed to take part in the research; only then was the researcher permitted to establish contact with the young person. Following this stage, ten participants agreed to be interviewed. The main reason for withdrawal included lack of spare time due to other commitments such as work or holidays or lack of response.

TABLE A: Participant characteristics

Young person code	Gender	Age	Commenced with Triage (approximately)	Triage status	Location	Engaged with the scheme	Length of interview (minutes)
A	Female	16	First time 10 months ago, second time 6 weeks ago	Completed first, Active second	Cardiff	Yes	24
B	Female	16	5 months	Active	Cardiff	Yes	21
C	Female	17	6 months	Completed	Cardiff	Yes	36
D	Male	17	6 weeks	Completed	Cardiff	Yes	21
E	Male	16	2 months	Active	Vale of Glamorgan	Yes	12
F	Male	16	3 months	Active	Vale of Glamorgan	Yes	14
G	Male	14	1 month	Active	Vale of Glamorgan	Yes	11
H	Male	16	1 month	Active	Vale of Glamorgan	Yes	8
I	Male	17	1 year, 5 months	Completed	Cardiff	Yes	50
J	Male	17	2 months	Active	Cardiff	Yes	24

As illustrated in the table above the final sample consisted of ten young people, who were predominately male (n=7, 70%) with a mean age of 16.2 years (range: 14-17) and the majority resided in Cardiff (n=6, 60%). The mean length of time since commencing with the scheme was 5 months (range: 1 month to 1 year 5 months) and the majority were still actively involved with Triage (n=7, 70%). They had all been arrested for a low level offence. This included: theft, violence, criminal damage, public disorder, handling stolen goods and drug possession. However to protect their anonymity their exact offence is not specified. Variation of young people involved with the scheme was achieved for each criterion except engagement; It was hoped that individuals who failed to engage with Triage would be incorporated, as unusual cases may be particularly enlightening (Patton, 1990). Thus it is recognised that the findings will only reflect those young people who engage and comply with the scheme.

DESIGN

The purpose of the research was to understand how young people had experienced Triage; the concern was therefore with meanings attributed to events by the young people themselves. The

research was therefore open-ended and inductive, concerned with the exploration of lived experience from the perspective of the young person (Green & Thorogood, 2004). The method chosen for the research was that of semi-structured interviews. Kvale and Brinkman (2009) describe semi-structured interviews as “An interview with the purpose of obtaining descriptions of the life world of the interviewee in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena” (p.3). This was therefore deemed the most appropriate method to answer the research questions as it provides an opportunity for the interviewee to talk about a particular aspect of their life with the added benefit of allowing for clarification and elaboration of their responses (Willig, 2008).

The epistemological stance taken in this research was a social constructionist approach. Knowledge constructed is believed to be the product of specific interactions, constructed within different historical and cultural contexts (Burr, 1995). Language plays an important aspect of socially constructed knowledge as the same event can be described in different ways, resulting in various ways of constructing social reality and in an absence of an ultimate truth, rather multiple truths that co-exist (Willig, 2008). Based on this epistemological position, the transcripts are viewed as a manifestation of available discursive resources that the young person is drawing upon to construct a particular version of events (Willig, 2008). It is believed that the words the participants speak will not provide access to their internal states, such as attitudes (Carter & Little, 2007); thus no attempt was made to measure such entities. It is also recognised that the researcher has contributed to the construction of meanings throughout the process, the researcher has therefore maintained a reflective log during the research in order to explore their involvement, and how their values, experiences and beliefs may have shaped the research.

MATERIALS

The following materials were used: An audio recorder, information sheet (Appendix A), recruitment poster (Appendix B), consent form (Appendix C), debrief form (Appendix D) and interview schedule (Appendix E)

As no prior qualitative interviews involving Triage had been conducted; the interview schedule was developed using a combination of the following sources: Published information regarding Triage (e.g. Home Office, 2012); personal insight from those working within Triage; previous interview schedules formulated for other restorative justice disposals, such as the referral order (e.g. Newbury, 2008 & Miers et al, 2001); and previous questionnaires used to evaluate Triage (Wood et al. 2011). To ensure a suitable interview schedule was developed it was discussed and reviewed with both the University of Gloucestershire dissertation supervisor and suitable members of the Triage team.

The interview schedule consisted of fifteen pre-specified topic areas, each containing numerous probes and prompts to use as required (Appendix F). The questions were selected as each had a particular relevance to at least one of the two research aims. For example:

Research aim 1: How do young people perceive and experience Triage?

Example question: “can you tell me about your knowledge of the Triage scheme?”

Research aim 2: How do the young people’s experiences throughout Triage relate to the underpinning principles of restorative justice?

Example question: "Do you feel Triage has helped you move on from the incident?"

The aim of the interview was to cover each stage of their Triage involvement, from the moment they were first informed of the scheme by the police, up until the present day and their feelings about their progress made. Each question was used as a starting point, and the young person subsequently asked probing questions and prompts such as 'Can you give me an example of that?'. Careful reflection was conducted after each interview to consider the interviewee's responses to the questions posed. Where it was felt the question had led to confusion or a limited response, the question was slightly altered with the aim of encouraging a more detailed response. This was done within the scope of the topic area, so not to deviate from the research aims.

PROCEDURE

The active assistance of the Triage workers was a necessity as the researcher was unable to initiate contact with the young people. The Triage workers were provided with an advert containing brief information and an information sheet detailing the purpose of the research to pass onto young people involved with the scheme. If the young person expressed interest then contact was made by the researcher to provide more detailed information. Once all aspects of the research were confirmed, a meeting time was arranged to conduct the semi-structured interview; this was arranged at a convenient time for them, but within the Triage building either located in Cardiff or Vale of Glamorgan so to maintain a safe and comfortable environment. All participants were required to sign a consent form before commencing the interview, for those under 16 years parental consent was also obtained prior to the interview. Each interview was recorded and later transcribed verbatim and not reduced at any point until the commencement of analysis (Davidson, 2009). Participants were made anonymous during transcription and any identifiable details (e.g. locations and names) omitted. A transcription system was followed to ensure consistency and precision throughout (Davidson, 2009). The transcription system was adapted from Poland (1995) and King and Horrocks (2010) (Appendix G).

ANALYSIS

Recordings were immediately transcribed verbatim; a verbatim record was deemed beneficial as it enables a closeness between the researcher and the text, thus facilitating data analysis by bringing the researcher closer to their data (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006). All transcription was conducted by the researcher, providing the advantage of having first-hand knowledge, expertise in the subject area and having participated in the exchange, the risk of any potential transcription errors was reduced (Poland, 1995). Once all interview transcripts were completed thematic analysis was conducted on each of the transcripts. Braun and Clarke (2006) describe thematic analysis as a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns within data. In relation to the research question it therefore provides a method of unpicking meanings, whilst looking for patterns to hopefully provide an insight into the young person's experiences. Familiarisation with the data was essential before commencing the analysis (King, 1999).

As recommended by King and Horrocks (2010) descriptive coding was initially conducted, which involved familiarisation with the transcripts; highlighting areas of interests, followed by preliminary comments and then descriptive codes, the aim was to stay close to the data, avoiding speculation, this was treated as ongoing process and codes modified or merged when necessary. Following this

stage, descriptive codes were grouped together forming an interpretive code to capture the meaning. This was also treated as a reiterative process, in which the interpretive codes were continually redefined, until it was decided that all relevant meanings were captured. Finally overarching themes were developed that aimed to characterise key concepts in the analysis. Three themes were developed, although each was well-defined and distinct, they were all contained within a conceptual model with the aim of answering the research questions.

Main themes were identified, drawing illustrative examples from the transcripts (Appendix J). Whilst the themes are representative of all young people, each was consistently checked case-by-case to ensure the individual account was maintained (Appendix K). The final overarching themes and interpretive codes are indicated in the table below.

TABLE B: Thematic coding

Overarching theme	Interpretive code	Discussed in results
EFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH TRIAGE IN PROMOTING CHANGE	1. Therapeutic relationship	Yes
	2. Active participation	No
	3. Solution focussed	No
	4. Motivation to agree	Yes
	5. Barriers to engagement	Yes
	6. Perceived procedural justice	Yes
	7. Positive outcome	Yes
REFLECTION OF INCIDENT	1. Reflection on past behaviour	No
	2. Impact of offence (on self)	No
	3. Consideration of others	No
	4. Supportive challenge	Yes
	5. Expressing remorse	Yes
	6. Accepting responsibility	No
	7. Minimise severity of incident	No
MOVING FORWARD	1. Move on from the incident	Yes
	2. Learn from mistakes	No
	3. Self-develop	No
	4. Developing positive goals and aspirations	Yes
	5. Disengagement with deviant peers	Yes
	6. Construction of self-identity (as a non-offender)	Yes
	7. Desist from future offending	No

As illustrated in the table, three overarching themes were developed, with seven interpretive codes contained within each. As there is insufficient space to discuss each code in detail, the focus is on those that most strongly illustrate what the theme incorporates and which most effectively answer the research questions. Quotations are also included where it is felt they add to the analytic narrative.

In order to ensure a trustworthy analytical process, several techniques were utilised; this included the researcher reflecting on assumptions and feelings by keeping a reflexive journal throughout the research process (Green & Thorogood, 2004). Thick description and audit trails were maintained; this included keeping a record of the major stages of developing and organising the themes. Independent coding was also conducted as a quality check, the aim of which was to enable the researcher to think critically about the thematic structure and the coding decisions made. Independent coding was conducted at the final stage, by a peer following a code-confirming approach, in which the coder was asked to critically scrutinise the codes developed (King & Horrocks, 2010).

ETHICAL ISSUES

Ethical approval was granted in advance by the University of Gloucestershire Faculty Research Ethics Panel (FREP; Appendix H and I) and appropriate channels at Triage were consulted. The research was designed and implemented within an ethical structure that was young person-centred, enabling them to express their views, whilst ensuring their participation was informed and voluntary, and their protection maintained (Save the Children, 2010). Ethical issues arose throughout the research; it was therefore of importance that the researcher remained ethically attuned throughout (Willig, 2008). Any acknowledged concerns are therefore highlighted below, along with any procedures set in place to maintain ethical integrity (BPS, 2009 & BPS, 2010).

It was important that all young people understood that their involvement was truly voluntary, and that refusal would be of no detriment to their Triage progress. This was confounded by the necessity for the Triage youth worker to initiate contact with the young person; considerations were therefore taken to reduce significant risks associated with using insiders to help with recruitment. It was emphasised that no young person should feel pressured to take part, all youth workers were briefed about the research and its aims, and regular contact was maintained (King & Horrocks, 2010).

Care was taken to ensure the individual fully comprehended the consent form, allowing the opportunity for questions if required. The researcher also went through each point in the consent form and provided a clear explanation to ensure understanding. It was crucial that participants did not suffer from any distress. The interview schedule was therefore designed in such a way that attempted to encourage mutual respect and trust, supporting the young person to openly discuss their experiences. Indeed Newbury (2008) found that the majority of young offenders were pleased that someone was interested in them; many seeing this as a positive change from being told what to do by others. The researcher therefore emphasised the interview as being their opportunity to discuss whatever seemed relevant to them, and in no way forced a particular topic area.

The researcher aimed to focus on their experiences throughout Triage, and not delve into their past, to avoid any unnecessary upset. The semi-structured approach enabled the researcher to follow a framework, yet flow naturally depending on what the young person discussed, enabling them to feel more at ease. The researcher only probed further when it was felt that the young person was comfortable discussing topics in further detail. For the young people it was important that the interview was not overly formal, thus the researcher had to consider factors such as her attire and the layout of the room in order to create a more comfortable setting. The audio recorder was also a necessity, as not only did it provide a full record but also allows the researcher to maintain eye contact and build rapport. However there was a concern that some young people may not have

been comfortable with the presence of the audio recorder; it was therefore explained why the recording was being made and how it would be used. They were also reminded of their right to withdraw at any time. On completion of the interview, every young person was asked if they had any further questions, and provided with a debrief form containing contact details and their participant code should they have any later concerns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH TRIAGE IN PROMOTING CHANGE

The effective engagement of the young person with Triage, and specifically their Triage worker, was pertinent to the young person's progress with the scheme. The young people spoke of being involved throughout the process, and were appreciative of the collaborative and therapeutic relationship they formed. Through their active participation the young people were able to develop positive strategies and solutions. An important aspect of their compliance appeared to be their perceived sense of legitimacy throughout the process, alongside the relationship they formed with their Triage worker.

Therapeutic relationship

When discussing the Triage worker with the young person, it became apparent their relationship formed an important aspect of their progress. When asked how they would describe Triage, one young person stated "Well I'd say you get your own worker that's confidential that you can talk to them about anything you wanted and he'd help you, he wouldn't have a go at you or shout at you for what you said, he'd just help you along and hope for the best for your future" (G). This notion of the Triage worker being there to support and encourage was vocalised throughout:

P: Umm... It's basically like a counsellor

I: hmm

P: That's mainly what it is. Helps you... from the bad back to the right

I: When you first met with them were you expecting it to be like that?

P: Umm no, I was expecting it to be like 'Look you've done this, that and other, why did you do it?' But it weren't, it's like 'What happened? Why did it happen?' It was more like... talking about it and not him telling you what you done. (J)

P: But I mean ye, having *** was really good, whilst I was on Triage we'd always meet up... We would talk about what was happening and I told her whatever I had to tell her because I felt like I could talk to her and she would encourage me and she wouldn't ever be nasty or judgemental, she was just really supportive (I)

High value was placed on the Triage workers ability to connect with the young person.

P: I think me and *** get along really well which I like so I think that's the main thing really because you need to get along with someone, so you can like, they can listen to you, you listen to them and you can see what you can build on and what like you're reflecting on and everything (C)

They also valued what they saw as a personal commitment by the Triage worker to meet their needs:

P: Ye when you get a youth worker they're completely dedicated to you, no matter, like how long you need them for and what you need them to do (A)

The relationship they built with their Triage worker appeared to be the key element during the process; demonstrating an association between a therapeutic relationship and positive outcomes (e.g. Tighe et al., 2012). Bordin (1979) proposed that the working alliance comprises three key ingredients: an agreement on the goals, collaboration on the tasks, and an overall bond; with the quality of alliance considered more important than the process itself in predicting positive outcomes. Ross, Polascheck and Ward (2008) went on to propose a revised theory of the therapeutic alliance in which they define a therapeutic alliance as a collaborative relationship between therapist and client that can facilitate positive change; they reported it to be particularly relevant when seeking to reduce future risk of criminal behaviour. They also stipulated that this is true across disciplines, and not just therapist and patient scenarios. The importance of a collaborative approach was reflected among the young people:

P: Ye, he does listen and then *** will give his opinion, but he said before if I don't want to listen then it's OK so, he said just do what you want and what you think is best so, it's not just them working, it's like you have to work with them as well (F)

According to Ross, Polascheck and Ward (2008) the essence of therapeutic alliance is collaboration; this necessitates the Individual's ability to negotiate the terms of the therapeutic alliance. Thus the young person's sense of autonomy may be a necessary condition for the formation of a therapeutic relationship. Autonomy is a basic human need (Deci & Ryan, 2000), but can be compromised if an individual feels coerced during the process. Shirk and Karver (2003) also suggest that the therapeutic relationship may be more critical for young people, as some may be reluctant to engage. As a result, in the earlier stages building a therapeutic relationship with the young person may be crucial to the effective engagement. This requires a flexible approach, dependent on the young person's needs. Marshall and Burton (2010) refer to this as the "responsivity" principle; which demonstrates the need to employ demonstrably powerful change strategies (general responsivity) and to adjust this to each person's unique features (specific responsivity). It is apparent that this young-person led approach is maintained throughout, with the young person appreciative that the Triage worker is responsive to their needs, with one young person stating: "I just speak to him about stuff, and from what I've said, he just knows what to do next time" (A). Clearly building a therapeutic relationship with the young person is multi-faceted and specific to each young person; importantly, every young person highlights positive aspects of their relationship (often without any prompt) highlighting the success of the Triage workers in achieving this.

Motivation to agree

When asked why they agreed to participate with the scheme, nine out of ten young people stated it was because they "didn't want a criminal record" (A) and to avoid being "charged with the offence" (F). It was often stated that Triage was "the better option" (I) indicating a lack of an alternative:

P: I didn't have a choice, I either went to Triage, or I'd have to go to Court, so I'd obviously prefer to do this than go to Court (G).

This is in line with previous findings that young people agree to restorative processes due to a fear of the alternative (Karp, Sweet, Kirshenbaum & Bazemore, 2004). Soppitt and Irving (2011) similarly found that a number of young people had completed Triage because they did not want to go back to the police. According to Daly (2002) young people are more concerned with what sanction they will receive, than they are 'repairing the harm'. This raises questions about the true impact of Triage on some young people. Many of the young people however, also spoke of the 'horrific' (A) consequences of a criminal record, stating it would "affect their life" (I) and their "whole life be messed up" (D). It was often said they would "not be able to get a job" (F). The young people were extremely aware of the detrimental consequences of a criminal record and so in this context their relief was understandable.

Despite the finding, there was a clear shift in their motivations for involvement once engaged with Triage:

P: it prevents you getting a criminal record so that's the first reason why you should do it but as well it's really fun, there's loads of different activities they get you to do... get you stuff to go on your CV... and it's going to make you happy (I)

I: So why did you agree.. to take part with Triage?

P: Umm, just to learn more than.. cos I never knew anything about it, just to learn more information and stuff, we were taught what the effects were and stuff (D)

It appears that young people may initially participate with the scheme as a means to avoid sanctions for the offence they committed. Nevertheless, once the young people have engaged with the scheme their primary motivation appears to transform, redirecting their focus to the priorities governed by Triage.

Barriers to engagement

As previously noted all young people had actively engaged with the scheme, nevertheless a range of barriers were initially noted. This included: the "times of the meetings... [as] they were straight after college" (B), the "long procedure cos it does take a long time to get off Triage" (A), being overwhelmed at first "it was a bit too much for me to take in"(C), the gender of the allocated Triage worker "I was like thank god it's a man" (C) and the negative associations with other statutory agencies "[I] worried [at first] cos I didn't know if he was like another police officer. If I said something out of place would I get re-locked up" (J).

The young people also spoke of being hesitant to engage with Triage at the beginning, stating it felt "awkward" (B) and a "bit scary and daunting" (D). After a few meetings however, they were able to move past this and open up:

I: ...how have you found it talking?

P: Umm, ye quite good, I was nervous the first two but I've got to know him more now and it's alright (G)

I: So how did that feel talking to someone that you didn't know?

P: It was a bit weird cos I... didn't wanna say what I was feeling cos I didn't know him before but now we're closer so it's easier to speak to him about things (F)

The on-going nature of the relationship meant that the young people who were at first hesitant to engage had the time to feel more comfortable with their Triage worker, this emphasises the importance of a consistent approach by their worker, allowing the young person to feel more comfortable as time went on. Soppitt and Irving (2011) suggest that a lack of understanding of the process prior to the first meeting can result in initial resistance or increased anxiety by the young person. This highlights the need to identify strategies to overcome these barriers in order to enable effective support (YJB, 2008b). This may involve providing more detailed information about Triage prior to their first meeting. Another effective strategy clearly appreciated by the young people; was the informal nature of the relationship, recognising that this enabled them to actively engage with the scheme, such as utilising a neutral setting for their meetings:

P: it was a good job we meet up in a café, instead of in a police station... cos I probably wouldn't have been able to do it. I've been there once, I don't really want go there again (J)

It may be through this less formal relationship that the young person feels they can receive support and guidance. Young people have been found to favour informal support (Vincent, Warden & Duffy, 2006). By utilising neutral venues, the young person is able to see themselves as having moved on from the incident that led to the arrest. Strategies such as this appear to enable the young people to actively engage with the scheme. The YJB (2008b) state this is essential to ensure better outcomes, increased commitment and reduced attrition.

Perceived procedural justice

Many of the young people spoke about having to complete activities, such as the workshop. However, they appeared to accept these activities "Nah it's fine, I just do what I have to do" (H), indicating a sense of legitimacy:

I: And the stuff you kind of had to do, how did you feel about doing those? So like the workshop?

P: Err the [shoplifting] workshop; I stole from a shop so obviously I had to do that, and I didn't think that was unacceptable or anything... If I get arrested, I'm not going to be like 'This is not fair' if it is (A)

When asked if they considered the process to be "fair or too harsh or too easy?", no one stated that they thought it was too harsh, rather everyone appeared satisfied with the activities they had to complete, with one person stating it was "more than fair" (E). Some of the young also recognised the potential benefits of participating with the scheme and were therefore more inclined to comply:

I: So everything that you've done [with Triage] do you think that's appropriate for the actual incident?

P: Ye, I definitely think, umm what I went through was obviously... not serve a punishment, but like I had to go through it in order to learn stuff, so Triage was a big help [to] learn from

it and I felt comfortable doing it, and whatever they told me to do, I'd go along with it.. so I'd learn a lot more (D)

Young people may have been more appreciative of the scheme, due to their awareness of the alternative:

P: ...it's better than being charged, I think it's a better route to go down (F)

P: ...it's my own fault cos how I reacted, I could have dealt with it differently, so I have to face the consequences otherwise I'd have to go to Court (G)

Numerous studies have also found high levels of perceived procedural justice following restorative justice processes (e.g. Sherman et al., 1998 & Daly, 2005). This perceived procedural justice, may have been a factor in their compliance and co-operation with the scheme. As proposed by Tyler (1990) when a person perceives justice as legitimate, and when they have been treated in a fair and respectful manner they are most likely to comply. In addition, this effect may have been more pronounced, as Triage is introduced after a young person's first arrest, thus rendering the situation unknown. De Cremer and Van Hiel (2008) found that procedural justice effects become stronger in the context of uncertainty, in other words procedural justice matters most to people when they are trying to deal with situations that make them feel vulnerable. Procedural justice may therefore be of particular importance within this setting.

Positive outcomes

The overall impact was a positive one for the young people involved. The positive outcomes expressed included (re)building positive relationships. When asked about any changes in their life subsequent to the incident and their Triage involvement, many of the young people cited their improved relationships with their family:

P: since I got locked up and been to Triage I've been able to speak more to my parents and my brother and sister and that so... it is a lot better (J)

P: Umm, I'm spending more time with my dad now (I)

P: Me and my mum get on now (C)

Young people reported improvements in their home life, including a reduction in arguments, as a result of their improved behaviour. For example because they were "calmer" (B), and had "been more positive so obviously less prone to have arguments" (I) "I've learnt to control my anger; I haven't kicked off since the day I got locked up" (J). The findings highlight the wide range of positive outcomes experienced in the young person's life, whilst the long-term effects of this cannot be determined; it does appear to be a step in the right direction.

REFLECTION OF INCIDENT

The young people reported reflecting upon the offences which they had committed and the impact of the offence on the victims; this appears to serve as a process in which the young people were at various stages.

Supportive challenge

The young people often spoke of being offered alternative perspectives that they had not previously considered. The Triage worker encouraged the young person to reflect on the negative consequences of their behaviour. This included the impact of their behaviour on the victim:

P: I can say about how I feel and everything, and then they [Triage worker] can be like 'What about the other person?' And that makes me think even more like what am I actually doing to them, so it does really help (C)

And the effects on those around them:

P: ...we talk about the offence we started talking like a couple of weeks about that and about the victim. He just gives you different views like the view from the other person and other people and how it affects our community

I: So did it make you look at it differently talking to him about it?

P: Ye so how, like if there was people on the street how it would affect them as well as me and my family and other people

I: had you thought about that before?

P: No not really (F)

The process served as a dialogic encounter to persuade and show the young people how crime hurts victims and other members of the community. Young people appeared glad to learn this information as it helped them reflect on the incident differently. As this was done in a non-confrontational manner, the challenge led to the desired effect and the young people appeared to take it on board. The young people expressed how their Triage worker made them consider the negative impacts of the offence, thus judging the action as wrong, but not the young person as bad. This process can be likened to reintegrative shaming (Braithwaite, 1989), which involves communicating disapproval of the offence in a respectful rather than humiliating fashion, to avoid stigmatisation and permanent labelling as a criminal. Black, Curran and Dyer (2013) found that feelings of shame prevent people developing a close therapeutic relationship. Conveying disapproval in a respectful manner is therefore important and may help to further enhance the therapeutic relationship.

Expressing remorse

Most recognised that taking part in the scheme had helped them to recognise the detrimental effects of their offence on others. Some appeared genuinely remorseful and wanted to say sorry:

I: So how did that feel once you'd given it (letter of apology) in?

P: I felt really better, cos it was like the one I'd done it (shoplifting) from, so when I was going in apologising it made me feel a bit better, like I'd never do it again (D)

The letter of apology also enabled the young person to think about their actions:

P: It was good... it made me explain, but as I was explaining, it made me think... and made it sink in more that it was of order what I done

Some of the young people also discussed offering to help in the community or wanting to meet their victim demonstrating a level of responsibility and consideration as to how to repair the harm:

P: I would have liked to apologise to her

I: Ye, would you want to do that face-to-face or via letter?

P: I wouldn't mind either way, as long as I apologised to her to get something off my conscience (C)

One young person had not yet written the letter of apology and stated "I don't really want to do it but I know I have to so it would be worth just apologising", but they also recognised that doing it will help them "move on and not worry about it anymore" (F).

However, two young people appeared not to engage with apology letter activity, rather speaking in passive terms about the task and demonstrated no remorse for the victim. These young people regretted their actions but were not sorry for the victim: "I thought it was fair I had to write a letter of apology, but I wasn't sorry" (A), "I wrote what I had to write" (B). Both commented "I don't even think they read it" (A).

Such responses raise questions regarding their remorse; indicating that restoration is not fully achieved. Restoration is one of the underpinning principles of restorative justice, in which it is assumed that through discussion about the offence and its impact, feelings of remorse are evoked in the offender, which leads to a genuine apology and a desire to repair the harm (Daly, 2002). However there is evidently a discrepancy among young people. Newbury (2011) found that frequently young offenders were reluctant to apologise and would minimise their behaviour. Daly (2002) similarly found that when young offenders did apologise; remorse was not always directed toward the victim, instead they were sorry for what they had done, but less said they felt sorry for the victim. This is an important implication in light of the findings that those young offenders who are observed to be remorseful are less likely to reoffend (Hayes & Daly, 2003). Previously Soppitt and Irving (2011) have suggested that greater consideration of the restorative nature of Triage should be given. This could include the quality of the letters of apology produced by the young people, the 'symbolic' nature of the apology, and the extent to which it has real meaning for the young offender and the victim. They also suggested that feedback should be provided to the young person on how the apology was received, in order to maximise the restorative symbolism of the Triage intervention. One young person appeared pleased with the positive feedback he received:

P: when he was reading it, there was loads of things going through my head, like 'Is he going to accept my apology?' and then he turned around and said it was a good letter

Further, it is important to note that some of the young appeared to go a step further, and demonstrated levels of empathy with the victim; by personalising the victims, comparing them to family members or sometimes considering how the actions would affect them:

P: what you're doing to another person is going to affect them and it's going to scar them, even for the littlest thing you do, you don't know how it's going to affect them and to be honest if I was them, and they said something nasty to me, or they did something horrible to me that would scar me, that would really affect me quite a lot and I don't want to do that to them (C)

For this young person, a more empathetic orientation had developed. This also draws attention to the disparity between the young people and the levels of remorse displayed. Every young person appears to be at a different stage of the process, further whilst their offences are all low-level, there are major differences, in terms of the victim involvement and the harm caused. Due to the small sample though, it is not possible to draw conclusions, merely highlight the need for additional exploration.

MOVING FORWARD

Moving forward appears to be a central aspect of the young people's discourse; many discuss their future aspirations and their desistance strategies to attain their non-offending ideal. This is also a central tenet of restorative justice as it enables them to reintegrate and move forward with their life. Newbury (2008) suggests that a truly restorative approach should encourage a more positive, forward-looking perspective of helping young people to understand and appreciate the impact of their behaviour on others; enabling them, by addressing their needs, to become more responsible in the future.

Move on from the incident

The young people recognised that Triage was there to deal with the incident; however, they appreciated that the Triage worker did not dwell on it, and were able to move on once they felt it was dealt with:

P: I thought it was just going to be months and months about what I've been doing, like what I'd done... but it's not, it's like deal with that and once they think you can move on then they move you on (F)

It was clear from the young people's account that the Triage worker had encouraged them to be reflective and at the same time forward thinking. This enabled the young person to recognise the negative impact of the offence:

I: ...do you think you see it (the incident) any differently, compared to when you were initially arrested?

P: Ye... when I was arrested I thought 'ahh can't wait to get out', but now it's over, I look back and think 'why did I do it?'

Soppitt and Irving (2011) reported that it is important that young people do not see the actions which led to their Triage involvement in isolation; but begin to evaluate the way in which they interact and affect others around them:

P: I think it's appropriate to help me, *** said to me he wants to help me and focus on what I could do in the future and change things so I conduct myself differently and stuff like that (G)

By doing this they are able to move on from the incident and formulate future strategies to prevent it happening again.

Developing positive goals and aspirations

There was a sense of optimism amongst the young people who spoke of hopes for a positive future. Most had career ambitions and goals to aspire to:

P: Now [I'm] with Triage it's given me something to keep going at like goals and before I just wouldn't want to do anything, but now I want to get up and get a job and go to college (F)

Many of the young people described different aspirations in their life, indicating elements of ambition for what they wanted to do in the future. This goal or passion often comprised a chosen career and the pathways to achieve this. Passions and goals also included hobbies and aspirations, such as "biking" (F) and "travelling" (A). There was also the recognition that Triage had highlighted opportunities, that otherwise were not be accessible:

P: if you get charged with something then you can't really find a job cos they don't want criminals working with them so I think with Triage it swaps it around so now instead of not being able to get a job, it gives you opportunities to get a job so I think it's worth being able to go on Triage than not (F)

Tighe et al. (2012) suggest that by young people developing positive goals and aspirations for their future, enables them to imagine more positive 'possible selves' giving them hope for the future and motivation to change their behaviour in the present. Through setting themselves future goals, the young people also appear to develop a sense of self-efficacy. Bandura (1993) defines self-efficacy as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives" (p.118). Bandura (1993) noted that cognitions related to high efficacy were high goal setting and increased likelihood to imagine successful scenarios, whilst those low in self-efficacy tended to visualise failure. The stronger their perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer their commitment to them (Bandura, 1993). Social persuasions from others can also serve to develop self-efficacy beliefs. Through positive feedback, encouragement and problem solving the Triage workers are therefore effective raising their beliefs regarding their capability (Simin, 2007). Thus, by encouraging their future goals and aspirations, Triage appears to alter the trajectory of young people's lives by helping them to develop pro-social aspirations whilst also serving to empower the young people.

Disengagement with deviant peers

Some young people reported moving from a group of friends that had included offenders. One young person stated she had stopped "hanging around with the wrong people", most of whom were "in and out of prison" (B). Whilst another reflected on the negative impact of his friendships "when I'm with the boy I'm on it with we're horrible" (J). Although it was also indicated that this was not always an immediate decision:

P: ...until I got Triage I was planning on going back out with them all... but when I got Triage it sunk in there's no point... We're bad together, when we're together we... bring a bad side out in each other and we're just horrible (E)

The negative impact of these friendship groups was also recognised:

P: I feel that I can actually be myself now... cos the old *** was an absolute waste of space, so I'm relieved to have got rid of that cos there was one crowd I was hanging around with and I'm glad that I've met Triage cos it's stopped me, I've looked back and realised they're going to be a waste of space (J)

He was also insightful into their potential future, and was able to see that this was not the life he wanted:

P: Standing around street corners, drinking, smoking, that's no way to live your life... On the dole... I'd rather own my own house (J)

One young person however, appeared not to change her friendship group and as a result of her proximity to her offending friends was brought into contact with the police a second time for being "in a car with someone who's dealing" (A). She did not appear to recognise any wrongdoing with putting herself in that position, instead stating:

P: [They] still thought to charge me even though I had nothing on me. I did nothing.. but sit in the car... I just, I was in the wrong place at the wrong time (A)

Overall though, ceasing friendships appeared to be an important stage in avoiding future offending behaviour. Research has found that association with delinquent peers serves as an important independent predictor of convictions (e.g. Farrington, 1996), thus withdrawal from a delinquent peer group may be an important influence on ceasing offending.

Construction of self-identity (as a non-offender)

Although many recognised their past negative behaviour, they did not appear to identify with this negative image. Some of the young people were dismissive or made derogatory remarks toward other offenders:

P: I just think it's ridiculous they put children in like, well young people that have done something like that in cells with people like... animals (A)

P: Scary, it was a Friday night, people in the cells banging on the cells screaming and stuff. It's not a very good place for a 14 year old boy to be (G)

A conceptual divide appeared evident between themselves and other offenders. One young person also suggested that this process is 'circular' (J), in that being an offender was considered irreversible/ endless. Whilst when discussing their own offending behaviours often rationalisations were offered for their own illegal actions, thus minimising their behaviour:

P: I felt like it was a bit unfair though that they took my fingerprints, I mean you know like I wasn't even getting a criminal record so why would you want to treat me like I was a criminal, like obviously I've broken the law, but you know there was no reason to take my finger prints (I)

The young people would often define themselves as a non-offender; for example, by describing their behaviour as out of character:

P: Ye, she's seen a different side to me, but I never... I'm not normally like that, if you know what I mean (D)

Murray (2010) suggests that through ascribing negative characteristics to offenders, non-offenders are able to preserve their own resistance to offending by reminding themselves of the difference between them and their offending peers. Murray (2010) refers to this unequivocal divide as 'othering'. As Hall (2000) suggests, it is by accentuating differences in relation to the other, that identities are formed. This involves what Young (2004) describes as 'essentialization'; the process of defining oneself by constructing an other. By doing this young people may be able reaffirm their status as a non-offender, which in turn may help maintain their ideal.

CONCLUSION

What emerges powerfully in the young people's stories is that relationships are central; they determine and shape the young person's experience and developing sense of self. Triage acts to create alternative pathways, which is made possible by the effective engagement they develop with their Triage worker. It has been shown that the young people employed a range of strategies in order to go forward with their lives, this included: disengagement with deviant peers, construction of self-identity (as a non-offender) and developing positive goals and aspirations. Through engaging in these strategies it may be possible that young people adopt levels of resilience, self-efficacy and 'positive-selves'; however how they come to develop these strategies is beyond the scope of this research.

Young people are clearly supportive of Triage and the extent to which people engage in the process is a sign of success. It is apparent that the young people received support in areas that were important to them. These findings also support the reduced reoffending rates and FTEs as indicated in previous research (e.g. Home Office, 2012). Rather than punishing the young people for a committed offence; the young people were provided opportunities to succeed, and the encouragement allowing them to move forward with their lives. Whilst there are concerns raised about the level of restoration achieved, reintegration appears to have successfully achieved, with the young person adapting a more positive forward-looking perspective, with the potential to become more responsible in the future (Newbury, 2008). Some of the young people who agreed to participate in the scheme may have already been at least on the cusp of trying to desist; it appears that Triage may have helped reinforce that decision and provide the additional support to so do. Their involvement may have served as a form of 'desistance talk' (Shapland et al., 2008). The young people all expressed tales of desistance; this should be viewed as dynamic process that gradually unfolds over time.

Limitations of the research

Whilst the current study explored the subjective experiences of young people and provided novel insights beyond that ascertained using quantitative research, there are several limitations which further research could address.

The study recruited a small number of participants from Cardiff and the Vale of Glamorgan. A certain amount of caution should be applied to the extent to which these findings can be generalised beyond this context. Future research would benefit from a larger sample. A further extension would be to include additional areas where Triage is operating. Young people were also not differentiated based on gender or age; thus a larger sample size may allow for comparisons to be drawn. Moore, Sellen, Crompton and Hallingberg (2012) similarly reported that the effectiveness of Triage may vary depending on the age of the young person. It would therefore be of value to monitor the effectiveness of what works with who, to help further improve the Triage model.

Many of the young people discussed their future aspirations; a follow up study may prove insightful in determining whether these aspirations were maintained and to assess whether they sustained their future non-offending ideal. The research was also focused on certain issues and exploration

was limited to what the young person deemed relevant and felt comfortable to disclose. Exploration by a known Triage worker may also prove fruitful; alternatively the opportunity to meet the young people prior to the interview may have enabled a better rapport to be built. Previous research has indicated that parents would like to be more involved in the process (e.g. Tighe et al., 2012) and that family support should be enhanced (e.g. Sherman et al., 1998 & Soppitt & Irving, 2011), although this finding was not replicated here, this may be in part be due to the sensitive wording of the questions. Further careful exploration may therefore be required.

The interviews relied on self-report retrospective data, in which there may be issues surrounding young people accurately remembering past experiences. However, the aim of the research was not to quantify data, it was to obtain their insights. In addition, only those who had engaged and complied with Triage agreed to take part in the research. By implication a positive bias cannot be ruled out. It is possible that the sub-group that declined involvement held more negative or divergent views. While this limits the ability to generalise the findings to those who have not engaged, the analysis can still offer a useful indication of how some young people view the Triage process.

Implications for future research and practice

The findings throughout the research are best described as tentative and indicative of potential future developments in both the scheme and any further evaluation. The findings of the current research have opened up a number of areas that could be addressed. For example, future research would benefit by exploring young people's ability to maintain their desistance strategies, and how their strategies link to their future self. It would also be of interest to further assess the differences regarding remorse towards the victim, in an attempt to explain the divergence found. Further research addressing the limitations noted above would also be useful. The experiences of the young people varied across the research; this may be due to individual differences, or due to their progress with the scheme. The young people were at different stages of the process, and so the research would benefit from a longitudinal method to demonstrate how their story evolves across time.

The qualitative approach applied offers new insight into an area dominated by quantitative research. The importance of the research lies in the fact that young people are so often absent from justice discourse; the research therefore attends directly to the experiences of those who have offended and should be considered alongside quantitative findings. One important implication is the strategies young people adopt to desist from further offending, allowing them to move forward as a non-offender. In light of this, relevant organisations should emphasise those strategies that young people prioritise in order to prevent further offending. Young people also spoke highly of their relationship with their Triage worker, indicating the central importance of relationship development in achieving change.

Note

The author is writing in a personal capacity and does not necessarily represent the views of Triage.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148. DOI: 10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Barnardo's (2010). *From playground to prison: The case for reviewing the age of criminal responsibility*. Ilford: Barnardo's. Retrieved from: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/120910_from_playground_to_prison-2.pdf
- Bazeman, G., & Elis, L. (2007). Evaluation of restorative justice. In G. Johnstone, & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice* (pp. 397-425). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Black, R. S. A., Curran, D., & Dyer, K. F. W. (2013). The impact of shame on the therapeutic alliance and intimate relationships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 69*(6), 646-654. DOI: 10.1002/jclp.21959
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 16*(3), 252-260. Retrieved from EBSCO Discovery service database.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101. DOI: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- British Psychological Society (BPS). (2009). *Code of ethics and conduct: Guidance*. Leicester: BPS
- British Psychological Society (BPS). (2010). *Code of human research ethics*. Leicester: BPS
- Burman, E. (2002). Interviewing. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor, & C. Tindall (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in Psychology: A research guide* (pp. 88-100). Birmingham: Open University press.
- Burr, V. (1995). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). Hove: Routledge
- Cardiff Triage (2010). *Six month evaluation of Triage – June 2010*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/six-month-eval-triage-june-2010.pdf>
- Cardiff Triage (2013). *Cardiff Triage*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/cardiff-triage>
- Carter, S. T., & Little, M. (2007). Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies, and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(10), 1316-1329. DOI: 10.1177/1049732307306927
- Cardiff Council (2013). *Children and young people scrutiny committee. Cardiff Youth offending service – Annual plan 2013-2014*. Retrieved from:

http://www.cardiff.gov.uk/content.asp?nav=2872,3250,4337,4674&parent_directory_id=2865&id=13071&d1p1=1

Choi, J. J., Green, D. L., & Gilbert, M. J. (2011). Putting a human face on crimes: A qualitative study on restorative justice processes for youths. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 28(5), 335-355. DOI: 10.1007/s10560-011-0238-9

Communities that Care (2005). *Risk and protective factors*. London: YJB. Retrieved from: <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/publications/resources/downloads/rpf%20report.pdf>

Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime prevention and community safety. Politics, policies and practices*. Harlow: Pearson Education limited.

Crime and Disorder Act (1998). Retrieved from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/37/contents>

Daly, K. (2002). Mind the gap: Restorative justice in theory and practice. In A. Von Hirsch, J. Roberts, A. E. Bottoms, K. Roach, & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?* (pp. 219-236). Oxford: Hart Publishing. Retrieved from: http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/50263/kdpaper19.pdf

Daly, K. (2005). The limits of restorative justice. In D. Sullivan, & L. Tiff (Eds.), *Handbook of Restorative Justice. A Global Perspective* (pp. 134-143). London: Routledge. Retrieved from: http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/50314/rj_paper3_the_limits_of_rj.pdf

Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for Qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2), 35-62. Retrieved from: <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/viewFile/4205/5401>

De Cremer, D., & Van Hiel, A. (2008). Procedural justice effects on self-esteem under certainty versus uncertainty emotions. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32(4), 278-287. DOI 10.1007/s11031-008-9090-4

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. Retrieved from EBSCO Discovery service database.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007). *The Children's Plan. Building brighter futures*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families. Retrieved from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/The_Childrens_Plan.pdf

Dignan, J. (2007). Juvenile justice, criminal courts and restorative justice. In G. Johnstone, & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of Restorative Justice* (pp. 269-291). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Dugmore, P., & Pickford, J. (2006). *Youth justice and social work*. Exeter: Learning matters Ltd.

Farrington, D. P (1996). *Understanding and preventing youth crime*. York: York publishing services.

Farrington, D. P., Coid, J., Harnett, L., Jolliffe, D., Soteriou, N., Turner, R., & West, D. J. (2006). *Criminal careers and life success: new findings from the Cambridge study in delinquent development*.

London: Home Office. Retrieved from:

http://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/people/academic_research/david_farrington/hofind281.pdf

Gelsthorpe, L., & Morris, A. (2002). Restorative youth justice: The last vestiges of welfare?. In J. Muncie, G. Hughes, & E. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Youth justice: Critical readings* (pp. 238-253). London: SAGE publications Ltd.

Glover, J., & Hibbert, P. (2009). *Locking up or giving up. Why custody thresholds for teenagers aged 12, 13 and 14 need to be raised*. Ilford: Barnardo's. Retrieved from:
http://www.barnardos.org.uk/locking_up_or_giving_up_august_2009.pdf

Green, J., & Thorogood, N. (2004). *Qualitative methods for health research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Haines, K., & O'Mahony, D. (2006). Restorative approaches, young people and youth justice. In B. Goldson, & J. Muncie (Eds.), *Youth crime and justice* (pp. 110-124). London: SAGE publications Ltd.

Halcomb, E. J., & Davidson, P. M. (2006). Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary?. *Applied Nursing Research*, 19, 38-42. doi:10.1016/j.apnr.2005.06.001

Hall, S. (2000). Who needs 'identity'?. In P. du Gay, J. Evans, & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader* (pp. 15-30). London: Sage. Retrieved from:
http://scholar.google.co.uk/scholar_url?hl=en&q=http://caledonianblogs.net/mefi/files/2011/01/Hall.pdf&sa=X&scisig=AAGBfm1OqZ2Zizhtmv1I67jX9GMdAsa6Hw&oi=scholar&ei=uPeZUoqwBMfX7AaS_YHICg&ved=0CC8QgAMoADAA

Hart, D., & Thompson, C. (2009). *Young people's participation in the youth justice system*. London: NCB. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncb.org.uk/media/443937/participationinyouthjusticereport.pdf>

Hayes, H., & Daly, K. (2003). Youth justice conferencing and reoffending. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(4), 725-764. Retrieved from:
http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/50254/kdpaper17.pdf

Healthcare Commission (2009). *Actions speak louder. A second review of healthcare in the community for young people who offend*. London: Healthcare Commission. Retrieved from:
http://www.hmcpsi.gov.uk/documents/reports/CJI_THM/OFFM/Actions_speak_louder_200903252650.pdf

Home Office (2006). *The final warning scheme. Home Office circular 14/2006*. London: Home office. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-final-warning-scheme>

Home Office (2012). *Assessing young people in police custody: An examination of the operation of Triage schemes*. London: Home Office. Retrieved from:
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/crime-research/occ106?view=Binary>

Johnstone, G., & Van Ness, D. W. (2007) *Handbook of Restorative Justice*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Karp, D. R., Sweet, M., Kirshenbaum, A. & Bazemore, G. (2004). Reluctant participants in restorative justice? Youthful offenders and their parents, *Contemporary Justice Review*, 7(2), 199-216. DOI: 10.1080/1028258042000221193

King, N. (1999). The qualitative research interview. In C. Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 14-36). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

King, N. (2004). Using templates in thematic analysis of texts. In C. Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 256-271). London: Sage.

King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in Qualitative research*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Knuutila, A. (2010). *Punishing costs: How locking up children is making Britain less safe*. London: New economics foundation. Retrieved from: http://s.bsd.net/nefoundation/default/page/-/files/Punishing_Costs.pdf

Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of the Qualitative research interviewing* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act (2012). Retrieved from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/10/contents/enacted>

Marshall, T., F. (1999). *Restorative justice an overview*. London: Home Office. Retrieved from: <http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/homisc/occ-resjus.pdf>

Marshall, W. L., & Burton, D. L. (2010). The importance of group processes in offender treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 15(2), 141-149. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.008

McAra, L., & McVie, S. (2007). Youth justice? The impact of system contact on patterns of desistance from offending. *European Journal of Criminology*, 4(3), 315-345. DOI: 10.1177/1477370807077186

McAra, L., & McVie, S. (2010). Youth crime and justice: Key messages from the Edinburgh study of youth transitions and crime. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 10(2), 179-209. DOI: 10.1177/1748895809360971

Miers, D., Maguire, M., Goldie, S., Sharpe, K., Hale, C., Netten, A., Uglow, S., Doolin, K., Hallam, A., Enterkin, J., & Newburn, T. (2001). *Home Office: An exploratory evaluation of restorative justice schemes: Crime reduction research series paper 9*. London: Home Office

Ministry of Justice (2013a). *Criminal Justice statistics. Quarterly update to September 2012*. London: Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/220090/criminal-justice-stats-sept-2012.pdf

Ministry of Justice (2013b). *Proven re-offending statistics quarterly bulletin. July 2010 to June 2011, England and Wales*. London: Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/192631/proven-reoffending-jul-10-jun-11.pdf

- Ministry of Justice, Home Office, & Youth Justice Board (2013). *Youth Justice Statistics 2011/12. England and Wales*. London: Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/218552/yjb-stats-2011-12.pdf
- Monaghan, G., Hibbert, P., & Moore, S. (2003). *Children in trouble: time for change. Executive summary*. Retrieved from: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/resources/research_and_publications/children-in-trouble-time-for-change/publication-view.jsp?pid=PUB-1230
- Moore, S., Sellen, J., Crompton, K., Hallingberg, B. (2012). *A brief evaluation of Cardiff Triage*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/cardiff-triage-evaluation.pdf>
- Murray, C. (2010). Conceptualizing young people's strategies of resistant to offending as 'active resilience'. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40, 115-132. DOI:10.1093/bjsw/bcn115
- Nacro (2002). *Assessing responses to youth offending in Northamptonshire. Research briefing 2*. London: Nacro youth crime. Retrieved from: <https://www.nacro.org.uk/data/files/nacro-2004120102-479.pdf>
- Nacro (2009). *Youth crime briefing. Some facts about children and young people who offend – 2007*. London: Nacro youth crime. Retrieved from: <http://www.nacro.org.uk/data/files/nacro-2009070900-280.pdf>
- Nacro (2013). *Young people*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nacro.org.uk/what-we-do/resettlement-advice-service/advice/client-groups/young-people,1653,NAP.html#2>
- Newburn, T., Crawford, A., Earle, R., Goldie, S., Hale, C., Hallam, A., Masters, G., Netten, A., Saunders, R., Sharpe, K., & Uglow, S. (2002). *Home Office research study 242. The introduction of referral orders into the Youth Justice System: Final report*. London: Home Office. Retrieved from: <http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/hors/hors242.pdf>
- Newbury, A. H. (2008). *Youth crime, referral orders and restorative justice. A qualitative evaluation of the use and success of referral orders as a restorative approach in youth justice*. Doctoral thesis. University of Sussex, UK.
- Newbury, A. (2011). 'I would have been able to hear what they think': Tensions in achieving restorative outcomes in the English youth justice system. *Youth Justice*, 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/1473225411420531
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Designing Qualitative Studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage. Retrieved from: <http://legacy.oise.utoronto.ca/research/field-centres/ross/ctl1014/Patton1990.pdf>
- Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., & Guckenburg, S. (2013). *Crime prevention research review. Formal system processing of juveniles: Effects on delinquency*. Retrieved from: <http://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-w0692-pub.pdf>

- Poland, B. D. (1999). Transcription quality as an aspect of rigor in Qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(3), 290-310.
- Ross, E. C., Polaschek, D. L. L., & Ward, T. (2008). The therapeutic alliance: A theoretical revision for offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 13(6), 462-480.
DOI:10.1016/j.avb.2008.07.003
- Save the Children (2010). *Putting children at the centre. A practical guide to children's participation*. London: Save the Children. Retrieved from:
[http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/Putting_Children_at_the_Centre_final_\(2\)_1.pdf](http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/Putting_Children_at_the_Centre_final_(2)_1.pdf)
- Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Dignan, J., Edwards L., Hibbert, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G., & Sorsby, A. (2008). *Does restorative justice affect reconviction? The fourth report from the evaluation of three schemes. Ministry of Justice research series 10/08*. Retrieved from:
http://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/resource/ministry_of_justice_evaluation_does_restorative_justice_affect_reconviction_the_fourth_report_from_the_evaluation_of_three_schemes/
- Sherman, L. W. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473. Retrieved from British Library.
- Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2007). *Restorative justice: the evidence*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.quakersintheworld.org/uploads/articlePDFs/RJ%20-%20The%20Evidence%202.07.pdf>
- Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Barnes, G. C., Braithwaite, J., Inkpen, N., & Teh, M. (1998). *Experiments in restorative policing: A progress report on the Canberra reintegrative shaming experiments*. Retrieved from: http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/aic/rjustice/rise/progress/1998.pdf
- Shirk, S. R., & Karver, M. (2003). Prediction of treatment outcome from relationship variables in child and adolescent therapy: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counselling and Clinical Psychology*, 71(3), 452-464. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.71.3.452
- Simin, H. T. (2007). *Improving self-efficacy in problem solving: Learning from errors and feedback*. USA: ProQuest.
- Soppitt, S., & Irving, A. (2011). *An evaluation into the effectiveness of the early diversion intervention 'Triage' as a mechanism for tackling youth offending in Newcastle Upon Tyne*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Newcastle Youth Offending Team.
- Suther, A. (2011). What do 'they' think? Young offenders' views of youth offender panels: A case study in one youth offending team. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 9(3), 7-26. Retrieved from EBSCO Discovery service database.
- Tighe, A., Pistrang, N., Casdagli, L., Baruch, G., & Butlet, S. (2012). Multisystematic therapy for young offenders: Families experiences of therapeutic processes and outcomes. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(2), 187-197. DOI: 10.1037/a0027120
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Woodstock: Princeton University Press.

UK Children's Commissioners (2008). *UK Children's Commissioners' report to the UN committee on the rights of the child*. Retrieved from <http://www.childcom.org.uk/uploads/publications/61.pdf>

Vincent, S., Warden, S., & Duffy, M. (2006). *Raising awareness and promoting positive mental health and well-being among young people – The role of peer support*. Retrieved from Barnardo's: http://www.barnardos.org.uk/article_for_mental_health_today_helping_them_to_help_each_other_may_2007.pdf

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T. G., Feather, N. T., & Platow, M. J. (2010). Justice through consensus: Shared identity and the preference for a restorative notion of justice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 909-930. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.657

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing Qualitative research in Psychology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Wood, S., Eckley, L., Stuart, J., Hughes, K., Kelly, D., Harrison, D., & Quigg, Z. (2011). *Evaluation of the Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP) in Liverpool*. Liverpool: Liverpool John Moores University. Retrieved from: <http://www.cph.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/evaluation-of-the-youth-crime-action-plan-in-liverpool.pdf>

YJB (2008a). *To develop and improve reparation, as part of the Youth Crime Action Plan. Good practice, guidance for youth offending teams*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/youth-justice/working-with-victims/restorative-justice/TodevelopandimprovereparationaspartoftheYouthCrimeActionPlan.pdf>

YJB (2008b). *Engaging service users: Barriers and enablers*. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/youth-justice/yjb-toolkits/parenting/engaging-service-users.pdf>

YJB (2011). Youth justice indicators. Retrieved from: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/youth-justice/monitoring-performance/youth-justice-indicators>

Young, J. (2004). Crime and the dialectics of inclusion/exclusion. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 550-561. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azh034

Youth Crime Action Plan (2008). Retrieved from Home office: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/youth-crime-action-plan/youth-crime-action-plan-082835.pdf?view=Binary>

APPENDIX J: Additional illustrative quotes

Overarching theme 1: EFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH TRIAGE IN PROMOTING CHANGE

Interpretive code	Illustrative quote
1. Therapeutic relationship	Ye when you get a youth worker they're like completely dedicated to you, no matter, like how long you need them for and what you need them to do. Like, err *** going to help me get a job but that's nothing to do with why I got arrested or anything but he's still going to- (A:164-168)
	...he was definitely always there if I need help and stuff (D: 220-221)
	Umm probably not no.. cos if it's too intense, I get nervous and I lose everything, but if I'm comfortable I actually say what happened and stuff (D: 519-520)
	Like hmm ye, you feel more supported by them, you're more likely to co-operate, like obviously you would, but I mean because everyone's so positive and open here you feel comfortable (I: 330-333)
2. Active participation	...they do like things you do with the community and you go for walks and stuff so you get involved with other people, so it's a bit like a team (F:40-42)
	...they got me involved in umm the youth forum which is like a political group that aims to get young people's voices heard and from that we've done lots of things like gone to conferences like in **** and stuff and on *** news I spoke to, I think it was an MP or something so we've done lots of stuff (I: 189-193)
	Umm (long pause) I think it shocked me a bit that I got locked up, but then I was able to explain to *** what had actually happened and just got it out in the air basically (J: 71-73)
	...realise my mistake and not be forced to do it, at least I chose to do it (C: 266-267)
3. Solution focussed	...he showed me loads of weird stuff to make me think differently about my friends and stuff, and I got rid of loads of my friends, not in a bad way, cos they weren't my friends.. he showed me something on friends, it was called 'Friends that are there for what you do, friends that are for you and then friends that are only around while you're around' or something like that, dunno, but ye, I changed my friendship group and stuff (A: 410-416)

	<p>Ye, cos I didn't know what to write or anything about it so *** was helping with that (F: 143-144)</p> <p>...so it has shown me what I could do to change things and take it differently (G:135-136)</p> <p>Umm, I've learnt to control my anger, I haven't kicked off since the day I got locked up, umm (pause) I feel better in myself, actually being able to talk about what happened and get it out my system (J: 262-265)</p>
4. Motivation to agree	<p>I was hoping for Triage, I was hoping they might give me a-a.. like another kind of course like that, instead of getting a criminal record (A:347-349)</p> <p>Because I wanted another chance, and I want to learn from my chances, cos before I never did (C: 97-98)</p> <p>They said basically I aint getting a criminal record; I just have to go to meetings and that (B: 41-42)</p> <p>...for me to be on the Triage system instead of being charged with the offence (F:68-69)</p>
5. Barriers to engagement	<p>I hated being in the police station (A: 107)</p> <p>Cos I don't really like meeting new people (B: 51)</p> <p>.. I was like in the cell and everything, I was being questioned and everything and I was fed up, I was tired, I was hungry, and umm.. I was just really fed up (C: 49-51)</p> <p>Err...quite shy, err worried cos I didn't know if he was like another police officer. If I said something out of place would I get re-locked up, so, umm but when he said 'I'm nothing to do with the police' I was like that's fine, I'll tell him whatever then (J: 168-171)</p>
6. Perceived procedural justice	<p>...I get arrested like, I'm not going to be like 'This is not fair' if it is (A: 235-236)</p> <p>Umm, no but like it wasn't nice being forced to go along with it because I mean taking my fingerprints made me feel anxious enough and like not having the choice to say whether or not I wanted to be measured or weighed and it just wasn't nice (I: 143-146)</p> <p>Ye, ye more than fair (E: 115)</p> <p>...you shouldn't be able to do stuff like that and then end up without a criminal record (J: 204-206)</p>
7. Positive	<p>...he helped me do those things last time that I wouldn't have been able to</p>

Outcomes	do if I hadn't been arrested (laughter) (A: 171-173)
	...since I've been with them I actually have learnt quite a lot (C100-101)
	...it helps you like learn that you're doing wrong and that and they'll try and help you behave and like turn your life around before it's too late (E: 180-182)
	..put me in an appointment with a counsellor for my anger, so that's going to help me, ye my triggers and how to like solve them in different ways (G: 193-195)

Overarching theme 2: REFLECTION OF INCIDENT

Interpretive code	Illustrative quote
1. Reflection on past behaviour	...being an absolute lunatic, like humiliating myself so much (C: 176-177)
	It was like horrible but good in a way cos like being there that long makes you think like what you've done innit (E: 61-62)
	...I think like worse of it, like I think bad on myself than... ye, it just makes you think what you've done and how it affects people, that's the main thing (F:222-224)
	I feel a bit embarrassed, hmm I feel like I understand, like why I was taken in (I:698-699)
2. Impact of Offence	It was absolutely frustrating, I was heartbroken, because in **** I didn't do nothing basically, I was just rebellious and everything (C: 324-326)
	...except my parents look at me different, so my mum said to me after it happened, she's like, 'Whenever you go to town now it's still in the back of my mind' so it's always going to be there (D358-361)
	...because I could see like that I was putting myself in danger and I could see that it wasn't the right path to go down for my health and for my mental health and everything and for my future (I:598-601)
	I was really nervous then cos I was on my own, and I was thinking a lot and err.. it was horrible (D: 258-259)
3. Consideration of others	...realise what your mistakes are and how you've hurt other people and like it affects you in your life time (C:29-30)
	...all that was going through my head was my parents and what they were going to think of me (D: 261-262)
	...worried about what my mum's going to think (J: 122-123)

	Like to think about what I'm doing to other people not about me and whoever they're hurting, who's say like my friends, like I gotta think what I'm doing to them (C:103-105)
4. Supportive challenge	...I can say about how I feel and everything, and then they can be like 'What about the other person?' and that makes me think even more like what am I actually doing to them, so it does really help (C: 396-400)
	...they taught us.. what the effects could have been if I was a bit older and stuff (D: 40-41)
	He just gives you different views like the view from the other person and other people and how it affects our community (F: 111-113)
	Ye, like what I could have done in the future and it could have affected the past (G: 134-135)
5. Expressing Remorse	...I didn't think it was fair, I thought it was fair I had to write a letter of apology, but I wasn't sorry (A:259-261)
	I wrote what I had to write (B: 131)
	...I don't really want to do it but I know I have to so it would be worth just apologising (F: 153-154)
	How to react next time and how the victim actually feels when you've done something (J:126-127)
6. Accepting Responsibility	Ye, I think worse of it, like I think bad on myself than... ye, it just makes you think what you've done and how it affects people, that's the main things (F: 222-224)
	Just made me realise what I've actually done, it's just not fair (C:117-118)
	my family told me I'd got into this situation so I need to get out by myself (D:319-320)
	...it made me like explain, but as I was explaining it made me think and that and made it like sink in more that it was of order what I done (E: 89-91)
7. Minimise severity of incident	...obviously I've broken the law, but you know like there was no reason to take my finger prints (I: 135-136)
	...I kind of knew like it wasn't the right thing to do but I mean it wasn't too, like I didn't think it was that serious (I:404-405)
	...I don't have a criminal record even though I don't deserve one, but at least I don't have one (A: 369-370)
	...I had not really done anything at all-I wrong so when I was in there, I

	wasn't very happy at all (A: 114-115)
--	---------------------------------------

Overarching theme 3: MOVING FORWARD

Interpretive code	Illustrative quote
1. Move on from the incident	I felt really better, cos it was like the one I'd done it from, so when I was going in apologising it made me feel a bit better, like I'd never do it again (D: 181-183)
	...cos when I thought, aww it's going to be about the offence that I done, but then now it's not (F: 280-281)
	...good to have it in the past and move on now (G: 176)
	Umm not really now, umm because I had her phone number but when I called it, it was someone else's phone number so she must have sold her phone or something, ye and I didn't really want to pester her because obviously if I've finished it now like I don't want to keep coming back, you know like I have to go sometime don't I, I can't just stay there [Triage] for the rest of my life (I: 656-662)
2. Learn from mistakes	She was upset that I got arrested, but then like when I started going to Triage and that, and learnt it was wrong and everything, she was like happy for me(B: 259-261)
	...when like, a young person gets into serious trouble like with the law or anything, they give you a chance to like, not do it again and realise what your mistakes are (C: 27-29)
	I was really relieved I wouldn't have a criminal record and I'd have a second chance (F:72-73)
	...what you could do in the future to change things and for better for what you could do in the future (G: 37-38)
3. Self-develop	I've grown up a lot more, feel a lot smarter than I was (A: 322)
	No I wouldn't be hanging around with the same people, I'd still be angry (B:242-243)
	...when you're in that rage, normally you have that little voice in your head telling you to step back, that never popped up , but now it does... and now I think about things before retaliating and thinking 'IS IT REALLY WORTH IT, is it really worth me taking out all my anger and emotions?'. And it is not worth it; I'm just wasting EVERYTHING that I can just be happy and move

	along. I'm not letting you bring me down, I'm happy (C:628-635)
	...one of the reasons why I was drinking was because I was a bit depressed and um so obviously now because I have positive things to focus on it stops me being negative (I: 348-350)
4. Developing positive goals and aspirations	...Like, err *** going to help me get a job but that's nothing to do with why I got arrested or anything (A: 166-168)
	Cos I want to work like in Law (B: 64)
	...the career you want and everything and if you really want it that bad you don't want to go down that bad road (C: 727-729)
	I'm starting biking and all that, he's started, said he would try and help me get into stuff like that so (F: 197-199)
5. Disengagement with deviant peers	I'm still close to his friends, but they always ask me to go out with them and I'm just like 'No', it's just really bad in and out of prison and that (B: 205-208)
	I've stopped hanging around with all the people I used to hang around with (E:134-135)
	...by not listening to other people (G:157)
	...there was one crowd I was hanging around with and I'm glad that I've met Triage cos it's stopped me, I've looked back and realised they're going to be a waste of space, so it is a good good good thing that Triage was available (J: 420-424)
6. Construction of self-identity (as a non-offender)	1....she's seen a different side to me, but I never... I'm not normally like that (D: 367-368)
	I felt like it was a bit unfair though as well that they took my fingerprints, I mean you know like I wasn't even getting a criminal record so why would you want to treat me like I was a criminal (I: 132-135)
	...never ever ever thought I'd be in that situation ever (D: 262-263)
	...It's not a very good place for a 14 year old boy to be (G: 61-62)
7. Desist from future offending	...I would never do it again (C: 68)
	...now I think about things before retaliating (C:630-631)
	...make sure they don't do it again obviously and teach us everything about it (D: 31-33)
	...I'll never do anything like that, I don't want to cause trouble ever again like, it's not worth it (E: 130-131)

