

## **Developing a social impact measurement framework to enhance outcomes for young people in custody – what to measure?**

*Claire Paterson-Young, Richard Hazenberg, Meanu Bajwa-Patel and Simon Denny*

### **Abstract**

Government and societal attention on young people's involvement in offending has resulted in expansion of the youth justice system, with emphasis on developing effective and sustainable interventions to reduce recidivism and enhance outcomes for young people. Social impact measurement provides the tools for exploring the experiences and outcomes of youth justice interventions. By exploring the social impact of Secure Training Centres, this paper makes an original contribution to knowledge through exploring and identifying themes in developing a social impact measurement (SIM) framework for youth offending interventions, specifically in custody. By developing Farrington's (2005) Integrated Cognitive-Antisocial Potential (ICAP) theory into a SIM framework, this research seeks to demonstrate the benefits of social impact measurement as a form of operational and performance management for organisations engaged in youth justice interventions provided that the outcomes for young people exist at the centre.

### **Key words:**

Custody, Youth Justice, Social Impact, Re-settlement

### **Introduction**

The number of young people entering the youth justice system has reduced since 2008, with equally significant reductions evident in the use of custody. Between 2007 and 2016,

the number of offences committed by young people decreased by 73% (Bateman, 2017). Despite this reduction in offending, the youth justice system exists in a wider context with austerity measures reducing the resources and provisions available for children and young people (UK Children's Commissioner, 2015). Improvements and developments in interventions for young people have relied on outcome data with limited emphasis on understanding the wider impact (e.g. on education and non-cognitive skills). Given that the Social Exclusion Unit's (2002) report emphasises the importance of factors such as education and family relationships in promoting desistance, this research explores the impact of interventions on such factors. To improve the impact of such interventions, the views of young people are central; therefore, this research is fuelled by a desire to facilitate the active participation of young people held in Secure Training Centres (STCs).<sup>1</sup>

This article makes an original contribution to knowledge through exploring and identifying themes in developing a social impact measurement (SIM) framework for youth offending interventions, specifically in custody. By positioning Farrington's (2005) Integrated Cognitive-Antisocial Potential (ICAP) theory, with reference to strain theory, within a wider SIM framework, this research seeks to demonstrate the benefits of social impact measurement as a form of operational and performance management for organisations engaged in youth justice interventions *provided* that the outcomes for young people exist at the centre. Using an adapted sequential design strategy, the researcher applied a mixed methodological approach to data collection with initial phases of data collection contributing to the later phases. The initial phase of data collection, which is discussed in this article, gathered quantitative information from a scaled questionnaire and qualitative data from a case file analysis.

### **Social Impact Measurement**

SIM has received considerable attention from the government and academics although a common definition remains elusive. Indeed, the Public Services (Social Value) Act (2012) details the government's focus on understanding the wider benefits of commissioned services (GECES, 2014; Clifford and Hazenberg, 2015). A survey conducted by New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) stated that: "impact measurement means different things to different people..." (Ogain et al., 2012:33) and differing interpretations have resulted in

confusion in measuring social impact. Definitions for social impact contain subtle differences, with the central element surrounding the intended or unintended consequences resulting from activities (Maas, 2014; Clifford et al., 2014).

Vanclay's (2003) definition for social impact acknowledged the intended and unintended social consequences of interventions, which allows for the development of effective interventions with scope for identification of ineffective interventions. This definition identifies several areas in conceptualising social impact, including: life, community, political system, health and wellbeing, and fears and aspirations. In the youth justice field, these factors are relevant for measuring the social impact of youth offending interventions, specifically in considering the associations between social impact and the causes of crime. For example, criminological theories emphasise the impact of relationships, education, deprivation and attitudes on involvement in criminal activity (Merton, 1938; Agnew, 1985; Farrington, 2003 and 2007; Van Der Laan et al., 2009). In considering the social impact of youth offending interventions, one important area to consider is the promotion of changes in fears and aspirations that were highlighted by Vanclay (2003). Although this definition provides scope for measuring impact, in isolation this approach reduces the opportunity to capture changes achieved by others or changes occurring regardless of interventions or activities. Adopting the definition proposed by Clifford et al. (2014) in the GECES<sup>2</sup> (2014) framework allows for consideration of elements missed from Vanclay's definition (2003). Clifford et al. (2014) consider the changes resulting from other activities (alternative attributions), the changes occurring regardless of activities (deadweight), and the changes that decline over time (drop-off). Combining the two definitions, provided by Vanclay (2003) and Clifford et al. (2014) enables a more sophisticated and relevant measurement of social impact to be considered.


For youth offending interventions the use of social impact measurements has benefits for the individual (micro), the organisation (meso), the government, funders and communities (macro) by identifying effective and sustainable interventions (Clifford et al., 2014). With concerns over the financial situation in England and Wales, understanding the social impact of youth justice interventions is increasingly important in determining 'what works' in allocating resources (Nevill and Lumley, 2011; Brand and

Price, 2017). SIM frameworks can support the development of innovative and successful interventions that reduce recidivism and promote desistance (Nevill and Lumley, 2011). Such evidence-based assessment of intervention performance, that incorporates multi-stakeholder viewpoints and outcomes, will in the long-run improve outcomes for young people and reduce the need for costly punitive justice interventions. This article explores the social impact factors for young people in custody in order to identify how best social impact frameworks can be utilised to promote positive outcomes for young people and society.

### **Developing a theory of change**

Developing a plausible theory of change that explores the perceptions of young people in STCs is crucial to the measurement of relevant data in social impact measurement (Clifford et al., 2014) and also assists organisations to engage in research that is relevant, accountable and transparent (Hazenbergh and Clifford, 2016). Theory of change models are grounded in plausible evidence, experiences and literature enabling a wider understanding of the strategies to generate intended results (Knowlton and Phillips, 2013). Developing a theory of change is predicated upon understanding the factors that influence crime and offending, which allows organisations and governments to design effective interventions (Knowlton and Phillips, 2013). Theories of crime explore assumptions about human nature, social structure and causation to provide an explanation for the phenomena explored (Knowlton and Phillips, 2013).

Exploring the between-individual and within-individual theories of youth crime and offending are important for developing a theory of change. Integrated Cognitive-Antisocial Potential (ICAP) theory (Farrington, 2005) was developed by combining traditional (e.g. strain theory, labelling theory and differential associations) and developmental (e.g. adolescence limited/ life-course-persistent theory and social control theory) theories of crime and offending. The key construct in ICAP theory is antisocial potential (AP) “and it assumes that the translation from antisocial potential to antisocial behaviour depends on cognitive (thinking and decision-making) processes that take account of opportunities and victims” (Farrington and Ttofi, 2014:28). Figure 1 illustrates a simple example of Farrington’s (2005) Integrated Cognitive-Antisocial Potential theory.



Farrington (2005) distinguishes the long-term antisocial potential from the short-term antisocial potential. These long-term factors are influenced by modelling, strain, socialisation and labelling while the short-term factors depend on motivation, situation, intelligence and cognitive ability (Farrington and Ttofi, 2014). Farrington (2005) identified a continuum of long-term antisocial potential, ordering individuals from low to high. The distribution of antisocial potential on the continuum is skewed, suggesting that antisocial behaviour and offending are versatile (Farrington and Ttofi, 2014). This versatility explains the reasons ICAP theory applies across different types of offending

and antisocial behaviour. Findings from the Cambridge Study suggested several core risk factors for later offending including: hyperactivity; impulsivity; low intelligence, poor school attainment, family criminality, poverty, ineffective parenting, disrupted families and attention deficit (Farrington, 2003 and 2007; Van Der Laan et al., 2009). The long-term risk factors associated with criminal behaviour identify the reasons some individuals commit crimes; however, the theory fails to explain the reasons other individuals desist.

Identifying the protective factors (for example, unconditionally supportive parents or carers, high school attainment) for individuals is equally important as identifying the risk factors (Farrington and Ttofi, 2014). Recognising the protective factors for children and young people in STCs are central in exploring the positive and negative (intended and unintended) impact. By exploring the positive protective factors, the researcher has the opportunity to examine the wider social impact of STCs. Farrington and Ttofi (2014) highlighted the complexities in distinguishing between the risk factors causing offending and antisocial behaviour and the correlating factors. By identifying risk factors causing offending and antisocial behaviours, researchers can develop effective interventions (Farrington and Ttofi, 2014). For individuals with high long-term antisocial potential, the most prevalent motivational factors are: strain; desires for material goods; status with family members or intimates; excitement; and sexual satisfaction. These motivational factors indicate the presence of high long-term antisocial potential; however, the availability of legitimate means to satisfy such factors (employment, income etc.) is equally important in predicting offending. For example, the desire to offend for individuals with legitimate means to achieve is lower than for individuals with no legitimate means. Furthermore, Farrington and Ttofi (2014) highlight the influence of socialisation, attachment and exposure to antisocial models (differential associations) on the antisocial potential. Van Der Laan et al. (2009) tested ICAP theory by completing a survey with 1,500 young people aged 10-17 years-old in the Netherlands. Findings suggested that long-term individual, family and education factors correlated with serious offending and antisocial behaviour. Other factors considered by Van Der Laan et al. (2009) related to the short-term situational factors including drugs and alcohol and the absence of appropriate parents or guardians. The findings from the study conducted by Van Der Laan et al. (2009) support the idea proposed by ICAP theory that the probability


of young people engaging in serious offending and antisocial behaviour increases with the number of antisocial probability factors.

ICAP theory identifies the short-term and long-term factors influencing future criminal behaviour as supported by research conducted by the Social Exclusion Unit (2002). According to the Social Exclusion Unit (2002), failure to address issues arising with education and training, employment, substance misuse, health attitudes and self-control, life skills, housing and family relations may influence recidivism. Identifying the factors influencing offending behaviour as well as protective factors (and risk factors) are important for this research project, particularly for developing an effective social impact measurement framework. Farrington and Ttofi's (2014) focus on explaining the offending behaviour of children and young people from lower class backgrounds limits the generalisability of ICAP theory. Despite this limitation, synthesising ICAP theory with traditional and developmental criminological theories allows the researcher to create a robust theory of change framework. This is essential if one is to develop a holistic social impact measurement framework for youth offending that places young people at the centre of a beneficiary outcomes driven approach. It also allows the research to adopt a genuine multi-stakeholder approach to the developing of said framework, identified as best practice in prior research, through identification of all relevant stakeholders within the theory of change (Hazenberg et al., 2014; Clifford and Hazenberg, 2016).

## **Methodology**

In order to explore both definable outcomes and socially constructed narratives, the researcher adopted a sequential mixed methods design strategy (Figure 2) (Johnson et al., 2007), allowing for an interactive process, with the initial data collected contributing to the data collected in later stages (Creswell, 1998). This 'Straussian' grounded theory approach allows the researcher to consult with the literature in order to identify research focus and knowledge (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Adopting this approach allows the researcher to simultaneously collect and analyse data, creating analytical themes and codes from data rather than by pre-existing conceptualisations (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

Figure 2 – Research Strategy





A questionnaire was implemented to allow young people to share opinions confidentially. To create the questionnaire, the researcher considered the literacy and numeracy ages of the population and designed a Likert-scale questionnaire for young people, with open response questions for additional information. A retrospective case analysis was completed by accessing case file data for incarcerated young people agreeing to participate in the research. The initial categories and themes explored were grounded in existing literature, with revisions and adaptations made following analysis. Participants in the research were allocated codes to ensure anonymity and confidentiality throughout the research process. To complement the research, the researcher was also immersed in the research environment, attending meetings and spending time in the STC.

The STC participating in this research accommodates boys aged between 12 years-old and 18 years-old. At the time of data collection, the STC accommodated between 53 (YJB number cap from October 2016 – January 2017) and 96 young people. The demographic of young people was examined to establish the inclusion and exclusion criteria as directed by the literature and research questions. By adopting this method, the researcher excluded young people accommodated on remand due to their sentencing status (i.e. not yet proven guilty) and the indeterminate custodial timeframe. From the inclusion participant group, the researcher identified a sample of young people for invitation to the study. The research participants were aged 13-18 years-old, and the sample was representative of the STC population (n=68). The ethnicity of the participants was recorded by the researcher, with 46% identifying as White British, 32% identifying as Black, 14% identifying as mixed and the remainder identifying as White Other. Another important factor considered was the offence type, with participants indicating the offence type in the questionnaire. The main offence type for participants in the study was GBH (40%), with robbery the second most common offence type (29%). The experiences and relationships for children and young people prior to entering STCs was explored, with findings showing that a significant number of young people were exposed to parental separation (68.4 per cent), pro-criminal family members (68.4 per cent), domestic abuse (50.6 per cent), bereavement (25 per cent) and/or experiences in the care system (42.7 per cent).

## Analysis

Supported by a Straussian grounded theory approach, the researcher completed concurrent data collection and analysis (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). This approach, framed by a sequential mixed-method design, informed the direction of each step in the research process. For example, the emerging categories and/or themes and categories from the questionnaire and case file data were compared with existing literature and the initial analysis (Eisenhardt, 1989). Adopting a constant comparative method involves considering: What is happening? What conditions lead this to happen? And what does the data indicate? (Glaser, 1978; Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Data collected from the questionnaire was examined and analysed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (version 22), a quantitative analysis software package for managing data. The following statistical tests were run: descriptive statistics, sample distribution normality test, chi-square (cross-tabulation) test, correlation, and regression analysis. The questionnaire achieved a Cronbach's-alpha coefficient of .94, exceeding the recommended value of .80 (Loo, 2001) with no individual items significantly altering the overall reliability.

## **Findings**

Relying solely on theoretical perspectives, with limited exploration of the perceptions of young people, limits understanding of the social impact of youth offending interventions; therefore, this research will explore the perceptions of young people, albeit grounded within a theoretical frame centred on social impact measurement and ICAP theory. Following repeated interrogation of existing literature and primary data, four themes were identified: education; independence and resilience; relationships and trust; and attitude to offending. These areas supported prior research by the Social Exclusion Unit (2002) that suggested recidivism may occur if education and training, employment, substance misuse, health, attitudes and self-control, life skills, housing, and family relationships are inappropriately addressed.

## Education

Van Der Laan et al. (2009) suggested that long-term individual, family and education factors correlated with serious offending and antisocial behaviour. Further studies conducted by Machin and Meghir (2004) and Machin et al. (2011) reported empirical evidence of the positive effects of education on reducing acquisitive offences. Studies exploring the impact of education factors on desistance found that education has positive effects on reducing involvement in criminal activity (Van Der Laan et al., 2009; Machin and Meghir, 2004; Machin et al., 2011). A high proportion of participants had stopped attending education around 18 months before entering the STC, with an average education cessation age of 15 years-old. This finding raises questions about the effectiveness of education for this cohort of young people.

The negative impact of cessation in education for young people supports the ideas proposed by traditional strain theory around experiences of strain resulting from a failure to attain goals through legitimate means (Merton, 1938; Agnew, 1985; Farrington, 2003 and 2007; Van Der Laan et al., 2009). According to strain theorists, young people experiencing strain may resort to illegitimate means to achieve goals. The majority (76%) of young people in custody left education with no qualifications, training or employment opportunities. This reduces the legitimate means of achieving goals, hence influencing participation in criminal activity. In custody, young people receive 25 hours of education per week with the opportunity to complete GCSE and vocational qualifications; provision of such opportunities increases their available legitimate opportunities to achieve goals. On exploring satisfaction with education, young people that attended education prior to custody reported higher levels of satisfaction with education than those with prolonged absences from education. Satisfaction with education in the STC influenced the desire to continue with education, with those satisfied significantly more likely to continue with education or training on leaving the STC.

The number of young people in custody (36.4%) with Special Educational Needs [statement or Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan] was significantly higher than the national average for boys of 14.7% (DfE, 2016). Support for young people with Special

Educational Needs receives attention in government policy; however, support ceases for those Not in Education Employment of Training (NEET). From the case file information explored, 85% of young people were classed as NEET, with 36.4% reported to be SEN. The majority of young people failed to complete compulsory education before attendance ceased, with an average age for cessation of 14 years-old. The influence of educational factors (SEN, NEET, literacy and numeracy ability) on offending behaviour was explored by Lahey and Waldman (2005), Moffit (1997), and Sampson and Laub (1993).

Analysis showed that young people arriving at the centre had an average reading age of 12 years-old and average numeracy age of 11 years-old, whilst the mean age for young people accommodated in the centre was 16 years-old: 14.5% had a reading age between one and five years lower than expected and 24.0% had a reading age between six and eight years lower than expected. The differences in numeracy age were higher, with a numeracy age 5 years lower than expected in 50% of young people and a numeracy age between 6 and 8 years lower than expected in 35.4% of young people. On discharge from custody, the reading and numeracy ages for young people increased, with an average increase of seven months for reading age and nine months for numeracy age; the average increases in both reading and numeracy ages correlate with the length of sentences imposed. For young people receiving short custodial sentences the opportunities for improving their reading and numeracy skills is limited.

### Independence and Resilience

Education plays a significant role in supporting young people to develop; however, in a custodial environment young people are isolated from society which reduces the opportunity for developing independence skills that are crucial on release (Maguire and Raynor, 2006). Whilst the STC addresses active participation in education little is done to develop independence or resilience. Another important element of the STC statement of purpose relates to identifying stable living environments for young people (Dickens, Howell, Thoburn and Schofield, 2007). Dickens et al. (2007:639) found that young people require stable and secure accommodation to reduce the emotional turmoil resulting from "raised expectations and potential serial losses". Knowledge of future stable and secure accommodation is central to reducing emotional turmoil, particularly for young people presenting emotional regulation difficulties (67.7% of participants had reported


emotional regulation difficulties). Despite the statement of purpose, results suggest that 58.5% of young people have limited or no knowledge of future accommodation plans, which could be seen to create insecurity and impact negatively on their emotional wellbeing and motivation for the future.

Developing resilience and independence in young people is central to promoting positive transitions (Masten, 2001). Masten (2001) explored the notion of resilience, focusing on the importance of the environment in fostering or hindering the individual's ability to thrive, as a dynamic process with the interactions between the environment and individuals central to developing positive outcomes. The removal of adequate connected arrangements of support upon release creates a dislocation for young people at a time when they enter a difficult period confounded by a greater risk of involvement in criminal behaviour. Developing independence skills is equally important for promoting resilience in young people transitioning from custody, with young people receiving support to complete daily activities (e.g. cleaning, cooking), support that ceases upon release. Morris and Morris (1963) found that staff in custodial environments focused primarily on the custodial sentence, with limited emphasis on release preparations, a finding that this research supports. Over 50 years later, punishment appears to have remained the primary focus of custodial environments. Indeed, for young people leaving the STC, upon release the level of support reduces or ceases completely. Questionnaire data showed a significant number of young people (61.5%) received no support in learning independence skills or securing survival needs such as 'a place to live, a place to work and people to love' (Taxman, 2004:34).

### Relationships and Trust

Traditional theories on youth crime and offending highlight the importance of relationships in shaping the behaviours of young people. Analysis showed that a high proportion of young people had exposure to pro-criminal family members and peers (Figure 3).

Figure 3 - Exposed to pro criminal family members or peers



Research shows that strong and supportive relationships aid desistance from offending, highlighting that offending behaviour is influenced by poor family relationships, negative school experiences and delinquent influences (Sampson and Laub, 1993). Initial data analysis supports the work of Sampson and Laub (1993), with a high proportion of young people in the STC exposed to pro-criminal families and/or peers.

Another factor to consider in relation to family relationships was exposure to domestic violence, as 41.5% of research participants had witnessed or experienced domestic violence in their family home. Research by Kitzmann et al. (2003) found that exposure to parental aggression hinders the development of the psychosocial functioning of young people. Holt et al. (2006: 807) concluded that domestic violence “may resonate (for young people) inter-generationally with their own involvement in adult violence”. Information from a recent Ofsted (2017) report of the STC suggested that 37% (n=47) of young people had reported physical restraint since arriving and a significantly higher number will have witnessed this restraint. For young people with historical experiences of domestic violence, witnessing or experiencing a physical restraint in custody serves to mirror historical experiences, resulting in further trauma.

Given the importance of family relationships for young people in custody, the researcher examined the associations between mental wellbeing and relationships. Data shows that young people with positive family lives had significantly higher feelings of optimism and

usefulness. For these young people, the satisfaction with education and the desire to continue were also significantly higher. Developing positive and trustful relationships is central in motivating and supporting individuals to desist from offending, develop positive relationships and access services for support upon release (Clancy et al., 2006; Maguire and Raynor, 2006): Farrington and Ttofi (2014) discuss the importance of positive relationships and positive role models in reducing offending behaviour. Partridge (2004) explored trust, highlighting that young people do not want to share information with a succession of people.

Despite significant staff turnover, data suggests 95.4% of young people have positive relationships with *some* staff. On further exploration, young people reported relationship breakdowns following restraint, changes in case manager and/or inconsistent boundaries. Case files analysis shows that young people have significant relationships with an average of four members of staff (excluding unit staff members which vary on units). The impact of interventions delivered by staff members is influenced by the development of trust; however, this is challenging with young people in custody. This cohort will have experienced negative interactions with the criminal justice system (for example, police and social care), impacting on attitudes and relationships. The expectation that young people can develop significant and sustained trusting relationships with several staff members is unrealistic, reducing the impact of interventions (Hart, 2015). Hart (2015) recommended the creation of small living units, allowing staff and children to develop significant and trusting relationships. Before introducing small living units, organisations should consider the rates of turnover in order to minimise the impact on young people. Given the high turnover rates in STCs, training staff on managing change effectively is important in reducing the disruption caused to other staff members, young people and family members (Whitebook and Sakai, 2003).

Research conducted by Clancy et al. (2006), Maguire and Raynor (2006) and Lewis et al. (2007) highlighted the importance of continuity and trust in motivating and supporting desistance from offending. Young people in the STC report positive relationships with staff members on the units; however, the majority of interventions and key work sessions are delivered by different members of staff. This revolving door of professionals serves

to disrupt the continuity of trust between young people and staff, reducing the impact of interventions. Whilst acknowledging that 'handover' and change is inevitable in challenging environments, retaining the confidence and trust of young people relies on a sensitive transition process.

### Attitudes to offending and desistance

Maruna's (2001) research emphasised the role of personal narrative in understanding recidivism and desistance. This research suggested that recidivists viewed their personal circumstances and background as uncontrollable variables, while desisters acknowledged their responsibility for decisions and their control over life. Lewis et al. (2007) found that projects addressing attitudes and thinking with links to resources upon release are central to developing and sustaining motivation to change, resulting in higher rates of recidivism. Individuals sentenced to custody face several obstacles on release (for example, finding secure accommodation, reconnecting with friends and family, and securing education or employment). Zamble and Quinsey (1997) explored the impact of obstacles for adults leaving custody, finding that recidivists tended to respond with anger and despair, resulting in a decrease in motivation. For participants in this research, data shows that the majority (61.5%) felt no remorse for the crimes they had committed, with no desire to make amends. Given the high proportion of young people with pro-criminal relationships, young people learn definitions favourable to law violations rather than definitions unfavourable to law violations, in keeping with Sutherland's (1947) concept of differential association.


Exploring the perceptions of staff on desistance allowed the researcher to understand staff views on the wider social impact of custody on young people. Despite the STC's statement of purpose which highlights their aim of "preventing re-offending and preparing young people for their return to the community", the researcher found that a significant number of staff (73%) felt that young people would offend in the future. This conflict between the theoretical purpose of STCs and the perceptions of staff members creates questions over the effectiveness of STCs. In comparison to staff perceptions, 27.7% of young people felt they would offend in the future and 23.1% were unsure. Given the fact young people receive limited opportunities to learn independence skills and



develop pro-social attitudes, both central elements to reducing recidivism (Masten, 2011), the social impact on a significant number of them is minimal.

#### Rehabilitative Environment Model

Based on the themes identified from this research, a model for developing an environment promoting positive outcomes and desistance was created by the researcher (Figure 4).



This model, developed by positioning Farrington's (2005) framework within a wider SIM framework, highlights the key areas for developing positive outcomes for young people in custody (Farrington, 2005; Knowlton and Phillips, 2013 and Farrington and Ttofi, 2014). By monitoring and reviewing each step in this rehabilitation pyramid, STCs and Youth Justice Boards have the opportunity to measure the outcomes at each stage

(Hazenberg et al., 2014). If satisfactory outcomes are not achieved, it is impossible to progress up the pyramid. An environment promoting positive outcomes is predicated upon developing safety, trust and continuity as supported by existing literature and the current research project. Before developing trust and continuity, however, addressing health, wellbeing and safety issues for young people is central to creating an environment for fostering positive outcomes. Developing trustful relationships is central in motivating and supporting young people to desist from offending and effectively transition from custody (Clancy et al., 2006; Maguire and Raynor, 2006). Developing trustful relationships is influenced by staff continuity and consistency, which is challenging in complex environments. Introducing small living units with consistent staff members allows staff and young people to develop significant trustful relationships.

Fostering the right environment creates opportunities for young people to engage in education and training. Participation in education, training and employment is beneficial in promoting desistance and achieving positive outcomes for young people. The average age of cessation from education for those in the STC is 14, meaning that creating a positive environment to encourage participation in education is key (Merton, 1938; Van Der Laan et al., 2009; Machin et al., 2011). Another important factor for young people in custodial environments relates to developing independence and resilience. As young people in custody are isolated from society, creating an environment that helps develop their independence skills and resilience is important and would support the initial stages of their rehabilitation by allowing them to explore their attitudes to offending while promoting positive outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

This article sought to explore the use of social impact measurement as a form of organisational performance management for youth offending interventions. Measuring the social impact of youth offending interventions is a nascent area academically, with political and media attention focused on the offending and re-offending rates for this group. This article presented insights into the importance of education; independence and resilience; relationships and trust; and attitudes to offending in reducing recidivism and promoting desistance. By positioning ICAP theory within a wider SIM framework, an overall model (the rehabilitative model) was developed, providing the first steps in

introducing a model for measuring the wider impact of custody on young people. This rehabilitative model contains several sub-elements (i.e. relationships and trust), providing an opportunity for professionals to monitor and review the impact of each stage on young people in custody. This framework highlights the core factors of rehabilitation for young people in custody, paving the way for further research.

Acknowledging the limitations of findings from self-reported questionnaires are pivotal for developing further research. As statements in the questionnaire are fixed participants may misunderstand the statement or exaggerate responses. To reduce validity and reliability issues, responses were compared with data from the case file analysis and further research (semi-structured interviews) has been completed. Further research on developing a comprehensive social impact measurement framework for youth offending interventions remains a work in progress, with the interview stage nearing completion. Nevertheless, the early-stage data presented in this article suggests that a framework would provide a useful tool with which to assess outcomes for young people in custody, in order to better demonstrate those interventions that are most efficacious. Findings from this study have wider national and international relevance for the youth justice system, specifically in addressing the lack of effective measurement frameworks. Furthermore, the evidence gathered from such research provides support to those seeking to challenge the dominant policy discourse in youth justice that is centred upon punishment, control and retribution and has limited impact on recidivism.

## References

- Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social forces*. 64(1), 151-167.
- Bateman, T. (2017) *The state of youth justice 2017 – An overview of trends and developments*. National Association for Youth Justice – Justice for Children in Trouble.
- Brand, S. and Price, R. (2017) *The Economic and Social Cost of Crime*. The Home Office Research Study 217.
- Clancy, A., Hudson, K., Maguire, M., et al. (2006) *Getting Out and Staying Out: Results of the prisoner Resettlement Pathfinders*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Clifford, J., Hehenberger, L., & Fantini, M., (2014), *Proposed Approaches to Social Impact Measurement in European Commission legislation and in practice relating to: EuSEFs and the EaSI*, European Commission Report 140605.

Clifford, J. and Hazenberg, R. (2015) Aligning the needs and requirements for social investment, commissioning for social value and effective social enterprises. E3M Policy Article.

Creswell, J. (1998) *Qualitative Enquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. California: Sage Publications Ltd.

Department of Education (DfE) (2016) *Schools, pupils and their characteristics*. SFR 20/2016.

Dickens, J., Howell, D., Thoburn, J. and Schofield, G. (2007) Children starting to be looked after by local authorities in England: an analysis of inter-authority variation and case-centred decision-making. *British Journal of Social Work*, 37: 597-617.

Eisenhardt, K. (1989) Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.

Farrington, D. (2003) Key results from the first 40 years of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. In Thornberry, T. P., and Krohn, M. D. (2003) *Taking stock of delinquency: An overview of findings from contemporary longitudinal studies*. New York: Kluwer.

Farrington, D. (2005) *Integrated developmental and life-course theories of offending*. - *Advances in criminological theory*. NJ: Transaction.

Farrington, D. (2007) Childhood risk factors and risk-focused prevention. In Maguire, M., Morgan, R., and Reiner, R. (2007) *The Oxford handbook of criminology*, Fourth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farrington, D. and Ttofi, M. (2014) Developmental and Life-Course Theories of Offending, edited by Morizot, H. and Kazemian, L. (2014) *The Development of Criminal and Antisocial Behaviour*. Springer.

G4S (2016) *Principles and Practices in Secure Training Centres*. [email]

GECS Sub-group on Impact Measurement (2014) "Proposed Approaches to Social Impact Measurement in the European Commission legislation and practice relating to: EuSEFs and the EaSI", GECS Group.

Glaser, B. (1978) *Theoretical sensitivity*, California, The Sociology Press.

Hart, D. (2015) *Correction or care? The use of custody for children in trouble*. Available online:

<http://www.prisonerseducation.org.uk/data/Hart%20Diane%20Report%202015%20Final.pdf>. Accessed on 05/06/2017.

Hazenberg, R., Seddon, F. and Denny, S., (2014) Programme Recruitment & Evaluation: The effect of an employability enhancement programme on the general self-efficacy levels of unemployed graduates, *Journal of Education & Work*, 28(3), 273:300.

Hazenberg, R. and Clifford, J., (2016) 'GECES and the valid measurement of social impact in the VCSE sector'. In Gunn, R. & Durkin, C. (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship: A Skills Approach*. Policy Press.

Holt, S., Buckley, H., and Whelan, S. (2006) The impact of exposure to domestic violence on young people: A review of the literature. *Journal of Child Abuse and Neglect*. 32, 797-810.

Home Office (2004) *The role of education in enhancing life chances and preventing offending*. Available online: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/8465/1/dpr19.pdf>. Accessed on: 21 November 2016.

Johnson, R. and Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004) Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 14-26.

Kitzman, K., Gaylord, N., Holt, A., and Kenney, E. (2003) Child Witnesses to Domestic Violence: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 71(2), 229-235.

Knowlton, L. and Phillips, C. (2013). *The Logic Model Guidebook: Better Strategies for Great Results* (2nd Edition). London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Lahey B., and Waldman I. (2005) A developmental model of the propensity to offend during childhood and adolescence in Farrington D., *Advances in criminological theory*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers.

Lewis, S., Maguire, M., Raynor, P. et al. (2007) What works in resettlement? Findings from seven pathfinders for short-term prisoners in England and Wales. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 7(1): 33-53.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. California: Sage Publication.

Loo, R. (2001), Motivational Orientations toward Work: An Evaluation of the Work Preference Inventory, *Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and Development*, 33, 222-233.

Maas, K. (2014) *Classifying Social Impact Frameworks*. Available online: [http://tcblogs.org/public\\_html/wp-content/uploads/TCB\\_GT-V1N2-14.pdf?width=100](http://tcblogs.org/public_html/wp-content/uploads/TCB_GT-V1N2-14.pdf?width=100). Accessed on: 9 September 2015.

Machin, S. and Meghir, C. (2004) Crime and Economic Incentives. *J. Hum. Res.* 39: 958-979.

Machin, S., Marie, O. and Vujić, S. (2011) The Crime Reducing Effect of Education. *Econ J*. 121: 463-484.

Maguire, M. and Raynor, P. (2006) How the resettlement of prisoners promotes desistance from crime: or does it? *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 6(1): 19-38.

Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Merton, R. (1938) "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review*, 3:672-682.

Moffitt, T. (1997) Adolescence-limited and life-course persistent offending: A complementary pair of developmental theories, in Thornberry, T. *Advances in criminological theory*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction.

Morris, T. and Morris, P. (1963) *Pentonville: A Sociological Study of an English Prison*, London: Routledge.

Nevill, C. and Lumley, T. (2011) Impact measurement in the youth justice sector. Available online:

<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/measuring-together/youth-justice-measurement-final-3/?post-parent=4831>. Accessed on 9 September 2015.

Ogain, E., Lumley, T. and Pritchard, D. (2012) *Making an Impact*. London: NPC.

Ofsted (2017) *Inspections of Secure Training Centres – Inspection of Oakhill Secure Training Centre*. Available online:

[https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/secure-training-centre-reports/oakhill/OakhillSTC\\_January2017.pdf](https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/secure-training-centre-reports/oakhill/OakhillSTC_January2017.pdf). Accessed on 01 March 2017.

Partridge S. (2004) *Examining case management models for community sentences*. Home Office Online Report 17/04. London: Home Office.

Pearson, G. (1983) *Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears*. London: Macmillan.

Pitts, J. (2001) *The New Politics of Youth Crime: Discipline or Solidarity*. Dorset: Russell House.

Prowle, A., Murphy, P. and Prowle, M. (2014) Managing the Escalating Demand for Public Services in a Time of Financial Austerity: A Case Study of Family Interventions. *Journal of Finance and Management in Public Services*. 12(1), pp. 1-19.

Sampson, R., and Laub, J. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947) *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of qualitative research Grounded theory procedures and techniques* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Taxman, F. (2004) The offender and re-entry: Supporting active participation in reintegration. *Federal Probation* 68(2): 31-35.

Taylor, C. (2016) *Review of the Youth Justice System in England and Wales*. Ministry of Justice. ISBN 9781474134880.

UK Children's Commissioners (2015) Report of the UK Children's Commissioners UN Committee on the Rights of the Child: Examination of the fifth Periodic Report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Vanclay, F. (2003) International Principles for Social Impact Assessment. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 21(1), 5-11.

Van Der Laan, A., Blom, M, and Kleemans, E. R. (2009) Exploring long-term and short-term risk factors for serious delinquency. *European Journal of Criminology*, 6, 419-438.

Whitebook, M. and Sakai, L. (2003) Turnover begets turnover: an examination of job occupational instability among child care centre staff. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18, 273-293.

Youth Justice Board (2014) *Deaths of children in custody: action take, lessons learnt*. Available online:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/362715/deaths-children-in-custody.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/362715/deaths-children-in-custody.pdf). Accessed on 30 June 2016.

Youth Justice Board (2016) *Youth Justice Statistics 2014/2015*. Ministry of Justice. Available online:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-annual-statistics-2014-to-2015>. Accessed on: 12 September 2016.

**Claire Paterson-Young** completed an undergraduate and master's degree in criminology and criminal justice. She has significant experience working in youth and restorative justice, child sexual exploitation and safeguarding. Claire is currently completing research on the use of social impact measurement on youth offending interventions at the University of Northampton.

---

<sup>1</sup> STCs are designed to accommodate vulnerable young people aged between 12 and 18 years-old, providing a safe environment within secure conditions with educational provisions at the centre. Young people have access to 25 hours education per week in addition to substance misuse, psychology and health care services.

<sup>2</sup> Group of experts of the Commission on social enterprise.