

Exploring Pathways and Transitions between Juvenile
and Adult Penal Institutions

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements
of the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor
in Philosophy

By Jayne Price

May 2019

Abstract

This thesis advances understandings of how young people comprehend, negotiate, and experience, the pathways and transitions between young offender institutions [YOIs] within the juvenile secure estate and penal institutions within the young adult/adult estate. Young people within the juvenile secure estate are widely considered to be ‘vulnerable’ (Goldson, 2002; Gooch, 2016; Charlie Taylor, 2016) and the institutions in which they are held are intended to provide tailored support for the additional safeguards they require (Youth Justice Board [YJB], 2018a) despite evidence which suggests that this does not always obtain in practice (Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons [HMCIIP], 1997, 2017a). Upon turning age 18 years and therefore becoming ‘adult’ (Goldson, 2013) young people transfer into the young adult/adult estate (National Offender Management Service [NOMS], 2012). By virtue of their status, the services they are involved with and/or entitled to also change. This has been described as feeling like a ‘cliff-edge’ (Social Exclusion Unit [SEU], 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; National Audit Office [NAO], 2015).

NOMS (2012, p. 1) have acknowledged that this transfer represents a “challenging part of [young people’s] time in custody” due to the significant changes in regime and environment. The difficulties associated with transitions were first acknowledged within a joint inspection report in 2012 (Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorates [CJJI], 2012). Subsequent independent reviews (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) and inquiries (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c) have reported how the move is one of the most ‘stressful’ transfers (Harris, 2015, p. 95) and is “frequently abrupt and inadequately planned” (Royal College of Psychiatrists, cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61).

This thesis is unique in its exploration of this period of transition. A mixed methods approach was taken; this included tracked interviews which followed a cohort of young people pre- and post-transition, supplemented with interview data from a range of key stakeholders and data drawn from Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons [HMIP] surveys conducted during inspections. Four perspectives of transitions have been identified: (i) the official guidance (ii) ‘insider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working within penal institutions, (iii) ‘outsider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working outside of penal institutions and (iv) the experiences of the young people. There is a clear gap between the rhetoric of the official guidance and the ‘grim reality’ (Sim, 2008, p. 139) for young people. Although the young people interviewed reported that they felt ready to move and progress through the system, they stated they had little information and involvement throughout the process, and they felt unprepared. It was evident that the support the young people required post-transition was not available. It is argued, therefore, that the transition experience is ‘imagined’ (Carlen, 2008) and is a period which serves to exacerbate the vulnerability of those held (Beal, 2014).

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the young people who gave their time and participated in this research. I am extremely grateful that they shared their experiences with me. I wish them all the best and hope that through this research we help other young people.

The key stakeholders also kindly gave their time to be interviewed because they saw the value in this research and sought to help young people. I would like to thank them and wish them luck in this ongoing endeavour. I am also grateful to the staff within institutions who went out of their way to facilitate this research to ensure that the young people had the opportunity to share their experiences.

Without the unwavering patience, love and support of my parents and my partner, Phill, I would not have been able to undertake this PhD. I cannot thank them enough. My sister, Lyndsey, has also encouraged me throughout.

I am lucky to have had the backing of a wealth of knowledge and experience from my supervisory team. Professor Barry Goldson devised the original project and has been an inspiration to me. He has provided invaluable advice, detailed feedback and commitment to me throughout. I am grateful to Dr Liz Turner who has also provided clear, considered feedback and supported me through this process. Catherine Shaw from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons kindly facilitated significant access to the Inspectorate which was of great importance to the research. I wish to thank them all for their contributions.

I also would like to acknowledge the Economic and Social Research Council CASE studentship funding (ES/J500094/1) which made the project possible.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons was a contributing partner to this project and every member of the team I met was extremely kind and welcoming. I would especially like to thank Dr Tamara Al Janabi, Deborah Butler, Ian Dickens, Angela Johnson, Keith McInnis, Angus Mulready-Jones and Helen Ranns. The contribution of the Inspectorate was of immense value and I wish to thank Professor Nick Hardwick, the previous Chief Inspector of Prisons, for his support for the project.

I have been fortunate to study at two fantastic Universities during my time within academia. Dr Janet Jamieson, Dr Matthew Millings and Professor Joe Sim from Liverpool John Moores University stimulated my interest in the areas of youth justice and prisons and have always been available to offer advice and support when needed. I am grateful to everyone within

The School of Law and Social Justice at the University of Liverpool who made my time there thoroughly enjoyable, particularly Lisa Hawksworth who provided much needed library assistance and Katie Hunter who has been a supportive friend from my first day.

Finally, I must acknowledge my colleagues at the University of Chester who have been wonderfully supportive and welcoming.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
List of tables	viii
Glossary of Terms	ix
Chapter One. Introduction	1
Research context.....	1
<i>The Youth Justice System [YJS]</i>	1
<i>The juvenile secure estate</i>	2
<i>Young adult prisoners</i>	5
<i>The young adult estate</i>	6
<i>Institutional transitions and inspection regimes</i>	9
The background context	11
Research objectives	14
Conceptual and methodological approaches	15
Outline of the thesis.....	16
Chapter Two. Life course transitions: from childhood through youth and into adulthood	20
Childhood.....	20
<i>Developmental psychology approaches</i>	21
<i>Social constructionist approaches</i>	21
Transitions: biological and structural processes.....	23
Reconfigured ‘transitions’	30
Conclusion.....	32
Chapter Three. Institutional transitions: from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult estate	35
Introduction	35
Institutional and post-institutional transitions	35
<i>Planning, communication and continuity</i>	40
<i>Reception and induction processes</i>	44
<i>Risk</i>	47
<i>Needs</i>	52
<i>Management, control and coercion</i>	55
Policy implications	59
Conclusion.....	63
Chapter Four. Methodology	66
Background, aims and research design	66

Methods, sample sizes and reflections.....	67
<i>Documentary, statistical and literature review</i>	67
<i>Access and interview techniques</i>	68
<i>Interviews with young people</i>	69
<i>Interviews with key stakeholders</i>	71
<i>Aggregated/thematic analyses of HMIP survey data</i>	72
<i>Fieldwork notes</i>	75
Practical issues in attaining access and selecting participants	76
Ethical considerations.....	79
Thematic analyses / framework for analysis	84
Reliability and validity	86
Reflexivity.....	88
<i>Researcher role</i>	88
<i>Narrative</i>	90
<i>Institutional environments</i>	92
<i>Emotions: researcher and participants</i>	93
Conclusion.....	95
Chapter Five. Life in the juvenile YOI: pre-transition.....	96
Introduction	96
Reception and induction.....	97
<i>Official guidance</i>	97
<i>'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	98
<i>'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	99
<i>Young peoples' perspectives</i>	101
Assessment	105
<i>Official guidance</i>	105
<i>'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	106
<i>'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	107
<i>Young peoples' perspectives</i>	109
Doing time.....	111
<i>Official guidance</i>	111
<i>'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	111
<i>'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives</i>	113
<i>Young peoples' perspectives</i>	114
Preparation	118
<i>Official guidance</i>	118

' <i>Insider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives	119
' <i>Outsider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives	123
<i>Young peoples'</i> perspectives	126
Conclusion.....	131
Chapter Six. Life in the young adult/adult institution: post-transition	134
Introduction	134
Reception and induction.....	134
<i>Official guidance</i>	134
' <i>Insider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	135
' <i>Outsider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives	140
<i>Young peoples'</i> perspectives	141
Assessment	146
<i>Official guidance</i>	146
' <i>Insider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	147
' <i>Outsider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	150
<i>Young peoples'</i> perspectives	152
Doing time.....	155
<i>Official guidance</i>	155
' <i>Insider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	155
' <i>Outsider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	159
<i>Young peoples'</i> perspectives	161
Future transitions.....	166
<i>Official guidance</i>	166
' <i>Insider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	167
' <i>Outsider</i> ' key stakeholders' perspectives.....	168
<i>Young peoples'</i> perspectives	170
Conclusion.....	172
Chapter Seven. Pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult estate	174
Introduction	174
Vulnerability.....	174
Coping	178
Distinction between 'child' and 'young adult'	179
Distance between policy and practice.....	182
The impacts of transitions.....	184
Future transitions.....	186

Conclusion.....	187
Chapter Eight. Conclusion.....	190
Contextualising the research	190
Aims and methods	192
Principal policy and practice implications.....	193
<i>Responses to children and young people</i>	193
<i>Transition support</i>	195
<i>Responses to young adults</i>	197
Limitations of the research	200
Directions for future research	201
Bibliography	203
Appendices	265
Appendix One. Young person participant information sheet.....	265
Appendix Two. Key stakeholder participant information sheet.....	269
Appendix Three. Young person consent form	274
Appendix Four. Key stakeholder consent form	276
Appendix Five. Interview schedule - young person pre-transition.....	279
Appendix Six. Interview schedule - young person post-transition	287
Appendix Seven. Interview schedule – key stakeholder.....	294
Appendix Eight. HMIP survey data across STCs August 2014 – July 2017	303
Appendix Nine. HMIP survey data across YOIs August 2014 – July 2017	307
Appendix 10. HMIP survey data across Young Adult Institutions August 2014 – July 2017	316
Appendix 11. HMIP survey data across Adult Male Prisons August 2014 – July 2017	327
Appendix 12. HMIP survey data across Adult Women Prisons August 2014 – July 2017	337
Appendix 13. Interviewees	347
<i>Young peoples’ pseudonyms and their establishments</i>	347
<i>Key stakeholders</i>	347

List of tables

Table 1. Number of Transitions to the over 18 estate by gender and sector type, 2014/15 to 2016/17 (Onyejeli, 2018 and HMPPS Briefing and Correspondence, 2019).	377
--	-----

Glossary of Terms

ACCT	Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork Procedure
ADHD	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
Adjudication	A formal disciplinary process conducted within institutions when a prisoner is suspected of committing an offence (MoJ, 2017b, p. 30)
AMHS	Adult Mental Health Services
Association	Time spent out of cell on the wing with other prisoners
CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CHAT	Comprehensive Health Assessment Tool
CJI	Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorates
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CRC	Community Rehabilitation Company
Discipline transfer	A process whereby prisoners can be moved without notice to a different institution as a consequence of their 'violent and/or disruptive' behaviour. In the case of transitions, this may take place in advance of their 18 th birthday (NOMS, 2012)
ETE	Education, Training and Employment
Full search	Commonly known as a 'strip search' whereby the person being search is required to remove their clothing although guidance provides that young people should be provided with covering to ensure that they are not completely naked during a search (NOMS, 2016)
HMCIP	Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMPPS	Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges behaviour scheme
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board

Level A rub down search	An enhanced physical search of a person conducted by an officer. The person being searched is fully dressed, although they are asked to empty the contents of their pockets. The officer conducting the search also searches the individuals' footwear, head, nose, mouth and ears (NOMS, 2016)
Level B rub down search	A standard physical search of a person conducted by an officer. The person being searched is fully dressed, although they are asked to empty the contents of their pockets (NOMS, 2016)
Moj	Ministry of Justice
MMPR	Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint
NAO	National Audit Office
NEET	Neither in education, employment or training
nDelius	Case management system used by Probation Services (although CRCs are not obligated to use it) to hold offender information
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
NPM	National Preventative Mechanism
NPS	National Probation Service
NRC	National Research Committee
OASys	Offender Assessment System used across institutions holding adults
OMU	Offender Manager Unit
PA	Personal Advisor (for young people with care experience)
PPO	Prisons and Probation Ombudsman
PSI	Prison Service Instruction
SCH	Secure Children's Home
STC	Secure Training Centre

Sweat box	A colloquial term (prison parlance) to describe the cellular escort van that is used to transfer prisoners from courts to prisons and between institutions. Vans are described using such terminology because prisoners become exceptionally hot whilst confined in closed spaces within the vans
UNCRC	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
VP	Vulnerable Prisoners
YJB	Youth Justice Board
YJS	Youth Justice System
YOI	Young Offenders Institution
YOS	Youth Offending Service
YOT	Youth Offending Team

Chapter One. Introduction

This thesis advances understandings of how young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between juvenile young offender institutions [YOIs] in the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult institutions. It builds on, and substantially extends, previous findings from independent inspectorates (Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorates [CJJI], 2012; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) by offering original insights into the lived experiences of young people undergoing such transitions whilst they also negotiate life course transitions between 'childhood' and 'adulthood'. This chapter introduces the current research context within the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate before outlining the rationale for the study, research objectives, the conceptual and methodological approaches and finally an overview of the structure of the thesis.

Research context

The Youth Justice System [YJS]

Within domestic legislation (Home Office, 1933) and internationally recognised frameworks (United Nations [UN], 1989), 'children' are defined as aged under 18 years. Young people negotiating ambiguous transitions between 'childhood' and 'adulthood' are commonly referred to as 'adolescents', 'youth' and 'young adults'. During periods of transition and identity formation they may engage in more risky behaviours (Arnett, 2000) and flout societal conventions (Wallace and Cross, 1990). Therefore, this group are typically subject to more negative perceptions and representations than other populations in society (Jefferies and Smith, 1998). Such portrayals are especially present in criminal justice narratives particularly since the Conservative Party Manifesto in 1979 (Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 2018). More recently, in advance of the 1997 general election New Labour took a tougher stance on youth crime through numerous punitive policy documents (Goldson, 2015). After their successful election, New Labour created 1,018 new criminal offences by 2005 which resulted in a 25,000 increase of the general prison population by 2007 (Carlen, 2008). The child prison population also rose significantly due to several punitive sanctions (see Muncie, 2005, 2008; Goldson, 2010, 2015) and the "routine incarceration of children" became a key feature of youth justice policy (Goldson, 2006, p. 453).

The *Crime and Disorder Act* 1998 (Home Office, 1998) initiated a number of youth justice reforms including the introduction of the Youth Justice Board [YJB] and YJS which are

intended to be child-centred – although this has been disputed (see for example Goldson, 2015). In England and Wales children are held criminally responsible and therefore enter the YJS from age 10 years. The YJB was introduced (at least in part) to support those aged under 18 years within the Criminal Justice System [CJS] and both to address the risks they were deemed to pose and to attend to their specific needs as a vulnerable group (Home Office, 1998; Simmonds, 2016). Locally devolved youth offending services [YOS] and youth offending teams [YOT] supervise young people¹ involved within the YJS. Such young people are frequently described as vulnerable (Goldson, 2002; Yates, 2010; Willow, 2015; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017; Gooch, 2015, 2016, 2017; Girling, 2017) particularly due to the overrepresentation of those drawn from difficult circumstances (Goldson, 2010, 2015, 2019) including education exclusion and local authority care experience (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons [HMIP], 1999; Redmond, 2015; Simmonds, 2016; Taflan, 2017; Green, 2019). Many have also been victims of trauma and abuse (Goldson, 2002; Willow, 2015; Liddle *et al.*, 2016; Charlie Taylor, 2016; Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016a, 2016b; Longfield and Casey, 2018). Such children are especially vulnerable when they are placed in penal detention and even more vulnerable when such detention takes the form of a YOI (Goldson, 2002).

The juvenile secure estate

The Prison Service Instruction [PSI] *Care and Management of Young People* states: “young people are not yet adults and every care should be taken to ensure that both the conditions of custody and regime activities promote their well-being and healthy growth.” (Ministry of Justice [MoJ], 2012, p. 5). According to official guidance, young people aged under 18 years² are held within penal institutions that should be structured to provide the tailored support and the additional safeguards that they require by virtue of being a ‘child’ (YJB, 2018a). Three types of institutions comprise the juvenile secure estate; secure children’s homes [SCHs], secure training centres [STCs] and YOIs. In 2017/18, at the time of this research, the average monthly custodial population was 894 and was predominately male (96%) (YJB, 2019a).

¹ Throughout this thesis the term ‘young people’ is used to describe those experiencing the transition between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate. Although ‘young people’ aged under 18 years are by legal definition (Home Office, 1933) and international frameworks (UN, 1989) ‘children’ it is a term that many young people involved in this research would object to.

² Young people aged 18 years and over may be held in the juvenile secure estate for a short period after their 18th birthday (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2019b).

The youngest children - and those deemed to be the most 'vulnerable' (MoJ, 2014) - are held in smaller, more expensive units; SCHs and STCs which are supposedly more tailored to support young people and their specific needs and vulnerabilities (Department for Education, 2015a; Redmond, 2015; Warner *et al.*, 2018; Wells, 2018). The eight SCHs in England and Wales are managed by Local Authorities and the Department for Education and have a high staff to young person ratio (1:2 in SCHs, 3:8 in STCs (Wells, 2018)). Males and females aged 12-17 years are also held across three STCs which detain around 19% of the juvenile secure estate population (YJB, 2019a). Young people within STCs tend to be older than those within SCHs but they are also deemed to be vulnerable making YOI placement inappropriate (YJB, 2018a).

Older (aged 15-17 years) males are held in larger YOIs with lower staff to young person ratios than SCHs and STCs (1:10 (Wells, 2018)). The majority of young people held at the time of this research were detained within one of five YOIs (70%) (YJB, 2019a). YOIs hold only males as they were decommissioned for young women in 2013 (MoJ, 2015a). In 2014 the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Coalition Government announced plans to increase the amount of education a young person in a YOI receives per week to 30 hours (Selous, 2014; MoJ, 2014) in line with education expectations across the juvenile secure estate (Gov.UK, 2018a). The difference in support available across institutions is evidenced in the investment in resources: the costs per place per annum at £82,639 in a juvenile YOI (MoJ, 2016a), £178,000 in a STC (Redmond, 2015) and over £200,000 in a SCH (MoJ, 2014).

The juvenile secure estate population decreased significantly between March 2010 and 2015 with a 57% drop in the number of those aged under 18 years held (YJB, 2016a). The decrease was thought to be driven by the "de-politicisation of youth crime and justice, which was, in turn, encouraged by a desire to curb excessive cost." (Bateman, 2017, p. 49). Commentators have raised concerns that despite the drop in young prisoners there are "higher concentrations of complex needs" (Bateman, 2015, p. 4) and therefore are extremely vulnerable (Hardwick, cited in Summerfield, 2011).

Of the young people in YOIs in 2016/17 42% reported that they had experienced local authority care (Taflan, 2017) and 39% in 2017-18 (Green, 2019). Despite a drop in entrants to the juvenile secure estate the number of care leavers in YOIs rose sharply between 2009/10 and 2014/15 from 27% to 38% (Redmond, 2015). The vulnerability of children in trouble is often associated with their developmental immaturity (Goldson, 2002; Gooch and Treadwell, 2015; Gooch, 2016, 2017; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016b, 2016c).

Those with related emotional, learning or communication difficulties – including care leavers who are likely to have experienced multiple adversities such as personal difficulties, abuse, and victimisation (Bateman, 2017) – are considered ‘doubly vulnerable’ as they have complex support needs (Jacobson and Talbot, 2009).

The age of entrants to the juvenile secure estate has increased (Bateman, 2017) and there are concerns about the prevalence of complex needs of those held (Bateman, 2015; Hart, 2017; HMIP, 2018). Adverse experiences in childhood and experience within the CJS tends to ‘stall’ maturation (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform 2015) as it “risks exposing children to very real damage and harm, even fatal harm, during their formative years” (Gooch, 2016, p. 278). Article 37 (b) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child [UNCRC] (UN, 1989) states that child imprisonment should be a ‘last resort’ and for the “shortest appropriate period of time”, however data from 2016/17 shows that those sentenced are held for longer periods of time (YJB, 2018b). Some academics and campaign groups have called for the abolition of child imprisonment (Goldson, 2002, 2005; Willow, 2015; Godfrey *et al.*, 2017; Article39.org.uk, 2018).

In 2015 the Government announced a review of the YJS (Gov.UK, 2015). The review, led by Charlie Taylor (2016), a former teacher, focused upon the importance of education within custodial facilities and recommended the introduction of secure schools to rehabilitate young people. The Government responded by stating improvement would be made to youth custody provision through a 20% increase of frontline staff, greater focus on education and the introduction of two new secure schools (MoJ, 2016b) and further details of these institutions were emerging during this research (Argar, 2018; HM Government, 2018; MoJ, 2018a). In 2017 it was announced that the MoJ would take over the responsibility and accountability for commissioning youth custody services from the YJB under the newly established Her Majesty’s Prison and Probation Service [HMPPS] (Truss, 2017a). Michael Spurr (cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017), then the Chief Executive Officer [CEO] of HMPPS, stated that the YJB remained in a ‘valuable’ position to advise ministers about youth custodial provision without the responsibility of delivery.

Academics have frequently raised concerns about the suitability of the juvenile secure estate for children and young people (Goldson, 2002; Willow, 2015; Gooch, 2015, 2016). The emergence of footage in a BBC Panorama (2016) documentary which showed children held in Medway STC subject to abuse by staff of the privately contracted company G4S led to a Government response. The Youth Custody Improvement Board (Wood, Bailey and Butler,

2017) was established to review the youth custodial estate and to make recommendations. Medway was subsequently taken back into public management (Gove, 2016b; YJB, 2016b) and four staff were sacked but later cleared of misconduct (BBC News, 2018b). Subsequent inspection reports have judged Medway to be inadequate or requiring improvement (Ofsted, 2016, 2017, 2018a) and there have been calls for its closure (Article39.org.uk, 2016; Crook, 2016). Concerns about the juvenile secure estate are persistent over time, and were raised by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons [HMCIP] (1997) over 20 years ago and repeated in 2017 (HMCIP, 2017a, p. 9): "by February this year we had reached the conclusion that there was not a single establishment that we inspected in England and Wales in which it was safe to hold children and young people.". Commentators have raised concerns about staffing levels within the juvenile secure estate (House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019) and the Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse (2019, p. vi) has criticised the 'culture' of "containment and control" within institutions.

Young adult prisoners

'Children' and 'adults' are governed under different principles across the CJS (Home Office, 1998). The YJS is concerned primarily with young people below the age of 18 years and since 2017 it has formed a 'distinct' arm of HMPPS (Truss, 2017a). Those aged 18-20 years are defined as 'young adults' (MoJ, 2015b, 2017a) although this term has been criticised for being too narrow (Nacro, 2000). In 2017 young adults (aged 18-20 years) amounted to 5% (4,357) of the overall prison population (Allen and Watson, 2017). Although the young adult population has decreased (MoJ, 2017b) the drop is not as significant as that found in the juvenile secure estate (Bateman, 2015, 2017). Whilst the juvenile secure estate has reduced in size and population, distinct provision within the young adult/adult estate has declined and there have been reports expressing concerns about staffing resources and safe population management (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2014; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Charlie Taylor, 2016; Independent Monitoring Board [IMB], 2018a), a point that we will return to throughout this thesis.

Young prisoners aged between 21 and 24 years are considered as 'adults' despite research evidence that demonstrates how maturity and brain development continues until age 25 years. The processes of neurological development continuing into young adulthood (Prior *et al.*, 2011; HMIP, 2017a; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) means young people "continue to present with profound needs for support appropriate to their emotional and behavioural immaturity" (CLINKS, 2017, p. 5), which affects decision making and impulsivity (Edwards, 2009). Reckless

and aggressive behavioural traits reflective of ongoing neurological development are particularly exacerbated in those who have experienced neglect and abuse early on in life as many young adults/adults held within penal institutions have (Hart, 2017).

The statutorily defined differences between 'children' and 'adults' mean that additional safeguards offered to young people within the YJS do not follow them when they reach the age of 18 years and transition into the young adult/adult systems (Nacro, 2001; Prison Reform Trust, 2004; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2009; Charlie Taylor, 2016). Young adults have widely been acknowledged, across independent reviews and official discourse, as having differing needs to the wider prison population (HMIP, 2012, 2017a; MoJ, 2012, 2013c, 2016b, 2017a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). This has led to calls for an acknowledgement of young adults aged up to 25 years as a distinct group (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; HMIP, 2017a), however reaching the age of 18 years remains the defining marker of adulthood in criminal justice (MoJ, 2013a). The differing understandings across policies, practice, research and reviews has created a tension between the definitions of what constitutes a 'young adult prisoner', the provision that they receive and the services that they require. There have been calls for more developmentally appropriate principles for sentencing young adults (Howard League for Penal Reform and Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2018).

In 2016 The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) launched an inquiry into the treatment of young adults within the CJS. The Committee has been critical of the treatment of this population, particularly the arbitrary 'split' at age 18 years without any 'joined-up' oversight of young people aged between 18 and 25 years. Anyone aged over 18 years falls within the 'adult' prison population and MoJ and National Offender Management Service [NOMS] data of this population has been found to be inconsistent and often aggregated with that of older offenders (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). The Government responded to the inquiry by acknowledging that young adults have 'distinct needs' but stated that the 'constraints' of the prison estate means that they must be managed within, and to similar standards, to the adult population (Stewart, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018a, p. 1).

The young adult estate

Upon turning age 18 years young people are considered 'adult' and so transfer from the juvenile secure estate into the young adult estate (a dedicated young adult YOI for those aged 18-21 years or 18-25 years) or an adult prison which may have an integrated young

adult population (NOMS, 2012)³. In becoming an ‘adult’ and moving to one of these institutions the young person is expected to “adapt to the greater levels of autonomy expected once they reach legal adulthood” (MoJ, 2013a, p. 14). Establishments for young adults and adults have fewer staff and less supportive services available when compared with the juvenile secure estate (NOMS, 2012).

The *Criminal Justice Act 1988* (Home Office, 1988) introduced the ‘detention in a young offender institution’ sentence for males aged 14-21 years and females aged 15-21 years. The *Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000* (Home Office, 2000a) abolished this sentence with the Labour Government taking the view that as 18 years was the age of majority there was ‘no logic’ in having a separate sentence for those aged under 21 years. The House of Commons Justice Committee (2019) have stated that this ‘anomaly’ means that young adults are no longer held in suitably specialist provision. At the time of writing only Aylesbury (HMCIP, 2017b), Brinsford (HMCIP, 2018c) and Deerbolt (HMCIP, 2018a) were considered ‘young adult YOIs’ despite holding prisoners aged over 21 years⁴. Young adult YOIs have increasingly begun to accommodate an older cohort of offenders (Justice, 2017; Spurr cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017) and are ‘coterminous’ with adult prisons (National Preventative Mechanism [NPM], 2018, p. 51), so it is difficult to determine what exactly constitutes a ‘dedicated’ facility⁵. Young adult YOIs are only for males, females aged 18 years and older are held in women’s prisons. There remains a ‘statutory distinction’ between young adult offenders (aged 18-20 years) and adult offenders (aged 21 years and older) (MoJ, 2013a) however there is no specific legal framework governing them as a group (Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012; Allen, 2013) and HMCIP (2017a) has found young adult males were held in the ‘majority’ of establishments they inspected.

The *Young Offender Institution Rules 2000* (Home Office, 2000b, p. 5) state that the aim of YOIs is to help offenders prepare for release into the community by “providing a programme of activities, including education, training and work designed to assist offenders to acquire or develop personal responsibility, self-discipline, physical fitness, interests and skills and to

³ For more information about different functions of prisons based on prison category level within the young adult/adult estate see MoJ (2016a, 2018d).

⁴ HM YOI Feltham and HMP Hindley have designated young adults sites separate from the wider population (HMCIP, 2015a).

⁵ Given that previously ‘distinct’ young adult YOIs have begun to hold prisoners of all ages (Justice, 2017; Spurr cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017a), establishments which hold young people aged 18 years and over will be referred to as young adult/adult institutions within the young adult/adult estate throughout this thesis. The ‘young adult estate’ will only be used when making explicit reference to distinct, designated young adult YOIs.

obtain suitable employment after release”. The juvenile secure estate is more supportive and more generously resourced than the young adult/adult estate (YJB, 2014a) with guidance and structures that pay greater intention to the protection of children considering their age, maturity and individual circumstances (MoJ, 2012). Young adult/adult establishments, for example, do not have the same expectation of 30 hours educational provision as applies in the juvenile secure estate (MoJ, 2014).

The overall annual resource expenditure per prisoner within a young adult YOI was £47,391 in 2017/18 and as little as £29,967 across the wider adult estate (MoJ, 2018d) compared with £82,639 for juvenile YOIs (MoJ, 2016a). Juvenile justice systems focus on changing behaviours and attitudes “based on an understanding that the personalities and criminal patterns of youths are more malleable than those of adults.” (Abrams, Anderson-Nathe and Aguilar, 2008, p. 22-23). The separate jurisdictions and the vast difference in resource expenditure is indicative of the ‘second rate’ status of young adults (Scott and Grisso, 1997; Bryan-Hancock and Casey, 2011; Ellis, 2018).

In recent times prisons are reported to be in ‘crisis’ with accounts of violence (Rolfe, and Gillan, 2016a; Beard, 2017; BBC News, 2017, 2018a; Hansard, 2017) and low staffing levels (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2014) although academics have argued that prisons have perpetually been in crisis (Carlen, 2005; Sim, 2008; Wincup, 2017) and do not improve upon their past failures (Goldson, 2015). The Conservative Government has gone some way to acknowledge the issues and a number of reforms were planned within the *Prison Safety and Reform* White Paper (MoJ, 2016c) and *Prisons and Courts Bill* (Parliament, House of Commons, 2017). However, the dissolution of Parliament in May 2017 meant that the *Prisons and Courts Bill* was withdrawn (Gov.UK, 2017). The decision to withdraw the Bill was met with criticism from many including HMCIP Peter Clarke. However, one of the planned reforms was subsequently introduced when HMCIP was given the authority to publicly demand an urgent action from the Secretary of State for Justice through the ‘Urgent Notification’ agreement when prisons are found to have significant problems (HMIP, 2017b).

The *Prison Safety and Reform* White Paper went ahead with announced investments in prison officers and their relationships with prisoners (MoJ, 2016c). An additional 20% of operational frontline staff within juvenile YOIs was also allocated (MoJ, 2016b). The Government boldly claimed that the prison staff target within the young adult/adult estate was met seven months ahead of schedule (MoJ, 2018b, 2018c) but there were criticisms that the additional staff members simply replaced those with much more experience who had left; including

those who accepted a voluntary exit package (Sullivan, 2018). Following these reforms HMPPS was established as a new 'operationally focused' service to replace NOMS in 2017 to oversee the management of community and custodial sentences (Truss, 2017b).

Outside of the prison system, Probation reforms under *Transforming Rehabilitation* (MoJ, 2013b) split the Probation Service into: the public National Probation Services [NPS] and private Community Rehabilitation Companies [CRCs] which work on a 'fee-based service' (CJI, 2016). This has received widespread criticism (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2015a, 2017a; Burke, 2016; CJI, 2016; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018b) including from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) which believe that YJB and NOMS failed to consider the impact it would have on links and effective communication between youth and adult services upon transition. It was announced in 2019 that the Probation Service would be renationalised (MoJ, NPS and HMPPS, 2018, 2019).

Institutional transitions and inspection regimes

The processes of transition from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult estate was initially inspected in 2012 by the CJI (2012) which found that although young people apparently felt ready to transition, they received little information about their move in advance and their education, training and employment [ETE] opportunities were interrupted due to a gap in case management and sentence planning. This led to the NOMS (2012) protocol (which replaced the 2008 *Progression to the Young Adult Estate* guidance (see CJI, 2012)) and subsequent YJB specific guidance documents were also published (YJB, 2012, 2013, 2014b, 2015, 2018d, 2019c). A follow-up inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) found little progress on the CJI (2012) recommendations. Custodial transitions were found to be worse than those in the community with insufficient planning and communication which interrupted sentence planning and interventions (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation 2016a).

HMIP⁶ is an independent inspectorate statutorily obliged to provide scrutiny of the treatment and conditions of those held in institutions including prisons, immigration detention facilities and court custody suites (HMIP, 2014). HMCIP reports the Inspectorates findings directly to the Justice Secretary and Ministers. STCs and YOIs within the juvenile secure estate are inspected annually but young adult YOIs and the wider prison estate are inspected less

⁶ Inspection reports are authored by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons [HMCIP] other reports from the Inspectorate such as thematic reports are authored by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons [HMIP].

frequently. SCHs are inspected by Ofsted in England and Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales and Estyn in Wales (Redmond, 2015). HMIP inspection reports do not directly review the transitions processes and although they occasionally document instances of transitions the issue was entirely absent from the 2017/18 annual Children in Custody report (Green, 2019). Reports by wider commentators such as Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2015b), CJI (2016) and NPM (2018) also provide useful evidence on how young adults are prepared for wider transitions into the community.

Each YOI and prison has an IMB comprising voluntary members of the public who have unrestricted access to the institution throughout the year to monitor the standards within it and address any issues. The Boards were established by the Prison Act 1952 and the members are appointed by ministers. IMBs report their findings about whether institutions are meeting expected standards and the impact on those held annually to the Secretary of State (IMB, 2016c). HMIP and IMB work alongside each other together with the YJB, Prisons and Probation Ombudsman [PPO] as part of the UK's NPM which was introduced to comply with the Optional Protocol of the United Nations Convention against Torture. The NPM conducted a thematic project on transitions between places of detention, including child to adult custodial provision, and documented some examples of transitions within their 2018 annual report (NPM, 2018).

Concerns have begun to emerge about the experiences of young people transitioning between the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate (CJI, 2012; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013; Harris, 2015; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a). Particular attention has been drawn to the reduction of the young adult estate (HMCIP, 2015a) and inadequate treatment and conditions endured by young prisoners (Nacro, 2001; Bateman, 2015; Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015). Research which demonstrates how young people continue to mature developmentally until they are aged 25 years (Blakemore and Choudhury, 2006; Prior *et al.*, 2011; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) and make transitions into employment and independent living at older ages than previous generations (Roberts, 2009) has also begun to gain traction. Consequently, there has been an acknowledgement in independent reviews (CJI, 2012; HMCIP, 2014a; Harris, 2015; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and Government responses (MoJ, 2015b, 2017a) of the crucial importance of this 'stressful' period during transitions to adulthood (Harris, 2015, p. 95).

Medlicott (2008, p. 244) has argued that independent monitoring has not “prevented inhumane treatment and routine casual cruelty in the prisons of England and Wales”. There is some emerging – albeit schematic and episodic - evidence that young people can encounter substantial difficulties in negotiating (poorly managed) transitions between juvenile YOIs and young adult YOIs (Newcomen, 2017a). This research is informed by the existing evidence, but it stretches it significantly by undertaking the first empirical study of the specific experiences of young people as they transition from juvenile to young adult/adult institutions. Gooch (2016, p. 279) has highlighted the importance of such research at a crucial stage of the life course:

“The extent to which this combination of youthfulness, immaturity and transitional life stage gives rise to experiential and conceptual differences needs to be better understood, as does the way in which the treatment of children serves to mitigate, or exacerbate, the ‘pains’ of imprisonment.”

This thesis offers a unique insight into the experiences of, progression through and movements between prison environments and in doing so it extends knowledge of juvenile and youth penal detention.

This thesis comes at a time of significant change: as the governance of youth custody services has moved to HMPPS (Truss, 2017a); institutions for children have been deemed unsafe by a range of commentators (Fenton, 2017; HMCIP, 2017a; Local Government Association, 2017; Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017) and the structure of the juvenile secure estate is once more being reviewed (Charlie Taylor, 2016; HM Government, 2018; MoJ, 2018a). The change in context is further elaborated by the substantial reduction in the juvenile secure estate population, reforms to the young adult estate, the increasing mixed economy of youth justice and criminal justice stakeholders (public and private) and the revised lines of management across services, all of which have impacted upon the nature of service delivery during processes of penal transitions.

[The background context](#)

Seventeen years ago, Goldson (2002, p. 51) highlighted: “children whose lives have been damaged and disfigured by disadvantage, neglect and abuse are the very children who occupy the juvenile remand wings of our prisons”. Throughout their inspection and thematic reports HMCIP (1997, p. 68) has raised persistent concerns about the well-being of incarcerated young people arguing that: “there is no such thing as a neutral experience for

children in custody. They are either helped or damaged". Such concerns have particular salience in respect of young people making transitions between juvenile and young adult/adult institutions.

At the point of turning age 18 years young people are considered to be 'adult' and transfer into the young adult/adult estate. There is also a transfer of their case management across agencies, stakeholders and partners. Young adult/adult institutions are significantly larger and have a lower staff to prisoner ratio (NOMS, 2012) with the starting point for 'safe decent and secure operating levels' starting at 1:24 officer/prisoner ratio (Mukassa, 2019) compared 1:2 in SCHs, 3:8 in STCs and 1:10 in juvenile YOIs (Wells, 2018). They also have differing educational structures and operational regimes (NOMS, 2012; Coates, 2016) and young people who enter then from the juvenile secure estate are suddenly subject to rules intended for adults (Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012). NOMS (2012, p. 1) has recognised that this transition "represents a significant change in environment, regime and peer group, making it a particularly challenging part of [young people's] time in custody". Discretion may be used to allow a young person to remain within juvenile services beyond the age of 18 years (Lord McNally, cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a) but this rarely applies.

Within wider society, transitions defined by key markers of starting a family, entering independent accommodation and moving from education to employment are increasingly experienced later in life than previous generations (Roberts, 2009; Bessant Farthing and Watts, 2017; Goldson, 2019). There is also a developing body of research that shows how social and emotional development continues beyond the age of 18 years (Maruna, Coyle and Marsh, 2015). The transitions between child and adult institutions and services, however, is arbitrarily determined and fixed by age (Social Exclusion Unit [SEU], 2005; CJI, 2012; Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c).

The transfer between penal establishments is akin to moving between two fundamentally different 'institutional worlds' in which services and support are frequently lost. The Royal College of Psychiatrists (cited in House of Commons Justice Committee 2013, p. 61) has reported that this transition is "frequently abrupt and inadequately planned" and being uprooted from one institution to another can be extremely unsettling and potentially damaging for young people experiencing myriad problems (Prison Reform Trust, 2004). Young people are at a 'formative' stage and independent reports have concluded that they need additional support during this period whilst they are vulnerable and susceptible to

influence (HMIP, 1999; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). Young people in prison, are, as Gooch (2016, p. 292) describes; “trapped in a form of ‘kidulthood’ in between feeling like a child seeking support and an adult who is expected to survive within the prison environment.

HMCIP (2016a, p. 34) has suggested that young adults held in institutions are “inevitably some of the most vulnerable and troubled”. Whilst they undergo the period of institutional transitions, young prisoners are also undergoing the process of maturation and the developmental transitions between childhood, adolescence and adulthood. The less conventional transitions between institutions are such that young people are immediately expected to become accustomed to the demands and expectations of the adult world. They may feel overwhelmed and this can be excruciatingly difficult (Willow, 2015) and young people have reported feeling under-prepared for the change in service expectations when moving between institutions (CJJI, 2012; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a).

Over 20 years ago HMCIP (1997, p. 19) claimed the Prison Service was tailored towards adults and called for an adapted regime and appropriate treatment that acknowledged ‘adolescence’. The needs and vulnerabilities of young adults within institutions have more recently come to attention due to independent inquiries (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Lammy, 2017). NOMS (2015a, p. 10) has recognised that ‘young adults’ differ from ‘older adults’ and the MoJ (2017a, p. 10) has responded by stating they are “committed to recognising maturity” but rejected the House of Commons Justice Committee’s (2016c) calls for a specific strategy for young adults. Upon submitting evidence to recent inquiries HMCIP (2015a) echoed the view that the developmentally differing needs of young adults should be recognised and criticised the lack of coherent strategy and consistent treatment of this population.

Bateman, Hazel and Wright (2013) have argued that there is a lack of knowledge regarding effective service content and delivery when working with young adults as they are under-researched as a specific group. In light of the increased focus upon young adults, particularly in response to the House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) inquiry, the Conservative Government has outlined how they have been exploring best practice for working with young adults through dedicated expert and stakeholder workshops. Although further details have not yet emerged the Government is also said to be developing a specific model for operational delivery to be used in prisons holding young adults which aims to tailor the

services and functions of institutions more appropriately for the cohort (Stewart, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018a).

Research objectives

This research configured as part of a CASE studentship devised by Professor Barry Goldson and funded by the Economic and Social Research Council in collaboration with HMIP. The research investigates the processes of transition that are experienced by young people as they move from juvenile YOIs to young adult/adult institutions. Previous research has highlighted the vulnerability of young people held in institutions (Goldson, 2002; Gooch and Treadwell, 2015; Gooch, 2016, 2017) and has touched upon the ways in which young adult males adapt during the transition into prison (Harvey, 2012). Although inspection reports have addressed the transitions experiences of young people (CJJI, 2012; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) interviews are conducted at a single point in time. This research is unique given that it is the only study of young people who are followed through their transitions from juvenile into young adult/adult institutions using tracked qualitative interviews, it thus provides a more comprehensive and longitudinal insight into such processes.

The research aims to: formulate better understanding of how young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience transitions and contribute towards the evolution and discussion of policy and practice within the youth justice and child welfare spheres. The research comes at an important time; as the YJB move away from governance of youth custodial provision (Truss, 2017a) and the specific needs of the young adult prison population is gathering increasing attention (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, 2018c; Lammy, 2017).

The project is underpinned by three core objectives:

1. To extend knowledge of the (seemingly compounding) vulnerabilities of child/young prisoners. The vulnerabilities of child/young prisoners is well documented within academic research. However, there is a gap in knowledge regarding the pathways and transitions young people experience between the juvenile YOIs to the young adult/adult penal system and how this impacts upon such vulnerabilities.

2. To advance understandings of the means by which young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system. The schematic evidence that is available regarding transitions,

points towards great variations and inconsistencies across penal estates. It is important to understand how published protocols and official guidance is actually realised in practice and what impact this has on the experiences of young people. The research offers distinctive and timely qualitative insights from both young people and youth justice/criminal justice experts that serves to articulate experiences and inform the delivery of best practice/case management.

3. *To identify policy and practice approaches that might mitigate what the Royal College of Psychiatrists (cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61) describe as the “frequently abrupt and inadequately planned” nature of such transitions at a time of major reform (of both welfare and justice systems).* Advancing understandings of how young people prepare for, and experience these pathways and transitions can draw conclusions and offer recommendations in order to continue to improve the development of policy, guidance and practice approaches. This is especially important at a time when the prison system as a whole is undergoing a period of scrutiny and reform.

Conceptual and methodological approaches

This research takes the position that the experiences of growing up differ for each individual. The nature of ‘childhood’, ‘youth’ and ‘adulthood’ is determined by the cultural, social and economic context that frame it (Goldson, 2013). In England and Wales ‘children’ are statutorily defined as being aged under 18 years and ‘adults’ are similarly defined as being aged 18 years and older. Policy and practice approaches differentiate between ‘children’ and ‘adults’ in many respects but the term ‘youth’ has emerged in academic literature to refer to those between ‘childhood’ and ‘adulthood’. Taking the view that progression through the life course is socially constructed (Goldson, 1997a) transitions into adulthood are also understood to be experienced differently by each individual: they are not fixed and arbitrary events.

The ability to navigate ‘successful’ transitions to adulthood (Webster *et al.*, 2004) is impacted by the emotional and financial resources an individual has to draw from (Foster *et al.*, 2008). Transitions, therefore, have been found to be more difficult for marginalised groups (Parry, 2006; Stein, 2006; Shildrick and MacDonald, 2008) and young people from profoundly disadvantaged circumstances are more likely to be held within institutions (Goldson, 2002). It is problematic, therefore, that the transfer to the young adult/adult estate is set at age 18 years and completely fails to allow young people the opportunity to extend or delay their transition (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997) until they feel ready.

This research takes a mixed-methods approach using both primary and secondary data. The primary research methods comprise semi-structured interviews with 14 young people both before and after they made the transition across seven different penal institutions. This is supplemented by interviews with 22 key stakeholders who are involved with, or who have a professional interest in, youth justice and penal detention. A further four dimensions elaborate the research methods: documentary, statistical and literature searches; aggregated analyses of HMIP quantitative data; thematic analyses of HMIP qualitative data; and fieldwork notes taken whilst visiting institutions for interviews and shadowing HMIP inspections. The combination of methods has allowed for a range of views and experiences to be included in the thesis alongside important national statistical data and a wide range of additional evidence.

Outline of the thesis

Chapters Two and Three set the context for the research. Firstly, Chapter Two engages with the literature about how 'childhood' 'youth' and 'adulthood' are variously understood. Understandings of the movement from childhood-youth-adulthood are also presented and considered in the context of extended *developmental* and *structural* transitions. It is acknowledged that the consensus across academic literature is that young people develop neurologically until they are in their early twenties (Prior *et al.*, 2011; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) and undertake structural transitions (employment, independent living, and marriage) at a later age than previous generations (Beck, 1992; Roberts, 2009; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017; Goldson, 2019). Despite this, it is argued that many institutional structures expect young people to enter adulthood aged 18 years and so an 'exclusionary gap' is created as they are denied access to full welfare entitlements until their twenties (Jones, 2002). Young peoples' sense of being 'adult' is subject to their individual circumstances but subject to fixed or arbitrary age-determined processes. Moreover, transitions to adulthood are particularly difficult for marginalised groups, such as care leavers, as they are expected to enter adulthood upon turning age 18 years yet lose many supportive services (Macdonald and Shildrick 2007; Shildrick and Macdonald 2008; Stein, 2008; Paulsen and Berg, 2016).

Chapter Three explores the literature and policies regarding the juvenile secure estate, young adult/adult estate and institutional transitions between the estates. It outlines what is known about the juvenile secure estate population, including their structural vulnerabilities (Goldson, 2002; Redmond, 2015; Simmonds, 2016; Taflan, 2017; Green, 2019). Evidence that demonstrates how a period of incarceration compounds such vulnerabilities is also reflected

upon (Gooch and Treadwell, 2015; Gooch, 2016). The young adult population is introduced along with academic literature and independent reviews that consider their developmental needs (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Gooch, 2017). The academic literature regarding their (typically poor) experiences of imprisonment is also summarised. The evidence, mainly from independent reports such as HMCIP, shows how institutions often fail to provide an effective regime and tailored support for young prisoners. The official guidance regarding transitions between the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate is introduced alongside the literature reviewing its actual application in practice which reveals that young people are often unprepared pre-transition (CJI, 2012) and unsupported post-transition (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a). Wider literature from academics, independent inspectorates, independent inquiries and charities is used to illustrate how young people find transitional experiences 'abrupt' (Royal College of Psychiatrists cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61) with lower levels of support post-transition due to the arbitrary distinction between the estates based upon age.

Chapter Four, sets out the research methods comprising six components: (i) documentary analysis, (ii) statistical analyses, (iii) literature searches, (iv) qualitative data collection and analysis, (v) aggregated/thematic analyses of quantitative survey data and (vi) fieldwork notes taken whilst attending institutions for interviews and shadowing HMIP inspections. Issues relating to the reliability and validity of the research and mitigating strategies are considered. A discussion about ethical research with 'vulnerable' populations – young people and prisoners – follows (Guillemin and Gillam, 2004; Heath *et al.*, 2009; Girling 2017), and, finally, reflexivity is discussed.

Chapters Five and Six present analyses of the pre- and post-transition interviews respectively and are supplemented by analyses of the data drawn from the wider research methods. They explore transitions through four lenses: (i) the official guidance (ii) the 'insider' key stakeholder perspectives (those working within penal institutions), (iii) the 'outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives (those working outside of penal institutions) and (iv) the experiences of the young people. They reveal a dissonance between the expectations set by the official guidance, 'insider' and 'outsider' perspectives and the lived experiences of the young people. Chapter Seven draws the thesis together and makes recommendations for future policy and practice. The vulnerability of young people is a constant theme throughout the research.

Chapter Five focuses on the young peoples' experiences of being held within the juvenile secure estate in preparation for their transition to the young adult/adult estate and focuses on their pre-transition interviews alongside the interviews with key stakeholders. It shows how from entry the vulnerabilities of young people are often overlooked due to narrow institutional assessments and processes that expect young people to simply 'cope' within the YOI. 'Outsider' key stakeholders acknowledge the broader complexities of the young people's needs but 'insider' key stakeholders tend to hold that young people are adequately supported. The juvenile YOIs often appear to fail to provide regimes that support young people. The young people report to feeling unprepared for the reality of transition. Considerations about 'risks' were continually found to focus upon the institution rather than the young people. The young people hope for greater autonomy within the young adult/adult estate but have reservations about the transfer which were not adequately addressed by practitioners working with them.

Chapter Six presents an analysis of the experiences of young people within the young adult/adult estate drawn from their post-transition interviews. Their concerns were largely confirmed due to poor regimes and unsupportive provision within the young adult/adult estate. The institutions young people moved to had larger populations than the juvenile YOIs and some hold prisoners of all ages. Although some 'insider' key stakeholders acknowledged the impact transition might have upon young people they appeared reconciled to believing that they are unable to adequately support the needs of the population. Others appeared to 'imagine' (Carlen, 2008) that young people were being supported appropriately. 'Outsider' key stakeholders were more sympathetic to the challenges the transition creates for developmentally maturing young adults and more alive to the problematic impacts that reduced services have upon young peoples.

Chapter Seven draws together the key findings from Chapters Five and Six to consider the key themes identified in the research: (i) vulnerability, (ii), coping, (iii) the distinction between 'child' and 'young adult, (iv) the distance between policy and practice, (v) the impact of transitions and (vi) future transitions. This chapter reflects on the vulnerability of young people from entry to the juvenile secure estate and on how the transition experience into the young adult/adult estate often serves to exacerbate this. It argues that the focus upon institutional requirements overlooks the specific needs of young people and that this intensifies within the young adult/adult estate due to the diminished levels of support offered to young people. It considers how transition experiences act as a rupture within the life course for young people who receive less support from an institutional and service

perspective. The issues raised within this chapter provide the context for the policy implications as discussed in Chapter Eight.

In conclusion, Chapter Eight readdresses the research context and research objectives to discuss the policy implications of the research. The limitations of the research and future directions are also discussed. This research contributes to the body of literature regarding the vulnerability of young prisoners and offers insights from a range of key stakeholders invested in transitions process and analyses from HMIP data. It builds upon this by providing a unique insight into the experiences of young people between two fundamentally different estates at a crucial time in their life course. The original exploration of the movement between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate through tracked interviews provides greater insight into how young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system.

Chapter Two. Life course transitions: from childhood through youth and into adulthood

In England and Wales, the legal status of being a 'child' is applicable until an individual turns age 18 years and they are considered an 'adult' (Goldson, 2013). Most developmental psychology assumes that children follow a natural process of biological maturity (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998) into adulthood. Social constructionist theoreticians have disputed this, however, and believe that understandings of 'child' and 'youth' are subject to historical, cultural, social and economic conditions (Goldson, 2013). Involvement in education and movement into employment and family life now takes place beyond the age of 18 years, as do the developmental-psychological processes conventionally associated with adolescence (Dünkel, 2015). This chapter analyses the literature relating to childhood-youth-adulthood life course transitions alongside evidence regarding structural (Roberts, 2009) and developmental processes (Prior *et al.*, 2011) which challenge and delay previous notions of what constitute 'successful' transitions.

Childhood

The French historian Ariès (1962) stated there was no awareness of the concept of childhood in medieval society. In the 18th century, for example, 'children' were involved in labour in precisely the same form as adults. Critics and reformers who conceptualised this as a form of brutalisation, together with changing economic conditions, produced a shift whereby limitations were placed on children's work and more importance was given to their education. Eventually, the notion of 'childhood' in society evolved from 'child of the welfare state' to 'family member' and 'public responsibility' (Hendrick, 1997; France, 2007) and increasingly childhood was differentiated from adulthood (Galland, 1995). Children's rights increasingly became distinct from the rights of adults and legislation continued to be introduced to protect children from exploitation (Hendrick, 1997). Legislation pertaining to 'children' applied to those aged under 18 years of age (Home Office, 1933). Today the age of majority remains at 18 years and the UNCRC, which has been ratified in the UK (Office of High Commissioner Human Rights, 2015), provides an international framework of human rights specifically for those aged under 18 years (UN, 1989).

Developmental psychology approaches

Piaget was pivotal to developmental psychology which essentially views the stages of growth as biologically defined and inevitable. Within this perspective, childhood is perceived as a 'natural phenomena' (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998, p. 17) and maturation is considered a biological and cognitive process. Children are understood to be less mature than adults and this notion is acknowledged in law by the differing legislation applicable to them (Bryan-Hancock, 2011). A key factor in transitions to adulthood from this perspective is psychological maturation as 'new ways of thinking' are developed (Nurmi, 1998, p. 4). Developmental psychology approaches assume that stages of cognition and development eventually result in 'children' becoming logical, competent and therefore 'adult' (Prout and James, 1997).

Critics argue that any assumption that adult capacity is automatically attained from age 18 years neglects wider social factors that influence maturity (Griffin, 2013) and affect individual development. Goldson (1997b) has criticised the biological construction of childhood for overlooking the social, political and economic dimensions of lived experience. Social constructionists argue that childhood-youth-adulthood transitions are also affected by community and physical environments (Wyn and White, 1997).

Social constructionist approaches

Social constructionist perspectives differ from developmental psychology approaches as they consider the impact of wider social factors (Hendrick, 1997; Griffin, 2013) alongside biological determining factors which shape the life course. Defining a 'child' simply by reference to their age is viewed as reductionist as it collectivises them through physical and developmental stages (James and James, 2004). Within social constructionist approaches 'adulthood' is "located within the discursive interactional environment in which young people participate" (Horowitz and Bromnick, 2007, p. 209). The relations and divisions within social structures mean that the processes of 'growing up' are thought to be experienced differently and are shaped by the relations of class, ethnicity and gender (Goldson, 2013).

Social structures which frame the lives of young people have long been understood to have a significant impact upon their life chances and experiences (Evans, 2002). The perspective contends that the stages in the life course are differentially constructed (Centre for Mental Health, 2014) as they differ across "normative conventions and cultural contexts" (Goldson, 2013, p. 111). The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has argued that governmental policies pertaining to children and adults alter what constitutes 'childhood' and 'adulthood' (Jones,

2002). Societal expectations and structures frame cultural understandings of young people (Roberts, 2009; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) as they seek to 'achieve' adult status (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998). Despite shared experiences within institutional settings, social constructionists believe that young people are far from a homogenous group (Valentine, 2003).

Differing cultural norms, the rate of social change and political conditions comprise key 'markers' individuals negotiate during the complex processes of transition (Nurmi, 1998; Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011; Coyle, 2019). Policies define the age parameters regarding access to institutions, employment and rights (Wyn and White, 1997) which are accrued through the life course (Goldson, 2013). In England and Wales, young people are deemed 'responsible' for their behaviour from the age of 10 years owing to the minimum age of criminal responsibility (Goldson, 2009), but other societal rights and responsibilities tend to be granted between the ages of 16 and 18 years, however (Gillen, 2006). These parameters vary across cultures with the minimum age of criminal responsibility set between the ages of eight and 18 years across Europe (Muncie, 2008; Goldson, 2019). Different 'regimes' of transitional experiences also prevail across Europe (Walther, 2006; Dünkel, 2015; Goldson, 2019) which determine when young people leave education, enter employment and are expected to leave the family home (see Galland, 1995; Heinz, 1995; Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998; Roberts, 2009).

Childhood is represented as a period of freedom and opportunity during which children are dependent upon parents who are responsible for their welfare (Goldson, 1997b) although the criminal age of responsibility being set at age 10 years presents a contradiction to these representations (Goldson, 1997b, 2002, 2019; Such and Walker, 2005). Numerous terms have emerged to define young people moving from 'child' to 'adult' status aged from 13 to 30 years: 'adolescent', 'youth', 'young adult', 'emerging adulthood' (Arnett, 2000) as the period in between 'childhood' and 'adulthood' has become protracted (Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011). Bessant, Farthing and Watts (2017, p. 42) have criticised the categorisation of young people and argue that it is better to explore the *relations* and *processes* that particular groups engage in. The terms used to define young people signal the ambiguities of transitions. Perhaps more significantly the same terms often invoke a sense in which young people are socially constructed as a 'category' that requires 'training' and 'control'. If the adult is the 'finished product' the young person is the 'incomplete prototype' (Jefferies and Smith, 1998, p. 52). The term 'youth' thus implies incompetence, inferiority and inadequacy (Griffiths, 1996).

It is commonly claimed that entry into adulthood is achieved once an individual has passed certain structural milestones and interconnected transitions (Griffiths, 1996; Roberts, 2009; Hoolachan, *et al.*, 2017). As these milestones are approached young people are thought to experience a period of 'emerging adulthood' (Arnett, 2000) in which they are not fully subject to adult responsibilities. These milestones tend to take place – in the Western world at least - much later in life than they did for previous generations (Dünkel, 2015). The fixed and arbitrary age threshold of adulthood at age 18 years therefore, is problematic (Arnett, 2000; Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018).

Transitions: biological and structural processes

There is a growing body of evidence that outlines how neurobiological changes continue beyond the age of 'adolescence' into young adulthood (Edwards, 2009; Bryan-Hancock and Casey, 2011; Prior *et al.*, 2011; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018). The period in which young people develop towards adulthood is considered a sensitive period of brain maturation and biological transitions (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997). This is a time in which young people stabilise neurologically (Tanner and Arnett, 2009) and they develop 'new ways of thinking' which align with more 'adult' thought processes (Nurmi, 1998, p. 4). During this period young people as 'emerging' adults process information differently, they have more sensitive responses to emotional stimuli and have heightened selectivity and reactivity to negative-stimuli (Tanner and Arnett, 2009).

Academic evidence has suggested that the processes of maturity and brain development in many young adults continue until they are aged 25 years (see Prior *et al.*, 2011; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) and this view is increasingly being shared by charities (Livingstone, Amad and Clarke, 2015), independent inspectorates (HMIP, 2017a) and independent reviews (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). The neurobiological changes that occur throughout adolescence beyond the age of 18 years are considered to impact upon an individuals' social skills; their ability to plan and problem solve in addition to their social and emotional responses (Edwards, 2009). Campaign groups have also acknowledged that the processes of maturity develop at differing rates and it has been argued that maturity cannot be simply defined by age, nor forced (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and The Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015). During transitions to 'adulthood' the processes of psychological development are also affected by structural dimensions which mean that class, gender and ethnicity impact upon transitional experiences (Molgat, 2007; Goldson, 2013). Research has

found that young peoples' sense of becoming 'adult' is subject to their individual circumstances and biographies (Arnett, 1997; Molgat, 2007; Mary, 2014; Ellis, 2018).

The concept of 'adulthood' became more standardised following the Second World War and the 'classic markers' of transition: leaving home, starting an occupation and marriage gave a social indication of achieving 'adult' status (Blatterer, 2007; Roberts, 2009). These markers demonstrated the movement from dependence to independence. However, socio-economic opportunities available to young people have since changed (Mary, 2014). The 1970s and 1980s post-industrial society saw a decline of the English manufacturing industry (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998) and development of new technologies (Balaram and Crowley, 2012) meant that employment conditions were less secure (Coffield, 1995). Young people from typically working-class backgrounds found themselves vulnerable to exclusion from the labour market (Bynner, 2001) or exposed to precarious employment (Cuervo and Wyn, 2016).

Economic changes and increasing levels of unemployment from 1980s ended any presumption that the economy would provide employment opportunities and support young people in their structural transitions to adulthood (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017). In 1988 the UK benefit regime changed and many people aged under 18 years were rendered unable to access unemployment benefits. Those aged under 18 years were thus unsupported and unrecognised as 'unemployed'. Limitations have since also been placed on entitlements for those aged under 25 years (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997; Antonucci, Hamilton and Roberts, 2014). Subsequent policies, have compounded such problems and have created an exclusionary gap between the legal status of adulthood being attained at age 18 years and full entitlements (Jones, 2002), such as national minimum wage (Gov. UK, 2018a) and, until a U-turn, housing benefit (Department for Work and Pensions, 2017, 2018), being set at age 25 years and 22 years respectively. Young people have also reported not accessing social security benefits due to feeling stigmatised (Mackie, 2019).

The differing Government policies, entitlements and responsibilities impacting young people reflects how society constructs notions of 'childhood' and 'adulthood'. Young people are absent from the policy and political debates that have created their 'generational disadvantage' (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017, p. 186). The Trade Union Unison (2016) has argued that the age-discrimination of the national minimum wage legislation exacerbates young people's perceptions that they are worth less than 'adults' and has restricted their ability to improve their quality of life and movement into independence. Low pay has become

'endemic' in the increasingly casualised labour market across Europe and the minimum wage does not provide adequate standards of living for young people (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017). The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has also suggested that such policies, determined by age, extend parental obligation beyond conventional legal responsibilities (Jones and Bell, 2000; Jones, 2002). Structural transitions are based on the movement to independence but as these take longer to achieve young people remain dependent upon their family (Furlong, 2009). Family is now the most prominent source of support for young people (Shildrick, MacDonald and Anontucci, 2015) who are the "first modern generation with living standards lower than their parents'" (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017, p. 53).

Indeed, the literature surrounding transitions has identified economic uncertainty and recession as societal changes which have prolonged and complicated transitions – making them riskier (Roberts, 1997; Cohen and Ainley, 2000; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017). Routes into adulthood are perceived to have become fragmented (Roberts, 2009; Goldson, 2019). The changing labour market means that young people remain in education for longer and may re-enter for further qualifications although the relationship between education and employment is weak (Cuervo and Wyn, 2016; House of Lords Select Committee on Intergenerational Fairness and Provision, 2019). Wider cultural shifts have also become apparent as home ownership has become less affordable, the prospects for renting are unstable (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017; Hoolachan, *et al.*, 2017; House of Lords Select Committee on Intergenerational Fairness and Provision, 2019) and young people subsequently reside in the parental home for longer (Valentine, 2003). Family formation and their impacts on transitions have also changed as sex and marriage are more fluid (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998) and same-sex relationships, single parenthood and combined families have become widely accepted (Roberts, 2009).

Disruptions within the typical markers of transitional pathways, such as education, and the impact on a young persons' labour market competitiveness, affect their ability to navigate 'successful' transitions (Bottrell and Armstrong, 2007) meaning that modern transitions are more 'complex and contested' than previous generations (Jeffrey and McDowell, 2004, p. 131). The decline in stability previously offered by social processes and institutions (Jeffrey and McDowell, 2004) has left young people to negotiate more individualised transitions (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998). As a result, young people also have adopted more "individualistic ways of coping" (Molgat, 2007, cited in Molgat, 2007, p. 497).

Transitions to 'adult' status are bound by structural circumstances (Coyle, 2019) and academic research has identified two types of transitions within modern economic circumstances: 'slow-track'; those who have extended education and financial dependence on parents; and 'fast-track'; those who leave school earlier or became parents at a younger age (Bynner *et al.*, 2002; Jones, 2002; SEU, 2005). Subsequent research has identified that more successful slow-track transitions (Arnett, 2000) are typically taken by middle-class young people whereas fast-track transitions apply more often to working class young people (Arnett, 2015). Young people with limited family support must make structural transitions into living independently and supporting themselves financially earlier (Valentine, 2003). Further research has demonstrated that the dichotomy of transitions experiences overlooks the 'missing middle': young people who have educational attainment and are within employment but have limited opportunity to progress from their current employment and residential circumstances (Roberts, 2011; Shildrick, MacDonald and Antonucci, 2015).

As discussed, young people cannot fully access 'adult' welfare benefits until they are aged 25 years, they are in effect denied full-citizenship yet in other ways they are expected to be fully 'adult' (Valentine, 2003). Young people drawn from poor socioeconomic backgrounds with limited family support and involvement with welfare and/or justice systems are especially powerless (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Thomson *et al.*, 2004a; Phoenix, 2016) and often have worse outcomes than their peers (Heinz and Krüger, 2001; MacDonald, 2006; Xie, Bisakha and Foster, 2014) that have been found to impact upon their mental and physical health (Cuervo and Wyn, 2016) and their future socio-economic circumstances. The social, political and economic climate in which young people are making transitions to adulthood; declining industries, diminished welfare and austerity has marginalised them further (Goldson, 2019) and deepened inequalities (Weis, 2009).

Whilst it has been suggested that there is greater choice as young people navigate their transitions (Heinz, 2009) it has been argued that post-industrial society and delayed transitions have made life for young people more risky, insecure and broadened the definition of 'vulnerability' (Misztal, 2011). De-industrialisation has inevitably affected economically deprived areas more heavily. Limited job security, social insecurity and inequality have created forms of neoliberal governmentality (Wyn and White, 1997). The economic climate has contributed to young people being born into difficult socioeconomic circumstances. High levels of young people who are neither in education, employment or training [NEET] means that their circumstances do not improve (Gadsby, 2019; Goldson,

2019) those in employment receive lower incomes which has increased levels of youth poverty (Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017).

Ongoing cuts across social systems and services have continued to impact more profoundly upon socially and economically disadvantaged young people (Ridge, 2013). Marginalised young people typically enter periods of transition earlier than their peers due to factors such as early school leaving and disruptions in and out of institutional care. Young people whose pathways face disruption, social problems and are drawn from socially excluded communities are likely to be involved in certain public systems throughout childhood. Despite recognition from academics (Parry, 2006; Bottrell and Armstrong, 2007; Paulsen and Berg, 2016; Paulsen and Thomas, 2017) that such young people require ongoing support the state's obligations tend to end abruptly once they are aged 18 years. A report led by The Children's Society (2019) involving a number of organisations working with young people has highlighted how the 'cliff-edge' of support is experienced by those who find that their access to a multitude of services is withdrawn 'overnight' on their 18th birthday. It is argued within the report that the move from child to adult services exacerbates the difficult transition to adulthood for young people facing multiple disadvantage and has called for a more holistic approach to working with young people aged 18 years through integrated Government departments and agencies.

Limited opportunities for upward social mobility available to working-class communities since the post-industrial society have the potential to further 'entrench class divisions' (Jeffery and McDowell, 2004, p. 134) as individuals struggle to overcome such hardships (Wyn and White, 1997; Webster *et al.*, 2004; MacDonald *et al.*, 2005; Gadsby, 2019; Goldson, 2019). Critics of youth policy believe that lack of support for young people during transitions most heavily impacts upon those without wider support networks outside of the state (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997). People who do not adhere to societal expectations of a clearly structured progression through the life course may also be excluded from a 'social membership position' within it (Hurrelmann and Quenzel, 2015).

The reliance on individual autonomy and responsibility to make 'rational' choices fails to acknowledge the impact of structural disadvantage and poor socio-economic circumstances (Dwyer and Wyn, 2001). 'Normative' or desirable transitions for young people are based on ideas of a linear movement towards independence and ordering of life events, typically resembling transitions their parents followed. However, for young people whose life courses have faced disruption, transitions can be more chaotic and unpredictable which can impact

upon their ability to negotiate expectations and acquire 'adult' status (Parry, 2006). This can affect the psychological circumstances of young people leaving them feeling inadequate, powerless and disengaged (Wyn and White, 1997).

Tyler (2013) has argued that those living in impoverished areas are viewed as 'problem people' responsible for their circumstances. In addition to striving for financial security marginalised and socially excluded groups must also seek social security to escape existing prejudices; "achieving the status of 'worth' as a human being in a wage-based capitalist economy" (Wyn and White, 1997, p. 123). Moreover, 'dislocated' youth are often conceptualised as a threat (Goldson, 1997a), judged as 'social problems' (Prout and James, 1997) "in need of control and containment" (James and James, 2004, p. 10). Academics have argued that the fragmentation of routes into adulthood have been blamed on the immaturity of a generation rather than the changes in social structures and systems (Blatterer, 2007)

The common markers cited during transitions to adulthood, such as financial and residential independence, are more difficult for looked after young people (Osgood *et al.*, 2008) who are more likely to have experienced turbulent transitions: frequent short-term placements; numerous relocations (Valentine, 2003; Children's Commissioner for England, 2017a; Greenwood, 2017); emotional and psychosocial problems (Stein and Dumaret, 2011). A Safeguarding Children's Board (Mid and West Wales Safeguarding Children's Board, 2018) has identified that young people leaving care often feel scared, anxious and ill-prepared. Upon leaving care, young people have also been found to be more likely to be out of education, higher education and employment (NAO, 2015; Department for Education 2016), vulnerable to social exclusion; materially disadvantaged and marginalised (Stein, 2006). Such persistent socioeconomic disadvantage is understood to be more damaging to an individual's outcomes than intermittent adversity (Schoon *et al.*, 2002).

Young people who have experienced residential care are typically; "challenged, disadvantaged and often damaged children" (Narey, 2016, p. 65) with higher than the general population levels of educational and health needs. Although Local Authorities are responsible for taking a 'proactive duty' to keep in touch with care leavers until they are aged 21 years and support young people until they are aged 25 years (Department for Education, 2018), young people are otherwise expected to leave local authority care aged 18 years. Care leavers therefore enter periods of transition earlier than their peers (National Audit Office [NAO], 2015). Certain services fall away at a time when they are most needed, at a time where a 'traditional' family unit would not withdraw support for an individual. Care leavers

have limited opportunity to delay their transitions (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997) until they are emotionally, financially and suitably qualified to attain their employment aspirations, as many middle class young people do, which makes their transitions more challenging and difficult (Paulsen and Berg, 2016).

During their time in care young people are more likely to experience tighter regulation than those without care experience (Bottrell and Armstrong, 2007; Mook, 2017). Young people from the care system can develop a sense of learned helplessness and powerlessness over their lives as decisions about them are often made by professionals (Propp, Ortega and NewHeart, 2003). Despite a desire for autonomy, young people leaving child welfare services still require support beyond the age of 18 years (Paulsen and Berg, 2016). Young people have reported that adequate resources and social support are important in making successful transitions out of care (Mitchell, Jones and Renema, 2014). Upon transition into adult services social, practical, emotional, affirmational guidance and participation provision has been found to be necessary to support young people (Stein, 2008; Paulsen and Berg, 2016) yet a charity found that they may encounter difficulties whilst trying to access them (The Children's Society, 2017). Academics have also argued that care leavers should be provided with the opportunity to gradually transition out of care (Stein and Dumaret, 2011) as those without family support struggle financially and their attempt to transition into adulthood can be extremely difficult (Hoolachan, *et al.*, 2017).

The Coalition Government appeared to recognise that care leavers may be abandoned by services, and within the *Care Leaver Strategy* (HM Government, 2013b; Department for Education, 2018) it set out its intentions to support care leavers through integrated local authority support based on the principles of being a 'good corporate parent'. The strategy seeks to address the difficulties reported by care leavers: feeling inadequately prepared with life skills; difficulties in managing budgets; running their home; retaining education or employment; isolation; loneliness and fear about making transitions without a strong social network (HM Government, 2016) by mirroring elongated transitions that apply in wider society. A one-year progress review claims that the aim of embedding care leaver support across relevant departmental policies (HM Government, 2014) was met. However, a NAO (2015, p. 8) review found that the *Care Leaver Strategy* was "not set up as an effective programme" and support varied 'wildly' between local authorities.

Increasingly, boundaries between childhood, youth and adulthood are "blurred, indistinct, porous and changing" (Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011 p. 361), it has therefore been

suggested that elongated time periods spent as a 'youth' demand an extension of the definition of 'transitions' and identities. Academics have argued that the criteria of adulthood must be otherwise defined (Hurrelmann and Quenzel, 2015) as what constitutes 'adulthood' is unclear and remains variable subject to the social exclusion or inclusion of an individual (Thomson *et al.*, 2004a). Policymakers have been called to engage with the 'sociology of generations' when considering transitions (Woodman and Wyn, 2013, p. 271), to support healthy development to acknowledge the uniqueness of transitions and to provide suitable protections and support.

Reconfigured 'transitions'

Rights and responsibilities are statutorily assigned by age and indicate the movement from 'childhood' to 'adulthood'. This accumulation of the position of 'adult' in society in such an arbitrary age-determined fashion has been criticised (Goldson, 2009, 2013), particularly in the current climate whereby young people are increasingly experiencing delayed transitions to adulthood as a result of their structural circumstances (Goldson, 2019). Norms and social practice have changed since structural transitions to adulthood stabilised following the Second World War (Blatterer, 2007) The age of majority at 18 years is based on 'social convention' and does not account for insecure structural conditions and the differing rates of maturity experienced by young people (Bryan-Hancock and Casey, 2011).

The post-industrial period signifies generational differences in how transitions are experienced (Mary, 2014; Wyn, 2014; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017). Beck's (1992) theoretical work on the increasing 'individualisation' of the modern life course serves to illustrate how in the post-industrial era changes to society have created a 'new modernity' in which individuals negotiate a new set of 'risks' within their day to day life. Academic literature widely acknowledges that the economic and material milestones previously considered to represent transitions to adulthood are no longer structured and fixed in the same way and are more fluid and contingent (Roberts, 2009; Hoolachan, *et al.*, 2017). In these circumstances, different to that of previous generations, young people "renegotiate core values in ways that promote reflexive life management and the framing of life as an ongoing project largely devoid of explicit markers" (Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011, p. 362).

Traditional conceptual understandings of transitions have largely been limited either to developmental (psychological) theories or to structural markers of transition based upon rigid economic and social milestones (Beck, 1992; Mary, 2014; Hoolachan *et al.*, 2017). But 'successful' transitions are increasingly difficult to define (Webster *et al.*, 2004). Although the

term implies the linear progression and developmental movement to 'adulthood' (Wyn and Woodman, 2006), it is subject to structural constraints and social relations (Bottrell and Armstrong, 2007). The supposed 'incremental movement' (Hoolachan, *et al.*, 2017, p. 74) is flawed due to the prolonging of transitions which are no longer sequential. Extended transitions means that individuals are perceived as being in an "unfinished state of integration" (Blatterer, 2007, p. 785) which conflates their identity and roles despite their fragmentation.

Experiences of transition are "major institution[s] of integration and tension between individual and society that provides the social and temporal contexts for biographical planning and stock-taking as well as for ways of adapting to changes in public and private time and space" (Heinz and Krüger, 2001, p. 29). If 'successful' transitions are judged by education, employment and housing transitions, then more socially disadvantaged populations are likely to be 'unsuccessful' (Foster *et al.*, 2008). As social systems have been reconfigured, young people who struggle to make 'successful' transitions face further marginalisation, regulation and punishment (Bottrell and Armstrong, 2007). The reality is such that the most disadvantaged young people are expected to follow conventional patterns of behaviour and activity with fewer resources. Despite evidence that experiences of transitions have extended, age continues to be utilised as a principle of civil order to govern young people (Griffiths, 1996).

Heinz (2009, p. 4) has argued that youth transitions are "contingent and linked to complex interactions between individual decisions, opportunity structures, and social pathways". As the opportunity structures and social pathways have transformed from the period in which structural transitions were standardised, the European Group for Integrated Social Research (2001, p. 104-105) has outlined that transitions are more difficult to manage and the terminology should be reconsidered:

"The need for a reconceptualisation of transitions occurs for both young adults themselves and social institutions for policy and research. This means accepting that the ongoing diversification of structural and subjective dimensions does not permit clear-cut definitions of the point when young adults become adults. Despite the striking plausibility of the term 'young adults' it remains unclear what the phenomenon stands for in terms of social structure embodied in the life course."

Heinz (2009, p. 4) continues that “the notion of transition should be regarded as a heuristic concept, rather than as a descriptive one with special focus on youth” due to the individual interconnectivity of life course factors discussed within this chapter.

There is now a broad-based acknowledgement across academic literature (Roberts, 2009; Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011; Goldson, 2019) and independent reviews (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) that life-stage transitions occur later than previous generations, yet this has not been incorporated into policies affecting young people in general, and disadvantaged young people in particular (Sawyer *et al.*, 2018; House of Lords, Select Committee on Intergenerational Fairness and Provision 2019; The Children’s Society, 2019). The concept of ‘youth transitions’ provokes contradictory perceptions; one of fluidity and changes, another with a steady progression to adulthood (Wyn and White, 1997). To understand ‘youth’ and ‘transition’ it is vitally important to explore the views (Furlong, Woodman and Wyn, 2011) and subjective accounts of young people themselves. This is precisely what the research here aims to do by engaging the lived experiences of young people who are making two simultaneous transitions: one social and the other institutional.

Conclusion

One blunt way to understand transitions from ‘childhood’ to ‘adulthood’ is the movement from dependence to independence (SEU, 2005; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) whereby full ‘membership’ of adult society is not granted to young people until they are economically and socially independent from their parents (Griffiths, 1996; Jones, 2002; Valentine, 2003). But academics have increasingly argued that visible, structural transitions into adulthood no longer represent the entire transitional experiences as they are fragmented, delayed (Roberts, 2009), overlook social circumstances, and neglect to include social class, ethnic and gender differences (Antonucci, Hamilton and Roberts, 2014). Young people remain economically and socially dependent upon their families (Shildrick, MacDonald and Antonucci, 2015) as support from the state has diminished (Jeffrey and McDowell, 2004; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017).

The use of age as an arbitrary marker of adulthood across institutions, legislation and frameworks has also been heavily criticised by sociologists due to its ambiguity across structural circumstances, social and legal regulations of young people (Prout and James, 1997; Goldson, 2013). ‘Adulthood’ is a paradoxical term and a conceptually fixed status as reaching the ‘age of majority’ does not necessarily allow for full and equal access to citizen rights and responsibilities (Blatterer, 2007, p. 773). Young people are expected to be flexible

as they negotiate their transitions (Heinz, 2009) and are assumed to have become ‘adult’ at a fixed point, yet not fully afforded this role (Valentine, 2003; Brown, 2011). Expectations of ‘adulthood’ do not correspond with reality (Blatterer, 2007). Limited or episodic support can be frustrating (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997) and young people must negotiate their transitions to adulthood based on the resources available to them.

‘Youth-like’ dependency can coincide with adult autonomy (Walther, 2006) however young people continue to be governed within “inflexible, exclusionary and narrow categories” determined by age as a ‘contradictory and inconsistent’ marker of status. The focus on age conceals inequalities and differences across young people with the expectation that they will continue to navigate a ‘successful’ adulthood (Wyn and Woodman, 2006) despite the precariousness of their situation (Shildrick, MacDonald and Antonucci, 2015). Upon turning age 18 years young people are expected to be self-reliant to navigate through system frameworks to survive their transitions (Walther, 2006). But those who are marginalised often find that their circumstances do not facilitate transitions which are ‘successful’ by society’s standards. Typically age boundaries fail young people as they neglect to address developing capacity (Edwards, 2009) and fail to provide support tailored to the diverse and complex individual needs of young people (Osgood *et al.*, 2008; Woodman and Wyn, 2013).

Academics (Blatterer, 2007; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018), charities (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015) and independent reviews (PPO, 2014; Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; HMIP, 2017a) have called for a more developmental approach to legislation as has been adopted across parts of Europe (see Dünkel, 2015). It is argued that a more fluid approach would be more appropriate; “laws that aim to protect adolescents from harm (in which the legal age might be higher) from those that promote participation and empowerment (in which the age might be lower)” (Sawyer *et al.*, 2018, p. 3). The requirement for developmentally appropriate support for young people within the CJS has seemingly been acknowledged by Government discourse, policy and guidance specifically pertaining to the CJS (MoJ, 2015b, 2016b, 2017a; NOMS, 2015a) but it is not consistently expressed in operational practices.

Young people no longer follow the “socially expected and culturally transmitted age-norms” (Heinz, 2009, p. 3) which are believed to construct transitions between childhood and adulthood. Heinz (2009, p. 3) has argued that a reliance remains on these structural markers of transition as ‘social age markers’ although they have lost their normative force due to the socioeconomic transformations which have taken place. This is particularly the case for

institutions where access is determined by age, therefore, the transition to a different institutional environment is enforced due to 'becoming' an 'adult', as Goldson (2019, p. 242) has noted: "it is now widely recognised that for identifiable groups of young people – including those engaged in juvenile/criminal justice systems – youth-adult- transitions are becoming increasingly hazardous, precarious, distorted and stretched." Whilst there is an acknowledgment of the extensions to biological and structural transitions in wider society, transitions between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate remain subject to an arbitrary age-determined transition. The following chapter explicitly engages with the literature regarding the pathways and experiences of young people turning age 18 years who move from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult penal estate. It considers the dissonance between official policy guidance that aims to prepare and support young people to make 'successful' transitions between such institutions and the operational realities that often fail to observe such guidance.

Chapter Three. Institutional transitions: from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult estate

Introduction

Upon turning age 18 years, young people held within the juvenile secure estate transition into the young adult/adult estate. This chapter reviews the official guidance in place for this transfer, the literature and evidence surrounding its practice and considers how state institutions, monitoring inspectorates and campaign bodies conceptualise this period. The consensus across academic literature, inspection reports and other publications is that young people are not adequately prepared for the transition due to inconsistent application of guidance, inadequate provision and poor practice. Concerns have also been raised about the general inadequate condition and facilities across estates and the demise of the young adult estate.

Following on from the previous chapter, the literature analysed here demonstrates how despite institutional transitions occurring at age 18 years, the period of 'young adulthood' is poorly defined, acknowledged and supported within penal practice. It is argued that this arbitrary age-determined transition is a crude rupture to the life course. Evidence shows that for young people within the juvenile secure estate - who are likely to have experienced multiple disadvantages previously - the shift of institutional regimes, practices and services can be particularly abrupt. The policy implications that such issues raise are then considered.

Institutional and post-institutional transitions

Upon turning age 18 years, young people transition from the juvenile secure estate into a young adult YOI or adult prison holding prisoners of all ages. The *Custody and Resettlement: Section 7 Case Management Guidance* (YJB, 2014b) outlines how the YOT and juvenile secure estate practitioners should work together and plan for the young person's transition six months in advance of their transfer. NOMS (2012) guidance sets out requirements for the transfer and outlines four types of transition; automatic progression upon reaching age 18 years; discretionary progression upon reaching age 18 years; early transition prior to reaching age 18 years or transition on remand. Although the outgoing-Chief Executive of the YJB reported that there was an element of discretion which allowed the juvenile secure estate to retain a young person beyond the age of 18 years (Hinnigan, cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a), NOMS (2012) state they are 'contractually obliged' to move

young people serving long term sentences no later than a month after their 18th birthday as they can potentially become 'significantly older' than the other young people and then are deemed to present an increased risk of harm to them.

The different estates have distinctive expectations of young people and require varying levels of responsibility from them which the Standing Committee of Youth Justice (cited in the Children's Society, 2019, p. 41) has argued does not take account of developmental maturity. Within the young adult/adult estate, the onus is on the individual to seek support (PPO, 2017a). The IMB (2016a, p. 12) has noted how abrupt that change was for an individual they observed who was approaching age 18 years within the juvenile secure estate who: "realised that life would be very different. At 17 and 364 days he was a child with a lot of support. One day later he was an adult and needed to take on responsibility for himself." The MoJ (2013a, p. 14) outlines how the YJS is in place to provide children with levels of support but the situation changes from age 18 years as they maintain that young adults need to "adapt to the greater levels of autonomy expected once they reach legal adulthood". This is despite wider evidence and acknowledgment of the varying levels of maturity and vulnerability within this population (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and the support young people require from others to overcome their difficult circumstances and conditions (Webster *et al.*, 2004; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017).

At the time of this research no statistics were initially available in the public domain which indicated how many young people made this transition. Michael Spur, Chief Executive Officer of HMPPS (cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017) has previously reported that there are over 2,000 annual juvenile transitions across *community and custody* (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018c). Two FOIs requests submitted as part of this research, however, revealed that the number of young people transitioning per year by gender and accommodation type:

Table 1. Number of Transitions to the over 18 estate by gender and sector type, 2014/15 to 2016/17 (Onyejeli, 2018 and HMPPS Briefing and Correspondence, 2019)⁷.					
		<u>2014/15</u>	<u>2015/16</u>	<u>2016/17</u>	<u>2017/18</u>
<u>SCH</u>	Female	0	2	2	1
	Male	1	0	1	0
<u>STC</u>	Female	14	4	4	5
	Male	8	2	4	7
<u>YOI</u>	Female	0	0	0	0
	Male	383	350	307	336
<u>Grand total:</u>		406	358	318	349
<u>Average population of young people in custody (year ending March)</u>	Male and female	1,037 (YJB, 2016a)	960 (YJB, 2017a)	868 (YJB, 2018c)	894 (YJB, 2019a)
<u>Percent of population making the transition</u>		39%	37%	37%	39%

An initial FOI request provided the data for the period by gender and accommodation type from 2014/15 to 2016/17 (Onyejeli, 2018) a subsequent FOI request (HMPPS Briefing and Correspondence, 2019) provided this data for 2017/18 by gender and accommodation type and confirmed that no transitions data is held prior to 2014/15. Within the 2017-18 annual statistics the YJB (2019d) published transitions data within their supplementary tables. The published data includes the number of young people transitioning annually from 2015 (as is

⁷ Information obtained from Ministry of Justice Freedom of Information Request FOI/180517009 June 2018 and 190405020 May 2019.

detailed within the table above) although it is not broken down into gender and accommodation type.

The table shows the number of young people who transitioned from juvenile to young adult/adult institutions over a four-year period. The average population of young people in custody for each year and percent of young people transitioning has been inserted below. The figures show that up to four in 10 young people in the juvenile secure estate make the transition and become young adult prisoners. Whilst the population of the juvenile secure estate has decreased, the percentage of the population making the transition has remained consistent.

Annual data reveals that custodial sentence lengths are increasing (see YJB, 2016a, 2017a, 2018b, 2019a), and data from the MoJ (2018f) shows that the number of those aged 15-17 years and serving four or more years in custody has actually raised significantly over this period: 90 on 30th June, 2015, 105 on 30th June 2016, 116 on 30th June, 2017 and 117 on 30th June 2018. The number of those aged 15-17 years on long sentences has increased. Those aged 17 years were 53% of the youth custody population in 2017/18 and have comprised at least 50% for a decade (YJB, 2019a). The transition data published by the YJB (2019d) reveals how the percentage of those transitioning with a custodial episode of one to 91 nights have increased from 36% to 40%. Whilst the juvenile secure estate population is older and held for longer periods of time the transition experience cuts across those with short and long custodial episodes, this data raises important questions about what impact transition experiences have upon young people.

The process of transitioning across penal institutions has received a range of critical commentary from independent reviews. A joint inspection report (CJI, 2012) found transitions 'lacked a sense of purpose' and was followed by the release of the NOMS (2012) *Youth to Adults Transitions Framework*. Four years later, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) found inconsistent practice and poor information sharing which left young people unprepared and uninformed of their move. Inspectors felt that the NOMS (2012) framework should have been fully implemented and felt there had been an overall lack of progress in managing transitions since the 2012 joint inspection report (MacDonald, cited in Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a).

The Harris Review (2015, p. 95) into young adult (16-24 years) self-inflicted deaths in custody considers transitions from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult to be one of the most 'stressful' transfers and has called for additional support during this period. This

sentiment has been echoed by the House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) who highlighted the importance of managing transitions to better effect. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the MoJ and London Councils (2018) have also suggested that the transition to the young adult/adult system is a period of vulnerability, which requires a new approach.

In response to Harris (2015) and House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) The Conservative Government announced that a new protocol would be issued as a 'mandatory instruction' (MoJ, 2015b, p. 13) and 'policy framework' (MoJ, 2017a, p. 14). This was originally scheduled for Autumn 2016 but was not released until 2018. The *Joint national protocol for transitions in England: joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from Youth Offending Teams to Probation Services* guidance issued by the YJB (2018d) replaces their 2015 guidance (YJB, 2015). The official guidance is more focused upon community than custodial transitions, outlines practitioner roles and contains a '*Transitions Statement*' which has the overriding objective to provide for young people to have an "effective transitions process" which is 'managed safely' (YJB, 2018d, p. 4). YOTs are required to consult with the institution and Probation Services to identify a suitable placement for the young person based upon their needs and to plan for the transfer. The 2018 protocol (YJB, 2018d) added 'principles of a good transition' which places additional focus on the involvement of the young person and their family, advance transition planning as part of the sentence plan and the review of transitions work.

It is not made explicit within this document whether it is mandatory, nor does it state whether it replaces, or should be managed alongside the NOMS (2012) protocol. This guidance came into effect after the fieldwork for this research was completed. In 2018 The House of Commons Justice Committee (2018c) reported that 'welcome progresses' had been made by HMPPS and YJB to improve the transition between youth and adult services however, the Committee found that the arrangements still required an improved focus from establishments. HMPPS (2018) and YJB (2018e, 2019b) have listed transitions as a priority area in 2018. The following sections further explore evidence about transitions to outline how they are conceptualised in policy and practice.

Planning, communication and continuity

NOMS (2012) and YJB (2015; 2018d) expect that the transition process begins when a young person enters the juvenile YOI in order that that a suitable receiving institution⁸ - which meets their specific needs, including health; offending behaviour; education – might be identified. The YJB (2014b) recommends that to prepare a young person adequately for the transition a staff member from the receiving institution should visit them to explain what to expect from the young adult/adult establishment. The continued preparation for the transfer is expected to form part of the young person’s training planning meetings which should take place every three months and involve relevant agencies and family members. Practitioners within the juvenile secure estate should ‘prepare’, ‘support’ and ‘include’ the young person (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2013). HMIP (2017a) expect that individual ‘risks’ and ‘needs’ are adequately assessed and supported through these multi-disciplinary partnership arrangements.

When documented within inspection reports, transition planning arrangements typically fall under the ‘resettlement’ section. However, Ofsted (2017) consider the needs of those becoming ‘adult’ and transitioning from a juvenile institution to a young adult/adult institution during their sentence as different to those returning to the community. Independent reviews have found repeated flaws within the planning process in practice. HMIP survey data from 2015/16 revealed that less than half of young men (48%) within juvenile YOIs reported having a training, sentence or remand plan (Simmonds, 2016). Nick Pascoe, Deputy Director of Custody for Young People from NOMS (cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016b, p. 5), has claimed that preparation of the transition process is “personal and detailed” and NPM (2018, p. 55) reported that there was “considerable thought and planning behind most transitions”. However, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) found that young person’s views regarding their transition were not recorded in two-thirds of cases and some services had even neglected to identify those eligible for transfer. A consultation on plans for the juvenile secure estate led by the YJB (Voice, Barnardo’s and YJB, 2012) also found that only 24% of young people across SCHs, STCs and YOIs felt that their views were listened to whilst developing their plan. Focus groups with young people have also revealed that they felt that their plan was important and

⁸ The ‘receiving institution’ is the young adult/adult institution identified as the destination for young people making the transition from the juvenile secure estate.

advanced planning should take place earlier to better identify their needs (Voice, Barnardo's and YJB, 2012).

The YJB (2018d, p. 4) outline that transition planning should be in place for a young person no later than when they are aged 17 years and six months and should provide a "flexible and continuous service". Charities (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009) and independent inspectorates (PPO, 2016a) have argued that the services involved with young people should ensure the continuity of care and effective transition support however young people have reported that they were not receiving adequate support from YOT workers and social workers (Voice, Barnardo's and YJB, 2012). Independent inspections have also found poor attendance at meetings from social workers (HMIP, 2011; CJI, 2012) and other key professionals (HMCIP, 2016c, 2017a). The relationships young people have with such services are key to their future desistance. Notwithstanding this, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2015b) found that staff from different agencies did not always work together to the detriment of the young peoples' resettlement outcomes. A CJI (2016) inspection into resettlement planning across four resettlement prisons in 2016 found that prison and probation staff were focused upon completing processes rather than the needs of individual prisoners.

Evidence from independent reports also shows the disjointed nature of transitions across institutions. The NPM (2018) has argued that the wide variation in how young people are received is due to the large number of institutions accepting transitions from the juvenile secure estate. Finding a suitable placement has been found to be difficult and time consuming (PPO, 2014; HMCIP, 2015b). Relationships between institutions have been found to vary (HMCIP, 2017a, 2017b, 2018a) and to be better on split-sites which hold young people and young adults in separate institutions (CJI, 2012; HMCIP, 2018b, 2019a). Young people have reported that they were not given a choice regarding their transition and they were not involved; listened to; nor informed why specific decisions were made (CJI, 2012). Staff within secure institutions reported that they had little information or knowledge about placement and transfer arrangements which were found to often be uncoordinated and rushed and this can be particularly traumatising for young people (Justice Studio, 2014). Placements based on population pressures and impeded by ineffective communication and management have had particularly devastating consequences (Newcomen, 2017a).

HMIP (2017a) *Expectations* outline that young people must be given sufficient notice of transfers and should be allowed to communicate this with relevant people such as family,

next of kin and/or legal adviser. In practice, survey data from 2017 indicated that 52% of young people entering young adult training prisons (whether from court or another establishment) were informed where they were going to, yet only 7% received written information about the institution (HMCIP, 2017b). Inspection reports have also revealed that young people were not given a date for their transfer (CJJI, 2012; HMCIP, 2014a) and some only found out where they are going within the van in transit or upon arrival. Young people are therefore reliant on the information they have about the establishment from others or the reputation of the prison (Harvey, 2012). Limited knowledge of the institution or area in which they are moving to generates feelings of “isolation, loneliness and vulnerability” (HMIP, 2016a, p. 19). Young people were found to be ‘unprepared’ for the reality of the move (CJJI, 2012; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2015b) and unclear about change of service expectation of them (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a).

The PPO (2015) has been particularly critical of the YJB, reporting that the YJB did not appear to have an official process in place to ‘prepare’ young people due to the lack of handover work between institutions. Their investigation into the self-inflicted death in custody of a young person aged 18 years found that communication between the YOS and probation was also poor with no continuity of care in place for him post-transition (Newcomen, 2017a). HMCIP (2019d) have reported instances of no planned transition to adult services being in place and have deemed timely information sharing and forward planning between youth and adult services ‘insufficient’ (HMCIP, 2014a). Poor planning procedures have been found to restrict prisoners’ ability to progress in subsequent institutions (CJJI, 2016; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016b; HMCIP, 2016b 2017c). To improve planning, communication between establishments and effectiveness of transition, the YJB prevented transitions between institutions directly from court taking place in 2016 (YJB, 2016c). In 2018 the YJB (2018d) introduced the requirement for each YOT to have a qualified seconded Probation Officer from the NPS to act as a lead contact for transitions into adult services.

Despite the dissonance between policy and the practice reality, some pockets of best practice to prepare young people for transition have been identified (HMCIP, 2017l, 2018c, 2019b) particularly within SCHs (NPM, 2018). Examples from YOIs include the introduction of the role of ‘transition liaison officers’ (HMCIP, 2016d) and monthly visits from a caseworker from a young adult/adult institution (HMCIP, 2018d). Some inspection reports have been positive about institutions communication with the young person in STCs (Ofsted, 2017, 2018a, 2019) and communication with the young adult/adult estate. Advance transitional planning meetings held between institutions (HMCIP, 2015a), relationship building between

institutions (HMCIP, 2018e), and offender supervisors meeting young people within the juvenile secure estate (HMCIP, 2017d) were all found to take place. However, there was varying levels of institutional engagement (HMCIP, 2018e) and these practices were not found to be embedded across the wider estate. Inspection reports have called for more to be done (Ofsted, 2018b).

The MoJ (2013c) expect that all documentation regarding the prisoner should be transferred between institutions and consider this information sharing crucial to individual safety, well-being and continuation of care and support. NOMS (2012) indicate that it is 'essential' that all 'relevant' information is shared in advance of the transfer. Communication between establishments has been found to be disjointed in practice with difficulty contacting community YOT teams (CJI, 2012) a lack of assessment documentation being sent across (Goldson, 2002) and failures to pass on information about prisoners' vulnerability (HMCIP, 2017e). Sending institutions were found to be unaware whether relevant information received was acted on to prepare for a prisoner's arrival (HMCIP, 2016a). The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c, p. 33) were informed that there was a "disconnectedness between [youth and adult] services". A 'youth to adult' portal was introduced to support the electronic transfer of individual information which reportedly had a promising launch in 2015 (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) with high uptake of system use (Hinnigan, cited in the Justice Committee, 2016a), but portal efficiency has since been found to require improvement (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a).

Despite the fact that intervention providers (including health and education) are expected to be informed of transfers and invited by the YOT case manager to case transfer meetings within the YJB 2018 protocol (YJB, 2018d), poor information sharing is detrimental to consistency of services upon transfer. Health services differ between child and adult services and so treatment has been found to change or stop upon transition (NAO, 2017). Despite being considered a difficult group to engage in education (Coates, 2016), one-third of young adults reported the disruption to their ETE opportunities as a main complaint about the transfer between establishments (Voice, Barnardo's and YJB, 2012), preferring a structured regime (Clare Taylor, 2016). Some young people have been found to be unable to start specific programmes in the juvenile secure estate if they were unable to complete them due to their transition (HMCIP, 2014b) and this restricts their progression (Ofsted, 2010; CLINKS, 2016) and disrupts resettlement work (CJI, 2012). Figures of purposeful activity across estates have been found to be poor (Simmonds, 2016; HMCIP, 2017a, 2018f) and criticised for failing to meet the needs of young people (Prison Reform Trust, 2004).

As discussed in Chapter Two, the transitional stage to adulthood can be disruptive in the life course (Jewkes, 2005a; Gooch, 2016; Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016a, 2016b). Within the penal estate inadequate planning for a young person's individual move, effectively another of many placements they have experienced previously (Children's Commissioner for England, 2017), sadly "echoes the chaos that the system is meant to help them escape" (Justice Studio, 2014, p. 60). Poorly managed, transitions with minimal information or warning, undermine support (Newcomen, 2015a; PPO, 2016a; IMB, 2018b) and the fixed age-determined threshold means that the provision provided within the juvenile secure estate is abruptly lost upon transfer to the young adult/adult estate (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c).

Reception and induction processes

The reception process upon entering the juvenile secure estate or young adult/adult estate is an 'important moment' for a young person. The care and manner in which they are treated shapes their impressions of the establishment and their subsequent behaviour within it (Ramsbotham, 2005). The *Early Days in Custody* PSI for first night procedures (NOMS, 2015b) acknowledges that the first night in custody is extremely stressful and individuals may require support. The instructions set out a prison's obligations upon receiving young people within the young adult/adult estate. This includes identifying 'risk' to themselves and others, sharing information with relevant departments and overall, ensuring the young person's well-being.

Upon arrival to a young adult/adult institution, prisoners receive an initial interview with prison staff and should be offered any healthcare they may require (Gov.UK, 2018a, 2018b). The reception process differs across young adult/adult institutions but typically includes this initial interview, a search, placement in a holding room and the offer of a meal, telephone call and a shower (HMIP, 2015a). HMIP (1999) expect that those entering an institution who are deemed to be 'vulnerable' are identified upon entry. Although the MoJ (2013c) identifies that point of entry and early days in the prison as a period of risk to the individual - as they are especially vulnerable and present an increased risk of self-harm - support does not appear to be adequate in supporting this population. During reception screening 23% of adult prisoners have reported prior contact with mental health services yet this data could be incomplete, and problems may have developed during incarceration (NAO, 2017). Inadequate identification of support needs, risks and lessened contact has a detrimental impact on a young prisoner's adaptation post-transition (Harvey, 2012; Gooch, 2016; PPO, 2016b; HMCIP, 2017f).

HMIP (2017a, p. 28) expect that all young people transitioning into the young adult/adult estate are “identified systematically on arrival” and continued contact should be made in their early days (PPO, 2016c). Staff within juvenile YOI and young adult/adult institutions have reportedly repeatedly raised concerns about time constraints which limit the quality and depth of assessments that they are able to conduct (CJI, 2012; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a). An officer responsible for reception procedures at a juvenile YOI reported to an ex-Chief Inspector of Prisons (Ramsbotham, 2005, p. 196) that engaging with young people in conversation and showing an interest in them is of great value to them personally; “It’s probably the first time that they have come across an adult male acting responsibly.” Ultimately young people are reluctant to disclose private, personal information unless they have developed trust and feel they will be supported (Ramsbotham, 2005; Harvey, 2012). Staff are expected to look for self-harm and suicidal indicators (Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012), however, numerous fatal investigation reports have revealed that prison personnel have failed to identify individual risk factors (Newcomen, 2015a, 2015b, 2016; PPO, 2016b). Staff have been found to rely on an individual’s ‘physical presentation’ rather than taking the time to complete a process that might adequately identify their individual risk to self (Newcomen, 2016). The facilities upon entry have been found to be uncomfortable with limited opportunity for privacy and confidentiality (Goldson, 2002). The ‘first impression’ exacerbates fears and anxieties and Goldson (2002, p. 140) has argued that; “the notion that a child could be anything other than vulnerable at such a time is unreasonable”.

HMIP (2017a) expect that young adult/adult institutions are aware of young people who have experience of the care system, their needs and entitlements despite excluding collection of this self-report data within their young adult/adult survey questionnaires. However, there is no central record nor uniform process within the institution to acquire this information (Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017; Innovation Unit, 2019). Some care leavers may feel that the terminology brings a stigma which can be especially sensitive within the induction setting. If a young person’s care leaver status is not identified they can become ‘lost’ within the system (NAO, 2015). Even if this information is identified, Gooch and Treadwell (2015, p. 48) warned that it does not necessarily “translate to individualised support”. In 2018 the Government (MoJ, 2018e) announced that they would seek to better identify care leavers in custody to allow HMPPS to work more effectively with relevant agencies appropriate for the young people.

Reception procedures have been criticised for being designed for adults rather than young people (Ramsbotham, 2005). Focus groups held with young people across STCs, YOIs and young adult YOIs found that young people were concerned about the lack of induction and handover during transition from STCs to YOI (PPO, 2015). Receiving institutions have also been found to have no specific support in place for young people transitioning from the juvenile secure estate (HMCIP, 2018f, 2018a). The MoJ (2013c) highlight peer support as vital to help alleviate prisoner anxiety; address problems and contribute to suicide prevention strategies. HMIP (2016b) recommend that a representative from the prison i.e. a 'listener' should be available to young people to offer assurance on the first night or the next morning, yet this was not found to be common practice within young adult institutions (20% first night; 34% day-to-day).

Entering prison can be daunting for young people due to shouting through windows, interviews and allocation to shared cells with other prisoners they have not met before (Ramsbotham, 2005). The loss of social support networks and status upon leaving an institution can weigh heavily on a young person keen to re-establish themselves within a new environment (Harvey, 2012; Vaswani, 2015). Despite best efforts to 'prepare' the young person once they have entered the young adult/adult establishment the change in regime can be unsettling, "suddenly [feeling like] having the help pulled from under them" (Moseley, cited in Williams, 2012, p. 2). Young people who entered Feltham, for example, were found to struggle to comprehend the new regime and take control of their environment due to feelings of being out of their depth, uncertain and anxious (Harvey, 2012).

The composition and culture of an institution can impact heavily upon a young person's experience (Bateman, 2016). The use of 'first night' provision or 'induction wings' is intended to ease transition but can also affect the process of adaptation and feelings of unpredictability (Harvey, 2012) and safety (HMCIP, 2017d). The adaptation to a new institution can be particularly challenging if the establishment has a reputation for being hostile (Harvey, 2012). HMCIP (2016d, 2017e) found great variance in conditions and facilities across institutions. Resources, suitability of services (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2014) and contact with services drops upon transition (HMCIP, 2014a). It is expected that young people are simply made 'aware' of these differences prior to moving into the young adult/adult institution (NOMS, 2012).

NOMS (2012) guidance places responsibility onto young adult YOIs to ensure that young prisoners receive a full induction including information about the regime and what services

are available within the establishment and the wider estate. They advise that prisoners may not retain the information for long and therefore may need reminding (NOMS, 2015b). The processes of induction upon entering the juvenile secure estate are more thorough than the young adult/adult estate and some establishments have been found to take a multi-disciplinary approach to ensure that young people are met with relevant personnel over a five day period (HMCIP, 2017g). HMCIP (2010, 2017g) have found instances where prisoners in the young adult/adult estate were locked in their cell for a routine 24 hours from arrival and awaited an induction which was only scheduled to take place weekly. During this period newly arrived prisoners are reliant upon information from their peers (Ramsbotham, 2005; Harvey, 2012). Inductions have also been found to be underdeveloped (HMCIP, 2013) and generic rather than specific for young people upon transition (HMCIP, 2010; CJJI, 2012) which fails to adhere to the NOMS (2012) guidance. A poor first impression of an establishment can be extremely unsettling for young prisoners (Harvey, 2012).

Prisoners entering the young adult/adult estate have a basic custody screening which is intended to identify immediate needs as part of reception and induction procedures. They subsequently have a sentence plan which aims to reduce their risk of reoffending level based on an assessment of factors related to their offence (NOMS, 2015c). Sentence planning within the juvenile secure estate should be more in depth and reviewed more frequently (see YJB, 2013). Within the young adult/adult estate sentence planning meetings have been found to be based on risk and occur roughly every year with less family involvement expected (CJJI, 2012). Independent reviews have found inconsistencies across the estate in fulfilling these expectations with too few young adults having a sentence plan which resulted in some prisoners being unaware of the targets and expectations of them (HMCIP, 2017b, p. 48). This demonstrates a lack of individual involvement in sentence planning and how the young adult/adult estate places a lesser requirement of future planning and support. The MoJ (2016b) have outlined commitments within the juvenile secure estate to have dedicated officers to facilitate individual custody support plans. Similar planned changes within the young adult/adult estate would allow dedicated officers to have a personal caseload of six (MoJ, 2016c).

Risk

The conceptualisation of 'risk' within the context of children and offending behaviour has been contested within academic literature. The term is extremely complex and there is not the scope here to fully explore understandings and criticisms (see Hannah-Moffat, 2005;

Maurutto and Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Case and Haines, 2015; Warr, 2019). Upon entering the prison system young people are subject to an assessment of their 'risk'. Across the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult institutions the 'risk' an individual poses is conceptualised as either a risk of harm to themselves, a risk from others or a risk to others, and not to mention their risk of reoffending (MoJ, 2013c; YJB, 2014b; 2014c; NOMS, 2015c).

These risk assessment systems differ across estates. Within the juvenile secure estate AssetPlus aims to "provide a holistic end-to-end assessment and intervention plan" (YJB, 2014c) for each young person throughout their time within the YJS. The assessment gathers information about the young person, their family, their circumstances, previous offending behaviour and considers their individual risk to self and others alongside their risk of reoffending. It contains numerous subsequent 'modules' which informs what interventions are required to support the young person throughout their time within the YJS. This includes a module for youth to adult services which contains additional questions for its planning (see YJB, 2014c). The OASys system used in the young adult/adult estate is considered to be the "most advanced system of its kind in the world" using "actuarial and professional assessment to produce a detailed analysis of risk factors" (Home Office, 2004, p. 11). However, in practice, assessments have been found to vary with significant information being omitted which adds to disorientation of risk levels (Fitzgibbon, 2008).

The use of risk-based assessment tools has been heavily criticised within academic literature. Academics have argued that such processes conflate risk with need (Hannah-Moffat, 2005; Maurutto and Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017). Garland has (2001, p. 175) argued that that child assessments have become 'increasingly indistinguishable' from those used in adult prisons. Although agencies working with children have a duty to safeguard them (NPM, 2017) 'welfare' is said to have become overshadowed by a 'risk-conscious' approach that focuses upon cost effective controls rather than support (Garland, 2001). It has been argued that the assessments simply increase governance and facilitate decisions about institutional resource and allocations (Maurutto and Hannah-Moffat, 2006).

The MoJ (2013c) identify younger prisoners and those who have recently transferred into an establishment as particular 'at risk' groups. Prisoners considered particularly vulnerable are placed on an Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork [ACCT] document in which the care required to reduce their risk of harm is reviewed and monitored. Relevant agencies and families may be informed that a child placed has been placed on an ACCT document (MoJ, 2013c). An ex-Chief Inspector of Prisons (Ramsbotham, 2005) has stated that there should

be a distinct assessment of 'risk' and 'need' and believes that the assessment of risk that an individual poses to others should be assessed separately and that the young person's risk to themselves should be measured by medical staff.

Young adults within the CJS have said they feel "labelled, stigmatised and judged" (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015, p. 8) and reject the terms placed on them by adults (Ellis, 2018). The identity placed upon them by professionals comprises written information within assessments which young people reportedly feel is focused upon their past rather than their present (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015). Young people prior to transition at HMYOI Feltham were found to be subject to a further assessment of their risk as the institution had introduced an interdepartmental risk management review meeting before their transfer (HMCIP, 2018e).

Children's perception of safety in penal institutions is a great concern to HMIP who have reported that "violence, bullying and intimidation were a regular feature of life" (Simmonds, 2016, p. 16) within the juvenile secure estate. In 1997 HMCIP (1997, p. 5) declared: "of all the parts of the Prison Service that we inspect, the one that gives all of us in the Inspectorate greatest cause for concern is the Young Prisoner Estate". Twenty years on, as stated earlier, another Chief Inspector maintained that: "by February this year we had reached the conclusion that there was not a single establishment that we inspected in England and Wales in which it was safe to hold children and young people." (HMCIP, 2017a, p. 9). Incarceration is itself a 'risk'; prisons, by nature, 'create and exacerbate' vulnerability (Goldson, 2002; Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015).

Stability is important to young people (Children's Commissioner for England, 2017) and young adults have reported finding the process of being uprooted and moved to a different prison and regime sudden, disruptive and unsettling (Prison Reform Trust, 2004; Jewkes, 2005a). Undertaking a disruptive transition within the life course *during* a period of incarceration is especially traumatic for young people (Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016a, 2016b). Upon moving into a young adult/adult institution the change of service treatment and expectation (CJJI, 2012); with increased autonomy (MoJ, 2013a) and lower support (NOMS, 2012) is difficult to adapt to.

The struggle to 'cope' within a prison environment (Goldson and Coles, 2005) manifests in different ways (Gooch, 2015). NOMS (2017, p. 14) have acknowledged that "prisons hold a disproportionate number of people who are at high risk of suicide and self-harm, which can

be intensified in the prison environment through feelings of hopelessness, isolation and the loss of supportive relationships.” ‘Adults’ entering the young adult/adult estate who have previously experienced traumatic life events (Liddle *et al.*, 2016) have a greater requirement for support to enable them to negotiate transitions to adulthood (Parry, 2006). The sudden ‘cliff-edge’ (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) when much support is withdrawn at age 18 years exacerbates the distinct vulnerability of young adults during the process of development (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009) and young people can require more ‘intensive management’ within a new establishment (YJB, 2014a).

It has been argued that young people with complex needs require a supportive environment (Rose, 2008; Longfield and Casey, 2018). Smaller units in the juvenile secure estate facilitate greater opportunity for positive staff prisoner relationships (HMCIP, 2017g), therefore in a young adult/adult institution where young people may feel anxious, lower levels of interaction can exacerbate their concerns (Harvey, 2012; Gooch, 2016; PPO, 2016b). The *Safer Custody* PSI (MoJ, 2013c) outlines how ‘at-risk’ young people (including new arrivals and younger prisoners) should be encouraged to engage within the prison regime however staffing shortages (HMCIP, 2014c; Howard League for Penal Reform, 2014; IMB, 2018a) and limited provision (HMCIP, 2014c) have left the young adult/adult estate “woefully under-resourced” (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2014, p. 5). Inspections within the young adult/adult estate have widely reported that too often young men are found locked in their cell rather than engaged in purposeful activity (HMCIP, 2010, 2011, 2016d, 2017d, 2018g, 2018f). The loss of structure weakens a young person’s sense of purpose and control (Jewkes, 2005a). Restricted, unpredictable regimes have numerous negative impacts on young people such as lack of mental stimulation (HMIP, 2017d); feelings of isolation; alienation and distant relationships with staff (HMCIP, 2016d). The initial joint *Transitions* inspection found that staff members had little appreciation of the difficulties young people experience during transition (CJI, 2012).

Upon transition, young people have been found to be more likely to feel anxious about the uncertainty and risks within a new establishment and their ability to navigate them (Harvey, 2012). Charlie Taylor (2016, p. 2) argued that children require a ‘therapeutic’ environment with integrated service support to address the underlying causes of certain behaviours and therefore promote effective rehabilitation. This requirement does not stop abruptly when a young person turns age 18 years however support can be ruptured or terminated at this crucial time (SEU, 2005). As Goldson and Coles (2005, p. 26) have stressed “the vulnerabilities and needs of children in penal custody are well-established, but the prison system is

essentially ill-equipped to meet them". Concerns about the perceived vulnerability of young adults is emerging in academic literature (Gooch, 2017) and independent reviews (Bateman, 2015; Harris, 2015; Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). However, the perceived vulnerability of young people in official discourse diminishes once they turn age 18 years (MoJ, 2013a). Young people are most often the ones most *at risk* yet institutions tends to perceive the individual as *the 'risk'* (Case, 2006).

The official guidance states that young people should transition into a young adult YOI however, their destination establishment can hold adults of all ages (NOMS, 2012) and this has been found in practice (Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012; Allen, 2013; HMCIP, 2017a). The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c, p. 20) criticised the "lack of strategic differentiation in approach" and a limited evaluation of the outcomes for young adults under different placement scenarios. Young people are often more impulsive than the older prison population and more susceptible to influence (HMCIP, 1997; HMIP, 1999). The PPO (2014) has found a 'striking' number of young adults reported, or were perceived to have experienced, bullying. Yet this 'risk' to them was found to be unassessed and unaddressed meaning that younger prisoners were especially vulnerable within an integrated population (HMCIP, 2015b; 2016d, 2017h, 2017i). Despite an acknowledgement from the MoJ (2013c) that young people entering the young adult/adult estate are especially naïve and at greater risk of victimisation, there is limited provision for this vulnerable demographic of the prison population (HMCIP, 2015b, 2016d).

Institutions are stressful and personal adjustment can be difficult (School *et al.*, 2002). Feelings of physical safety are important. Young people may attempt to reduce their 'vulnerability' or the perceived 'risk' of victimisation by being prepared for altercations (Harvey, 2005, 2012; Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015; R. Allen, 2016). Charlie Taylor (2016, p. 38) has been critical that the juvenile secure estate appears to teach children how to 'survive in prison' rather than the outside world. During the transition to another establishment, as male young people experience transitions to adulthood, the culture of 'hypermasculinity' can be toxic (Gooch, 2016) and attempts to establish oneself within this masculine environment are heightened (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015). Violence and victimisation within the environment can make the individual feel "the need to 'grow up' and perform as a 'man' capable of surviving in the very adult prison world" (Gooch, 2016, p. 285). Support services enable a 'third space' away from risky masculine identities through the provision of advice, support and relationships (Robb *et al.*, 2015, p. 2). However, young people may be worried that seeking help will further their vulnerability amongst their

peers and therefore neglect to request support; “in order to prevent a detrimental impact on his position within the hierarchy of inmates” (Harvey, 2012, p. 104). Young people may also be unaware of the services they need or may feel uncomfortable about attempting to access them (Nacro, 2001).

Needs

Young people within the CJS are likely to have been involved with statutory child welfare/safeguarding services (HMIP, 1999; Redmond, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Simmonds, 2016; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017; Taflan, 2017; Innovation Unit, 2019), and commentators expect that ‘sufficient’ time should be given to adequately identify a young person’s needs at the beginning of their sentence (Ramsbotham, 2005; Lammy, 2017). Academics have argued that the services available to young people should be sensitive to their developing, and differing, needs (Foster *et al.*, 2008). At the point of transition, however, young people can ‘fall through the gap’ and their needs can be unidentified and unmet (Young, 2014; Harris, 2015), particularly due to the loss of services (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015). Continuity of support and guidance (Ofsted, 2010) is especially important for young people who have experienced negative and disruptive relationships previously. Young people turning age 18 years within the CJS face “double jeopardy”; their vulnerabilities are compounded, and youth support services fall away (Chitabesan cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, p. 8).

Care leavers have more challenging transitions to adulthood as they are expected to become self-sufficient upon leaving the care system (Propp, Ortega and NewHeart, 2003). Fitzpatrick and Williams (2017, p. 183) have acknowledged that NOMS set out guidance for staff to improve the identification of care leavers across prison and probation. However, this guidance imposes ‘no new requirements’ which they have criticised for being a ‘tick-box’ exercise de-prioritising care leaver issues. They have found there is no uniform process within the CJS to identify an adult’s care leaver status and this information is not collated within HMIP inspections (HMCIP, 2017a; HMIP, 2017c). By not identifying care leavers or addressing their ‘heightened complex needs’ (Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017) they simply become subject to the more ‘punitive and less supportive’ legislative frameworks of adult services (Young, 2014). This results in increased ‘vulnerability’ as young people are without the specific support they require (Centre for Mental Health, 2014; Transition to Adulthood Alliance and The Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017).

The 'character and content' of young people's problems and needs are different to those of older adults (Nacro, 2001; SEU, 2005). Children are treated under Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services [CAMHS] and transition to the Adult Mental Health Services [AMHS]. CAMHS and AMHS take different approaches and some conditions, such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder [ADHD] are not recognised by adult practitioners (SEU, 2005; Centre for Mental Health, 2014). An additional gap in provision can also become apparent as some CAMHS services only work with young people until they are aged 16 years (SEU, 2005; CJI, 2012; Centre for Mental Health, 2014), a concern which has been acknowledged by Government departments (Department for Education and Skills, 2005) and joint committees (House of Commons Education and Health and Social Care Committees, 2018).

AMHS place more emphasis on the service user responsibility and take a less holistic approach therefore; "AMHS are not vigilant in looking for, or responsive to, the less clear-cut, more subtle and less crisis orientated emerging mental health problems synonymous with young adults' needs" (Centre for Mental Health, 2014, p. 5). Despite the requirement for tailored support to address their complex needs young people often have the lowest access to services (Centre for Mental Health, 2014), which can be to the detriment of their health and well-being. The joint inspection report concluded that the gap in case management and sentence planning between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate means that the continuity of interventions including mental health difficulties are put at risk (CJI, 2012).

The transition between mental health services has been described as "particularly awful" (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2014, p. 10), and 'overwhelming' (Centre for Mental Health, 2014), as the removal of access to these services leaves young people feeling at a 'cliff edge' (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015). The end of services signifies a loss of relationships with staff members which young people must seek within a young adult/adult institution. Trusted, consistent and credible networks have been found to allow a greater depth of understanding to support the young persons' risks, vulnerabilities (Crawley, 2004) and facilitate their social adaptation to an institution (Harvey, 2012). Young people may be distrustful of adults due to experience of abuse, neglect (Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016b) and feelings of 'rejection and abandonment'. This impacts upon their relationships (Gooch and Treadwell cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and subsequent ability to form crucial new ones within an establishment (Harvey, 2012; PPO, 2014; NAO, 2015; HMIP, 2016a).

Young people require 'developmentally appropriate' provision (The House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) that is tailored to their individual needs (European Group for Integrated Research, 2001; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016c). Gooch (2017, p. 2) has found how: "negotiating the transition from childhood to adulthood is by no means straightforward, nor is it completely achieved and, although these teenage boys sought to perform as 'men', they also behaved like the children they still were." Prison officers are "agents of reform" key to supporting and engaging with the Government's vision of 'making prisons work' (MoJ, 2016c, p. 12). They perform numerous roles varying from care giving to punitive responses (Crawley, 2004; Harvey, 2012) however the formal and informal daily interactions between staff and young prisoners also form part of an individuals' support network (Harvey, 2012) once a trusted relationship is established (SEU, 2005). Displays of kindness and empathy enable young people to understand they can seek help and trust an authority figure (Harvey, 2012; Lanskey, 2016). Effective staff members require specialist training to adequately address the needs of the "distressed, disadvantaged and sometimes difficult" young people they work with (Goldson, 2002, p. 66).

In their early days in custody a prisoner is assigned a 'personal officer' who becomes their first port of call for any support they may need (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2009). Goldson (2002, p. 66) has acknowledged the importance of providing appropriate services to vulnerable children and stated it was 'extraordinarily complex' as staff require the skills, knowledge and training to do so. Staff-prisoner relationships have been considered 'ineffective' as young people were found to have limited awareness about who their personal officer was (HMCIP, 2017g; HMIP, 2018). Staff must understand the people in their care (Lammy, 2017) and the impact difficulties have upon them (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2016), yet they may not have been trained as such (HMCIP, 2017j). A young adult/adult establishment with lower staff levels may be restricted in the availability of staff to escort prisoners to the services they require and therefore in enabling support (HMCIP, 2017g). Shortages mean that staff members frequently work across different wings or prisons which limits their ability to effectively fulfil the personal officer role, form relationships and identify issues (NAO, 2017).

The provision of family is heavily regarded as a mechanism to facilitate support, desistance from crime and resettlement. This particularly relevant during a 'complex and difficult' transition (SEU, 2005, p. 7). The distress of being separated from one's family can be a shock and concern about potentially moving further from home into the young adult/adult estate can be isolating (PPO, 2014). It has been recommended that more consideration should be

given to location when planning transitions (HMCIP, 2014a) to ensure minimal disruption to the individual and their families (Prison Reform Trust, 2004). Following the UN Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (UN, 1990, p. 30) the YJB (2014b) have indicated that it is the establishments responsibility to 'actively facilitate' the supportive and positive network that family contact provides.

Management, control and coercion

Young people continue to develop neurologically into their early adulthood which can affect decision making and behaviours (Prior *et al.*, 2011; Willow, 2015; Hanham and Tracey, 2017; Hart, 2017; HMIP, 2017a; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018). The MoJ (2013c) has acknowledged that these challenging and complex behaviours exhibited by some prisoners are more prominent within this group. HMIP have argued that such behaviour "can be influenced by a wide range of factors, including their relationships with staff, the physical environment, the regime under which they are held and the incentives on offer to them" (Clarke, cited in HMIP, 2018, p. 5). Challenging behaviour is also reflective of the frustrations of prison life (Crewe, 2011a; Gooch, 2017) and previously suppressed emotions (Laws, 2018). Independent reviewers (PPO, 2014; Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; HMIP, 2017a) have called for a more developmentally appropriate approach towards young people as institutions have been found to lack any strategy for the population (HMCIP, 2018h, 2019c). In practice, young adults are disproportionately represented within disciplinary matters, violent incidents (HMCIP, 2010, 2015a, 2015c, 2019c) use of force (HMCIP, 2017j) and detrimental treatment (BBC News, 2017).

Upon entering the young adult/adult estate young people may find the regimes restricted to maintain order; for the purposes of gang management; violence reduction strategies and due to reduced staffing levels (Children's Commissioner for England, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). Mental anguish can impact upon all those who are confined, however a younger population can externalise their pain and frustration more than adults (Willow, 2015) and may exhibit such behaviours to reduce their emotional distress (Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016b) or manage their vulnerability (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015). Upon transition, young people can feel that they have lost control over their circumstances and display challenging behaviours (Heinz, 2009; Harvey, 2012). Challenging behaviour, such as cell damage and aggression, tends to be viewed as a security concern rather than a representation of underlying emotional distress (PPO, 2014). In 'exceptional circumstances', young people being 'violent and/or disruptive' can be subject to the process

of 'starring up' in which they are transferred to the young adult/adult estate in advance of turning age 18 years due to their behaviour (NOMS, 2012; Parliament.UK, 2018).

Upon transition feelings of mental anguish deriving from feelings of confusion, being sad, lonely or frightened (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016c) can be exacerbated and manifest into behaviour perceived as disruptive and difficult (Gooch and Treadwell, 2015; Gooch, 2016; HMCIP, 2017e). The Harris Review (2015, p. 80) found examples of staff members who acknowledged that young people are less mature than other prisoners stating that their acts can be "rash or as a front to hide their emotions from their peers". Institutional treatment of prisoners' changes when they reach 18 years as young adults are expected to improve and manage their behaviours (MoJ, 2013a). Many young adult/adult establishments (HMCIP, 2015b, 2015c) have been found to have little provision of tailored interventions as an appropriate response to this behaviour (Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016b). Charlie Taylor (2016) has highlighted within his review that staff members are not adequately trained to manage the complex behavioural problems of some young people within their care and have also reported feeling helpless (Ramsbotham, 2005).

The management of children and young adults is markedly different across estates. Children will experience a period of isolation differently to adults due to their 'stage of development' and 'particular vulnerabilities'. Isolation may serve to re-traumatise children who are victims of abuse and adverse experiences (Willow, 2015; NPM, 2017; Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse, 2019). The use of physical limitations can cause restlessness impacting upon mental health and well-being (Gooch, 2016; House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019). Concerns have been raised about the rise of segregation of children (Children's Commissioner for England, 2018; Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018; House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019) and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, Royal College of Psychiatrists and British Medical Association (2018) have released a joint statement calling for the end of solitary confinement. The Government (MoJ, 2016b) have stated they will measure time out of cell and segregation within the juvenile secure estate but not within the young adult/adult estate, the House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights (2019) have found issues with such data not being recorded correctly, if at all.

Behaviour within the young adult/adult estate is managed through the Incentives and Earned Privileges [IEP] scheme which is in place to reward good behaviour and challenge poor behaviour (HMCIP, 2017a). The 'subtleties' behind the scheme are thought to be problematic

and subjective (Liebling, 2008). Prisoners subjected to the scheme can become frustrated, perceiving it as a control mechanism utilised by staff members' making 'arbitrary' decisions (Liebling, 2008; Crewe, 2011b), and those aged under 25 years are reportedly the most negative about the scheme (HMIP, 2018). Indeed, staff have reported that it improves behaviour by placing 'pressure' on individuals to 'behave well' in institutions (Liebling, 2008).

The shift of behaviour management, control and staff-prisoner interactions is quite stark from juvenile to young adult/adult penal institutions (PPO, 2017a). The Howard League for Penal Reform (2016a) has reported that young people aged 15-24 years represent 20% of the prison population yet comprise 42% of adjudications. In 2017 the highest figure of proven adjudications was for those aged 15-17 years (81%; 72% for 18-20-year olds; 53% for those aged over 60 years) (MoJ, 2017b). Adjudications can be "confusing and intimidating for young people" (PPO, 2017a, p. 1) and have been deemed 'largely ineffective' (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, p. 51).

Interventions available to young adults within the CJS have been criticised for neglecting to acknowledge ongoing maturity and for being counterproductive to neurological development (Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015). Independent reviews have called for a more appropriate assessment which takes account of developing maturity and a fairer (Lammy, 2017), more 'sophisticated and flexible' approach to respond to the young adult population (The House of Commons Justice Committee 2016c).

Within the juvenile secure estate minimising and managing physical restraint [MMPR] guidance is intended to focus on staff relationships with young people to de-escalate violence (Simmonds, 2016). Control and restraint procedures within juvenile penal institutions and young adult institutions can include the use of batons (NOMS, 2015d; HMCIP, 2017k). Child protection referrals can be made within the juvenile secure estate when it is felt force is used inappropriately (HMCIP, 2017g). Young adults are able to make a complaint, but the same child protection measures are not available beyond the age of 18 years (Edgar and Tsintsadeze, 2017). The Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse (2019, p. vi) has argued that the use of pain compliance in juvenile penal institutions is a form of abuse which exacerbates the "habitually violent atmosphere in YOIs and STCs" and it has been argued that such techniques violate the human rights of young people in line with the UNCRC (Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018; House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019). The use of physical violence also reproduces masculine 'ideals' of power and toughness (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015). Penal institutions are symbolically

violent and power relations are reinforced by staff (Cooper, 2012) through poor acknowledgment and treatment of the developmentally differing needs of young people which restricts their opportunity to overcome their difficult backgrounds and circumstances.

Strip-searching within the juvenile secure estate is expected to be used only as part of a 'risk-based' approach (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2016b) however it has been found to be used on children under restraint (HMCIP, 2017a). Willow (2015, p. 83) has criticised the procedure of strip-searching as "inhuman and degrading treatment" which can exacerbate feelings of anxiety (PPO, 2014). HMIP (2017a, p. 6) have called for a similar intelligence-based approach to strip-searching in the young adult/adult estate. Any physical intrusion of a young person conducted by a staff member can be detrimental to their well-being and remind them circumstances they have experienced previously as victims of trauma and abuse (NPM, 2017; The House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019).

The Youth Custody Improvement Board (Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017, p. 1) reported in 2017 that the youth estate is only on "the edge of coping" in meeting the needs of young people due to a lack of skilled staff, and poor behaviour management. Behaviour management schemes are considered "ineffective in reducing violence, which is at historically high levels in all types of institution [...] reviewed" (Clarke, cited in HMIP, 2018, p. 5). Concerns have also been raised that the young adult/adult estate is comparably poorly equipped for caring for this population (Standing Committee for Youth Justice, 2017; Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse, 2019).

In their everyday roles prison officers "hold a large amount of discretionary power" (Crewe, 2011b, p. 456) by determining privilege levels and contributing to individual reports such as categorisation and early release. Some good relationships reflecting role modelling and genuine care have been witnessed within the young adult/adult estate (HMCIP, 2014c), however, in other cases prison officers have been found to have low expectations of prisoners in their care (HMCIP, 2014a, 2017b, 2017d). Staff members in the young adult/adult estate have also been found to be distant; disengaged with prisoners; intimidating (HMCIP, 2015d, 2016d) and simply untrained to work with young people (HMCIP, 2017j). Disrespectful elements of officer culture including derogatory name calling, as observed within academic research, builds the perception that young people are "lesser social objects" (Crewe, 2009, p. 161). The 10 weeks training prison officers undergo (Gov.UK, 2016) has been criticised for being too limited (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2009).

The prison estate has been criticised for having limited provision, strategy, targeted support and consultation to address the needs of young adults (HMCIP, 2014c, 2015b, 2016b, 2017a, 2017c, 2017d, 2017j, 2017m; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2014). ‘Shamefully’ (Willow, 2017) young people are therefore more involved in a more ‘adult’ orientated system (Barry, 2006; Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012; Newcomen, 2017b) which is ineffective and inappropriate (Jaspers *et al.*, 2017). Bodies conducting independent reviews on behalf of the Government have recommended that institutions do more to develop a strategic approach to violence reduction strategies (HMCIP, 2015a, 2015c) which strike a greater balance between discipline and care within the juvenile and young adult/adult estate (PPO, 2014). The *Prison Safety and Reform* white paper (MoJ, 2016c) acknowledged that a more coherent approach was required to manage and meet the needs of specific populations including young adults however calls for a developmentally different approach have been rejected (MoJ, 2017a).

Policy implications

Chapter Two outlined how life course transitions from childhood, through youth and adulthood for young people in wider society are increasingly delayed (Roberts, 2009; Prior *et al.*, 2011; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018; Goldson, 2019) and fragmented. Upon turning age 18 years - and becoming ‘adult’ - the expectations imposed upon young people shift as they are considered responsible for their actions (Such and Walker, 2005). It has been argued that the policy frameworks pertaining to young people are “struggling to keep pace with the rapidly changing and increasingly differentiated needs associated with these important transitions.” (Hamilton, Antonucci and Roberts, 2014, p. 4). Policies pertaining to ‘childhood’ and ‘adulthood’ have been called contradictory (Such and Walker, 2005; Goldson, 2013) and arbitrary due to their fixed age threshold (Sawyer *et al.*, 2018).

As discussed in Chapter Two, extended definitions of the period between childhood and adulthood have emerged (Wyn and White, 1997; Jeffs and Smith, 1998; Arnett, 2000; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) and young people may not necessarily identify themselves with the labels of ‘child’ or ‘adult’ placed upon them (Blatterer, 2007; Molgat, 2007; Arnett, 2015). The lives of young people held within institutions are likely to have featured trauma, abuse, poverty and marginalisation (Goldson, 2002; Phillips, 2012; Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015; Gooch, 2017). They often have been ‘catapulted’ into adult roles and strategies of coping with their challenging life experiences (Longfield and Casey, 2018). There is an argument that definitions of the life course should be subject to an individualistic context (Sawyer *et al.*,

2018), sense of self (Eder and Fingerson, 2001) and as a result of the impact of “complex relationships, structures and influences” (Such and Walker, 2005, p. 44).

Numerous commentators (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; Allen, 2013; Harris, 2015; HMCIP, 2017g, House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, Lammy, 2017) have called for developmentally appropriate treatment of young adults (more broadly at 16-24 years rather than the category of ‘young adult offenders’ aged 18-20 years). The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) has found that the inconsistent definition of ‘young adults’ and provision relevant to them within operational practices means that their age-specific needs are often neglected. The view that in England and Wales “the practices related to ‘young adults’ in the justice system are still evolving and not uniform” (Abrams, Jordan and Montero, 2018, p. 14) is realised in the evidence from HMCIP (2015b, 2016b, 2017h, 2017i, 2018h, 2018i) which has found limited or no developmentally appropriate provision for young adults held in the young adult/adult estate.

Young adults within the CJS may have substantial custodial experience but are likely to lack maturity within their thinking and behaviour (Gooch, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016b). Although the Government has appeared to acknowledge this, calls for a specific strategy for young people as a group have been rejected (MoJ, 2017a; Lee, 2018). The threshold for transitions remains at age 18 years and upon transfer young people are ‘forced’ into a “premature adulthood” (Gooch, 2016, p. 279). The traditional markers in transitions to adulthood may feel out of sight or lost to those within institutions who did not follow linear transitions (Gooch, 2016). When support networks are not available to alleviate such concerns, this transition can be especially difficult (Moseley, cited in Williams, 2012).

Reports and accounts from young people have demonstrated that services tailored to the individual including staffing, regime and support is most effective (CJJI, 2012; Livingstone, Amad and Clark, 2015; Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow, 2016a, 2016b). Although this has been seemingly acknowledged in transitions guidance (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d) in practice, it is subject to the availability of support offered by sending and receiving institutions (HMCIP, 2016d, 2017b, 2017d, 2017g, 2019d; Ofsted, 2017). There are multiple transitions of services, systems and relationships upon turning age 18 years, some or all of which can be unsuccessful. Young people’s wellbeing and mental health is at risk with an ‘imperfect handover’ during the change in services and institutions (Centre for Mental Health, 2014).

Whilst the low criminal age of responsibility in England and Wales has been subject to much dispute and debate (see Goldson, 2009, 2013, 2019; Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018)

the upper age limit of criminal responsibility – the age in which a young person moves from the YJB to the adult CJS (Dünkel, 2015) – has only recently received more attention given the acknowledgement of extended social and developmental transitions to adulthood. Some juvenile justice systems in Europe have introduced extended juvenile justice systems or alternative sanctions for young people within the adult criminal justice system until age 25 a recommendation endorsed by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (see Dünkel, 2015). Redefining the young adult population as an extended juvenile population is thought to be problematic as it would deny young people the opportunity to be treated as ‘adults’ with responsibility (Harvey, 2012; Woodman and Wyn, 2013; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018; Coyle, 2019).

When youth custody services were adopted under the governance of HMPPS the Howard League for Penal Reform argued it was far from clear “why this means a prison service already in crisis should be given more responsibility for some of the most vulnerable children in the country” (Neilson, 2017). Indeed, this move has been condemned for being ‘regressive’ by the Standing Committee for Youth Justice (2017) who believe that it risks providing a ‘fragmented’ and ‘adult-centric’ approach to those aged under 18 years held within institutions. The House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) and Lammy (2017) believe that young people within the young adult/adult estate would benefit from some of the multi-disciplinary approaches from the juvenile secure estate. The Youth Custody Improvement Board (Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017, p. 6) has supported this by stating that the Government should perform a needs analysis of the population to inform appropriate commissioning of services.

The Prison Reform Trust (Clare Taylor, 2016, p. 11) has argued that “quite often the specific needs of young adults are overlooked because once they turn age 18 years they are treated as adults”. The great change in service expectation has been found to be particularly difficult for groups such as those who have previously been looked after (Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017) who have a greater requirement for services (Ng *et al.*, 2012) yet are expected to become ‘self-sufficient’ (Propp, Ortega and NewHeart, 2003). It has been argued that Governmental discourses are “inconsistent with any sense of equity and social justice” (Stephen and Squires, 2004, p. 367), as interventions encourage young people to take responsibility but often fail to offer them enough support. This leaves them with limited input within the institutions in which they are held (Wyn and White, 1997). There is therefore as Harris (2015, p. 62) noted: “a disconnect between what those in charge think should be happening and what is actually happening”. The evidence here demonstrates how the

support and interventions available to young people have been found to be inadequate in meeting their needs and the transition is not managed 'effectively' or 'safely' from the perspective of young people (YJB, 2018d).

Despite HMCIP (2017a, p. 9) reporting that the inspectorate has found that no establishment was "safe to hold children and young people", the then CEO of NOMS reported that:

"I think that what we are doing at the moment, with the estate we have and the resources we have, is in the best interests of the young people. It reflects the fact that we have to provide a load of specialist services. If we had to replicate those for an under-25 population, it would be significantly more expensive for us to be able to do. We are trying to use the resources we have in the best way to meet the needs of individuals." (Spurr, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017, p. 5).

The House of Commons Justice Committee (2018c) has been informed by institutions that wider institutional pressures have meant that transition arrangements have become a lesser priority. It has been argued also that placing young people in an unsafe and detrimental environment would not happen outside of the penal context (Watts, cited in Local Government Association, 2017) and has severe ramifications. The delays in providing change within institutions means that there is a significant impact upon the generation of young people held in failing penal institutions.

Within *Transforming Management of Young Adults in Custody* the MoJ (2013a) proposed that a new transitions policy should ensure that institutions are better prepared to support young people. The White Paper *Prison Safety and Reform* (MoJ, 2016b) detailed improvements intended for the young adult/adult estate and acknowledged that transitions needed to be better managed. On one level these policy discourses have acknowledged the critical status of transitions between institutions (NOMS, 2012; MoJ, 2013; YJB, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2018d) however, transition experiences continue to be overlooked (CLINKS, 2017). The Charlie Taylor (2016) review and Government response (MoJ, 2016b) have outlined plans to better support those within the YJS. However, as CLINKS (2017) has highlighted, they neglect to address how changes to the juvenile secure estate will impact upon transitions to adult services and the ongoing needs of individuals who experience it. The impact of the revised YJB (2018d) transitions guidance was yet to be seen in independent inspection reports at the time of writing.

Conclusion

As discussed in Chapter Two, the terms ‘childhood’, ‘youth’ and ‘adulthood’ are constructed subject to societal norms and social expectations (Goldson, 1997a; Muncie, 2008; Heinz, 2009). The fixed age threshold for transferring to the adult penal estate seems arbitrary as it fails to acknowledge individual developmental changes (House of Commons Justice Committee 2016c); especially for those whose lives are disadvantaged and less ‘conventional’ (SEU, 2005, p. 52). The consensus across academic literature, government monitoring and campaign bodies is that young people continue to develop neurologically into young adulthood. However young people are subject to contradictory representations and expectations within social structures (Brown, 2009); there is a perception of a ‘child’: in need of protection in a period of dependency (Wyn and White, 1997) in contrast to the ‘adult’: who at age 18 years is expected to take responsibility for themselves (White, 2009) within an ‘accelerated’ transition (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016c).

The transition into a young adult/adult institution is fixed at age 18 years with limited flexibility or opportunity to return to previous, more supportive, circumstances as can occur within wider transitions (Dwyer and Wyn, 2001; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016c). The majority of young prisoners are not drawn from previously ‘settled’ lives and they require support from institutions to enable a positive move into more settled circumstances (Ramsbotham, 2005). Entry into prison is thought to push young people a premature adulthood (Gooch, 2016). A period of detention is damaging and harmful during the ‘formative’ years of youth as it restricts developmental markers of adolescence including independence, decision making and autonomy (Hanham and Tracey, 2017). For young people incarceration “is never a neutral experience” (Goldson, 2015, p. 181) and both estates have been found to fall below expectation (Simmonds, 2016; HMCIP, 2017a; Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017).

Haines and Case (2018) have argued that the service provided by the YJS has diminished over the past 10 years whilst the population has additional complex needs and problems. As the majority of the young offender population are held in YOIs (YJB, 2017b) they may already be without the specific support they require (Voice, Banardo’s and YJB, 2012) and further diminution in support upon moving to young adult/adult institutions is additionally damaging (CJJI, 2012; PPO, 2014). The period of institutional transition is one in which young people face a ‘cliff-edge’ (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) of support as protective services fall away and information about their needs may be lost or missed.

Within this context the transfer serves as “just one further stage in the exclusion of a group of children who between them, have already experienced almost every form of social exclusion on offer” (HMIP, 1999, p. 3).

At a time where the prison estate as a whole is affected by ‘reduced resources’ (HMCIP, 2018f; Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, the MoJ and London Councils, 2018), there is no appropriately tailored regime in place for those aged 18 years and over. Whilst there has been some financial investment in the juvenile secure estate (Lee cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017), conditions for those entering the young adult estate have remained stagnant or even deteriorated (Nacro, 2001; Bateman, 2015; Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015). The transition between the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult estate, therefore, presents “a cruel paradox: those whose need is greatest are often those who benefit least” (Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018, p. 424). Young people move into a damaging and inadequate environment rather than progress into a tailored system of individual support. Limited provision mixed with worsened conditions in the young adult/adult estate is linked to increased violence and ultimately to self-inflicted deaths (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, PPO, 2016b) characterised the transitional period.

NOMS (2012, p. 1) has acknowledged that the transition represents “a significant change in environment, regime and peer group, making it a particularly challenging part of [young people’s] time in custody”. This guidance has been found to be inconsistently applied in practice (CJI, 2012; Harris, 2015; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and HMCIP (2014a) has been critical that it is not applied in practice. The differences in support due to the ‘arbitrary removal’ of individually focused services (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, p. 39) and the drop in financed resource within the young adult/adult estate (MoJ, 2016a) demonstrates how “the time of transition to adult services is particularly high risk for them, as they move from a system that has evolved to look particularly at their needs to an adult system that is not designed in the same way” (Hinnigan cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a, p. 29). Evidence from independent inquiries’, reports and reviews, as outlined within this chapter, reveals that there is a lack of progress across institutions in effectively managing transfers. Young adult/adult institutions fail to engage with young people, support their needs and improve their circumstances. This sustains the “symbolic violence perpetuated on young people” (Cooper, 2012, p. 66). Despite evidence from government monitoring;

campaign bodies and academics; the Government and institutions continually fail to adequately respond to this population.

The issues discussed here raise further questions about how young people within institutions actually *experience* the transition, the difference in culture and environments (Gooch, 2017) particularly as it is difficult to quantify what constitutes 'vulnerability' and 'successful transitions' in this context (Jones and Bell, 2000). Independent monitoring, such as HMIP inspection reports that seek to review the treatment and conditions of young people, only report on pockets of practice witnessed during short windows of inspections. Although there has been more attention to the transitional period since an initial joint inspection report (CJI, 2012) there is no literature at the time of writing that explores the tracked qualitative experiences of young people before and after their transition. The literature chapters have presented evidence which outline how young people do not receive sufficient support from societal structures and institutions in their transitions to adulthood. This research seeks to fill the gap in knowledge by exploring the individual experiences of young people upon transition. The next chapter outlines and reflects upon the methodological approach taken for this research.

Chapter Four. Methodology

This chapter sets out the aims of the research together with the methodological approach. The research took a mixed methods approach which included the following six components (i) documentary analysis (ii) statistical analyses (iii) literature searches, (iv) qualitative data collection and analysis (v) aggregated/thematic analyses of quantitative survey data and (vi) fieldwork notes taken whilst attending institutions for interviews and shadowing HMIP inspections. The benefits and limitations of using such methods are discussed followed by the thematic framework for analysis. The chapter concludes by returning to my reflections on the research including ethical implications and a sense of reflexivity.

Background, aims and research design

A joint inspection by the CJI (2012) was the first to review transitions being made by young people moving between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult estate. It found that transitions work lacked a sense of purpose and young people felt unprepared for the reality of the move. This led to the introduction of an unenforced protocol on transitions from NOMS (2012) which replaced the 2008 *Progression to the Young Adult Estate* guidance (cited in CJI, 2012). The YJB (2012, 2015) has also introduced guidance for managing transitions but it is primarily focused upon the transition from YOTs to adult probation services as is the reissued protocol (YJB, 2018d). A follow-up inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) was critical of the lack of progress pertaining to transitions work on both local and national levels from the 2012 recommendations. HMCIP (see for example 2015b, 2017l, 2018c, 2019b) occasionally report on specific examples of transitions (captured at the time of inspection) and the NPM (2018) have also presented some examples of transition within their annual report. To my knowledge, no specific research following transitions between juvenile and young adult/adult institutions in England and Wales had since taken place at the time of writing and it is largely overlooked within policy discourse and academic research. Kate Gooch's (2017) ethnographic work has highlighted that the experience of incarceration during transitions to adulthood requires further attention.

This research seeks to understand - in their own terms - how young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult penal estate. A sample of young people (n=14) were followed as they made this transition and the research is unique due to the tracked nature of interviews which took place on two different occasions; pre- and post-transfer. Previous academic literature has focused

primarily on the 'vulnerabilities' of incarcerated children (Goldson, 2002) although there has also been a growing acknowledgment of the specific needs of the young adult prison population (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). By interviewing young people on two occasions during their simultaneous transitions between institutions and from 'childhood' to 'adulthood' the research also bridges a gap in knowledge about how young people experience imprisonment during this stage in their life course, the movement between institutions and the different environments in which they are held.

As stated above the research design comprised six components which together explored young peoples' experiences, professional perspectives and operational practices. The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was 'desirable and necessary' (Liebling, 1999, p. 148-149) and the engagement with multiple dimensions allowed for a broad spectrum of information gathering to adequately understand transitional experiences (Bryman, 2012). Whilst the qualitative methods offered an in depth understanding of the transitional period, the quantitative data provided the context of prison life and experiences in which these accounts could be situated and understood. This corroborative approach to methodology was vital in understanding the context of the issues being researched (Yin, 1994).

Methods, sample sizes and reflections

Documentary, statistical and literature review

A qualitative analysis of policy documents, along with academic and research literature regarding child and young adult imprisonment, was conducted to understand the current situation of young prisoners. I reviewed the official guidance which informs transitions; *The Transitions Process* (NOMS, 2012) protocol and *The Transition Process, Joint National Protocol for Transitions in England* (YJB, 2015, 2018d). Wider relevant policy documents and statistics published by Governmental Organisations including NOMS, MoJ and YJB were subjected to detailed secondary analysis. A wide range of literature pertaining to child/young adult imprisonment was also reviewed for context setting and to inform the key research questions. This included academic research, publications from penal reform charities, child welfare agencies, NGOs, independent reviews and inspection reports.

The detailed review of Government documents and statistics, alongside academic literature, independent reviews and inspections regarding child and young adult imprisonment and transitions allowed me to identify gaps in knowledge and develop the research questions.

Access and interview techniques

For the research to be approved and access to the various penal institutions to be granted, a research application was submitted to NOMS National Research Committee [NRC]. The first research application was declined in August 2016. Modifications were made to the second application (as discussed later in this chapter) and it was approved in November 2016. These delays were not initially expected and access to institutions took longer than anticipated.

Interviews were used to collect primary qualitative data. A total of 49 semi-structured interviews were conducted with young people (n=14) and key stakeholders (n=22). All interviewees have been anonymised in the presentation of the thesis.

Three interview schedules (young person pre-transition, young person post-transition and key stakeholder) (see Appendix Five, Six and Seven) were informed by the key issues/themes that emerged from the literature searches. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. A software package (NVivo) was used to facilitate data analysis.

The interviews were a 'vital method' (Bryman, 2012) which allowed for a wealth of thoughts, ideas and perspectives to be captured efficiently. Semi-structured interviews were used so that interviewees could influence the flow of the conversation and there was the opportunity for interaction and flexibility (Westmarland, 2011). Sections were used to structure the interview schedules but the amount of time discussing particular topics was led by interviewees' responses (Laws and Crewe, 2016). I interviewed young people and practitioners to attain a more complete understanding of the whole transition processes.

I hoped to audio-record each interview, however there was some prospect that this could alter what the interviewees said (Warren, 2001). I was therefore careful to explain to interviewees, upon seeking permission to use the dictaphone, that I was adhering to the University's data management policy which ensured that the recording would purely be used for the purposes of transcribing and would remain confidential and anonymous. The alternative was to take contemporaneous notes but, on reflection, I believed that this would add formality and/or interrupt the interaction (Cohen and Taylor, 1977). I aimed to make the interaction as relaxed and conversational as possible (Laws and Crewe, 2016). The precise techniques that I employed are documented within the reflexivity section later in this chapter.

Interviews with young people

Two juvenile YOIs were identified in advance of the second NRC research application. The young adult/adult institutions were determined by the destination of the young people within the sample. In total, 27 interviews were conducted with a sample of 14 young people across seven sites. Two waves of interviews took place. The first wave of interviews (pre-transition) were conducted with young people (aged approximately 17 years and 11 months) and took place whilst they were detained in one of the two juvenile YOIs. The second wave of interviews (post-transition) took place with the same young people once they had moved to a young adult/adult institution (aged approximately 18 years and one month). The time in between the two interviews ranged from three to five months and the reasons for this are discussed within the validity section of this chapter. Unfortunately, a post-transition interview could not be completed with one young person as he had been released when I was able to make contact with the young adult/adult institution.

The identification/selection of young prisoner interviewees was undertaken in close collaboration with nominated NOMS personnel in the juvenile YOIs and my principal supervisor. We judged that a sample of 14 young people would ensure an adequate representation of views and it would also be feasible to undertake the interviews within the practical constraints of the time available (Bryman, 2016).

At the beginning of each interview the interviewee was invited to define their ethnicity with an open question, this was then categorised employing the ethnic classifications that are used by HMIP in surveys for consistency across the data sets. The majority of the young people within the sample (n=9) identified as 'White British', two young people identified as 'Black' or 'Black British – Caribbean', one young person identified as 'British Muslim', one young person identified as 'White Other' (White mixed Caribbean) and one identified as 'Black British'. Whilst the young prisoner interviewees were not entirely reflective of the ethnic composition of the juvenile secure estate (see YJB, 2017b) and the young adult/adult estate (MoJ, 2018f) at the time of the research, every effort was made to ensure the selection was representative. Issues of race and ethnicity did not present as a dominant theme within the interviews (that principally centred preparation for, and experience of, institutional transitions). I had limited direct control over precisely which young people were identified for interview (this was largely determined by who was reaching their 18th birthdays at the time of the fieldwork) although I do consider the extent to which my gender and ethnicity might have affected the interviews within the reflexivity section of this chapter.

The interviews were audio recorded (with participant permission) using a dictaphone which had to be approved within every institution by the Governor. The pre-transition interviews took place between April 2017 and October 2017, the post-transition interviews took place from October 2017-March 2018.

The experiences of young people who were experiencing transitions were vital in understanding how they prepared for and negotiated them. The semi-structured interviews provided the opportunity for meaningful exploration of the interviewees' experiences; especially for those whose voice may have been "ignored, misrepresented or suppressed in the past" (Byrne, 2004, p. 182). Involving young people who are otherwise voiceless in society (Bauwens *et al.*, 2013) aimed to empower them by demonstrating a 'genuine interest' in their lives (Heath *et al.*, 2009). Vulnerable populations have reported that the opportunity to participate in research is beneficial and cathartic (Biddle *et al.*, 2013). It was important to me that the young people were aware of the potential participatory benefits to them (Bosworth and Kellezi, 2017) and found the interview experiences helpful. I communicated this within the participant information sheet and verbally upon meeting with interviewees.

Holding interviews with young people aged under 18 years took account of Articles 12 (1) and 13 (1) of the UNCRC which provide that States Parties should ensure that children have the right to express their views (UN, 1989). Capturing young peoples' perceptions of practice was considered a vital (Hill, 1999) source of information which directly acknowledged their ability to provide important insights into the services they are involved in (Voice, Barnardo's and YJB, 2012). Their opinions and experiences as sources of evidence which have been applied to recommendations for change during a period of reform are especially important (Hardwick, cited in Redmond, 2015) and was intended to allow them to see that their voices could create 'effective change' in policy (Mitchell, Jones and Renema, 2015). Although the YJB issued a consultation regarding the *Joint National Protocol for Transitions* (YJB, 2017c, 2017d) it is not clear whether young people with direct experiences of transition were consulted.

Following a semi-structured format, the interview questions invited the interviewees to narrate and explore their experiences and identify the topics important to them rather than the interviewer (Westmarland, 2011). The young people were able to shape their accounts in a way that was comfortable to them (Eder and Fingerson, 2001). Given this opportunity young people shared valuable, and sometimes unanticipated, insights regarding their

experiences and were invited to elaborate on their thoughts. Such data could not be captured in a closed-ended format (Colby, 1998; Mitchell, Jones and Renema, 2015).

The use of a second wave of follow-up interviews provided further views and perceptions (Mitchell, Jones and Renema, 2015; Hanham and Tracey 2017) which allowed the young people engaged in the research to reflect upon their personal experiences (Liebling and Maruna, 2005; Sanders *et al.*, 2014). Follow up interviews also allowed me to revisit previous responses and probe instances where opportunities to elicit information may have been missed within the first round of interviews. This element of the research makes it distinct from the CJI (2012) and HM Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) reviews as it offers first-hand distinctive and timely qualitative insights from young people themselves before and after their direct experiences of transition.

Interviews with key stakeholders

Twenty-two interviews were undertaken with key stakeholders those who were involved with, or who had expert knowledge of juvenile and young adult/adult penal detention (including institutional transitions). They included NOMS personnel from the juvenile secure young adult/adult estate, researchers, penal reform agencies, child welfare organisations and members of independent inspectorates. The key stakeholders have been categorised as 'insider' key stakeholders (those who are employed *within* penal institutions) and 'outsider' key stakeholders (those who are employed *out with* penal institutions). The 'insider' key stakeholders were interviewed generally about transitions to understand their perspectives on the processes rather than the specific young people involved in the research. This was done purposefully so that the interviews provided supplementary data about how guidance and procedures are actually applied within the penal estates and the perspectives of young people could independently reflect their experiences of transition. The interviews with key stakeholders were also audio recorded (with participant permission) using a dictaphone. The key stakeholder interviews took place from June 2017–March 2018.

Within the key stakeholder interviews, I hoped to engage with staff members with direct experience of working in penal institutions alongside other 'outsider' experts to understand their perspectives (Crawley, 2004) and acknowledge their experiences (Beyens *et al.*, 2015). The sampling of the 'insider' key stakeholders was largely opportunistic based on which staff members were available on the day that I attended the institutions for interviews (although the selection was guided as much as possible by the specialist functional responsibilities of such staff). 'Outsider' key stakeholders were selected using a purposive sample; they were

identified through supervision in a strategic way based on the stakeholders' recognised knowledge, experience and expertise pertinent to the research objectives (Bryman, 2016). I believe it was important to ask for the views, aims and perceptions across key stakeholders (Hamilton, Fitzgibbon and Carr, 2016) to offer different perspectives which gathered interesting insights into the 'challenges, emotions, tensions and conflicts' of their work (Crawley, 2004).

Of the 'insider' key stakeholders all those interviewed in the juvenile secure estate identified as 'White British' (n=5, female n=2, male n=3). In the young adult/adult estate all but one interviewee identified as White British, the single exception identified as 'Black' or 'Black British – Caribbean' (female) – (n=6, female n=5, male n=1). The majority of the 'outsider' key stakeholders identified as 'White British' (n=8, female n=5, male n=3), one male identified as 'White Irish' and one female preferred not to say.

Interviewing key stakeholders (both 'insiders' and 'outsiders') allowed for the collation of more evidence and experience from a cross-section of individuals with experience of the processes of transition. I was able to gather further information about transitional arrangements and practices based on their experiences and expertise. This also allowed me to place the young persons' narrative within a wider context of data gathered from key stakeholder interviews so that further factors including actions, decisions and views of others were considered (Heath *et al.*, 2009).

Aggregated/thematic analyses of HMIP survey data

HMIP provide independent scrutiny of the treatment and conditions of those held in institutions including prisons, immigration detention facilities and court custody suites and seek to promote positive outcomes for detainees and the public. The Chief Inspector reports inspection findings directly to the Justice Secretary and Ministers. The Inspectorate has a joint inspection programme and works alongside other specialised inspectorates including Ofsted (for education and social care), Care Quality Commission (for healthcare). STCs and YOIs are jointly inspected by HMIP and Ofsted and are supported by the Care Quality Commission annually (HMIP does not inspect SCHs). Juvenile YOIs and STCs are inspected every year and young adult/adult institutions are inspected less frequently approximately every two to five years (HMCIP, 2018j).

During their inspections of institutions in the juvenile secure and young adult/adult penal estates HMIP collate self-reported information about individuals' profile, circumstances and

experiences of being held within the institution. Questionnaires are distributed to all children in STCs and YOIs (Simmonds, 2016) and a sample of those held within the young adult/adult estate (HMCIP, 2017d). The questionnaire data forms a base of evidence and is triangulated with inspector observations, discussions with staff and young people and establishment documentation (Simmonds, 2016), to produce inspection reports which are made available in the public domain.

I was provided with access to HMIP data collected over a three-year period (August 2014-July 2017). The collaborative nature of the project also allowed me to attain an understanding of the HMIP questionnaire and inspection processes through shadowing two inspections and visits to the HMIP headquarters. I had access to the quantitative data on SPSS and to qualitative data. Both data sets were subject to aggregated analyses to identify themes and patterns.

Quantitative data collection/analysis

HMIP scan the questionnaires into their system 'SNAP' and the data is manually cleaned by the research team. The data is then put into Excel before SPSS Version 17. The quantitative survey data I accessed was drawn from seven STC inspections, 14 YOI inspections, nine young adult inspections, 13 female adult and 94 adult prison inspections. I merged the quantitative survey data and categorised it as follows: STC 2014-17, YOI 2014-17, young adult 2014-17, adult male 2014-17 and women 2014-17. They were then categorised further by age: STC 12-16 years and 17-18 years; YOI 15-16 years and 17-18 years. Across the young adult/adult estate data the sample could not be identified any further than 'under 21 [years]' I therefore grouped them using two categories: aged under 21 years and aged 21-70+ years. This data showed the frequency of responses to each question. I then manually typed them into the HMIP excel survey responses template to show the questionnaire responses by age across the three-year period (see Appendices Eight to 12).

I compared the data across institutions to reveal any reported differences in the experiences of those aged 17-18 years in the juvenile secure estate (STCs and YOIs) and those aged under 21 years in young adult and adult institutions. This provided a wider snapshot – to extend my primary qualitative data - of the self-reported experiences of young people held across the penal estate. The presentation of survey results across the three-year period by age category has not been presented as such within the public domain previously. The results may differ somewhat than the results that have been published in the public domain within individual

and annual inspection reports as the analysis process was changed within HMIP during this period.

Qualitative data collection/analysis

The HMIP questionnaires also contain free text comments. Until January 2016 all free text comments contained within surveys were summarised into a 'representative summary' by a member of the research team before the data was destroyed. Therefore, the comments from prisoners surveyed prior to January 2016 were no longer available. I had access to the free text comments of all questionnaires from January 2016.

Each survey I had access to corresponded to an anonymous ID on SPSS which could be cross referenced with the Excel spreadsheet containing all free text comments. This meant that I was able to group the free text comments into two categories: those made by young people aged 17-18 years in the juvenile estate and those aged under 21 years in the young adult/adult estate.

All qualitative comments from January 2016–August 2017 were reviewed. This period corresponded in part with the fieldwork window but was different to the quantitative window for the reasons cited above. Free-text comments made by young people were available from 53 inspections; three from STCS, seven from YOIs, three from young adult, five from women's, one from a category B, 11 from category C, 21 from local and two from open prisons. It transpired that free text comments for young adults from one women's institution were missing and comments drawn from STCs were not consistently recorded. For STCs only three data sets were available, two of which were from the same establishment across two inspections. Any comments directly relating to transition experiences – e.g. when an individual mentioned moving to or from young adult/adult institutions – were identified. Once again, this data captured more young people than my interview sample and the comments were used to provide supplementary secondary data to complement my primary interview data.

The HMIP survey data follows a robust methodology and provided a 'necessary starting point' (European Group for Social Research, 2001, p. 113) to contextualise my data and a foundational platform to build upon (Heath *et al.*, 2009). The use of existing survey data with standardised questions provided a substantial body of reported data from prisoners about their treatment and conditions whilst held in the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult institutions which meant that comparisons could be made across existing data sets over time.

The methods employed by HMIP, however, are limited in some respects. Whilst all young people detained within the STCs and juvenile YOIs are invited to complete questionnaires as part of annual inspections, young adult/adult institutions are inspected less often and only a sample of the population are invited to complete the questionnaires. The inspection of STCs is more stringent than YOIs as an urgent notification process (which must be responded to by the Secretary of State in 28 days) takes place when an STC is judged to be 'inadequate' (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, Care Quality Commission and Ofsted, 2019). Although HMCIP (2014a, 2015a, 2017c, 2018h) have acknowledged the developmentally different needs of young adults and their requirement for appropriate provision, their inspections of the young adult estate and adult prisons holding young adults are managed in precisely the same way as adult inspections. The Chief Inspector has highlighted that establishments holding what they term 'children and young people' – those aged under 18 years – are inspected annually "as a reflection of the particular risks and challenges that they face" (HMCIP, 2018c, p. 5). Young adult/adult institutions are inspected less frequently up to every five years (HMCIP, 2018j). This demonstrates that the inspectorate does not deem it necessary to subject institutions holding young adults to the same scrutiny as the juvenile secure estate. The survey data is also limited in its capacity to adequately capture in depth experiences reported by young people (Liebling, 1999), respondents may have minimised their difficulties (Willow, 2015) and information regarding transitions is not deliberately captured although it features in a more ad hoc fashion in many responses.

Fieldwork notes

Spending time in juvenile YOIs and young adult/adult institutions also provided opportunities to observe exchanges and interactions (formal and informal) between young prisoners and staff members (Harvey, 2012; Phillips, 2012) and to take an oversight of different aspects of prison life (Gooch, 2016). The collaborative partnership with HMIP further provided opportunities to shadow two HMIP inspections one at a juvenile YOI and one at a young adult/adult institution. When I attended institutions, whether for interviews or shadowing HMIP inspections, I kept detailed fieldwork notes taking account of observations and reflections to build a record of the day-to-day life within the 'complex' prison environment (Liebling, 1999) including differences between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estates. Attending juvenile YOIs and young adult/adult institutions in different capacities enriched my understanding of the social reality and context of penal establishments in which young people are held (Bryman, 2012).

Subject to the remit of the inspector I accompanied during the inspection I was privy to unrestricted access to the prison environment. This meant I could observe the prison at different times of the day in different areas which allowed me to experience the 'feel' of the institution (Gooch, 2017). I also had access to the knowledge and expertise of a wider group of stakeholders: the HMIP inspectors. Informal conversations held with members of the Inspectorate during long days shadowing two inspections gave me the opportunity to develop my understanding of the prison environment and HMIP's methodology. I also witnessed the inspectors' impressions of the establishment and familiarised myself with colloquial language used within institutions. By documenting my perceptions of the environment and interactions within it I had additional data whilst conducting my analysis some months later (Hammersley, 2003; Byrne, 2004). Checking and documenting my emotions (Jewkes, 2011) over the period I was conducting my fieldwork enabled me to be more reflexive as a researcher and added to the research's 'credibility' (Guba, 1981) as discussed later in this chapter.

Practical issues in attaining access and selecting participants

As Girling (2017) has noted, crime and punishment are political issues and political sensitivities no doubt served to limit access to institutions and young people. The small number of girls held within the juvenile secure estate (around 20 at the time (YJB, 2017b)) meant relatively few (if any) would transition into the young adult/adult estate annually. I was interested in how girls and young women experience the, potentially more significant, transition (see R. Allen, 2016) as they can only move from SCHs or STCs into adult women's prisons as no YOIs or young adult prisons are available for females (MoJ, 2015a). However, given the focus on STCs following the Panorama programme (see Panorama, 2016; Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017) I reached the judgement with my principal supervisor that accessing STCs would be extremely difficult and did not pursue them. This meant that deliberate selectivity took place as young people in STCs (including girls and young women) and three of the five YOIs were excluded from the research.

The NOMS NRC application formed part of the process of negotiation required to conduct the research within prisons. We were required to convince the committee of the importance of the research without compromising our original research objectives. Israel and Gelsthorpe (2017, p. 185) have questioned whether such procedures protect the interests of vulnerable groups or, alternatively, protect "powerful agencies from scrutiny by independent researchers". NOMS has been criticised for their defensiveness in review of their conduct and

practices (Haringey, cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a). The process of gaining access to data, closed settings and the cooperation of criminal justice agencies through institutional research committees has been labelled difficult (Bryman, 2012; Phillips, 2012), bureaucratic (Moore and Wahidin, 2017) and requiring careful negotiation (Heptinstall, 2000; Beyens *et al.*, 2015). Although NOMS personnel within two selected juvenile YOIs initially agreed to support the research, additional formal approval had to be obtained from each of the Governors. At this time both institutions were subject to a HMIP inspection and HMIP requested that I waited until after the inspections had taken place before approaching the institutions. Both juvenile YOIs eventually approved the research but the Governor of Juvenile Institution Two required me to take a DBS check and the HM Prison Service vetting procedure. This was indicative of the process of negotiation required when researching the lives of young people held in institutions and although it was quite legitimate it was also practically time consuming.

The daily demands of a prison environment presented additional challenges for the staff in facilitating my research and it often meant that it became a low priority. Although the initial contact with each juvenile institution was with one gatekeeper, in some cases I was directed to at least two subsequent gatekeepers within each, and this produced delays of weeks and months for various reasons including annual leave and staff turnover. This also meant that I had to repeat information about the project and my availability. Restrictions were also placed on when I could access institutions due to regime, lockdowns or staffing issues and on one occasion the research was cancelled at the last minute due to staff training (Juvenile Institution Two). Juvenile Institution One had a one-month period when they 'held off' transitions. I was informally told this was due to pressures in the young adult population and politely informed that I could not conduct the research during this period to avoid the risk of prompting the young people about transitions.

The sample of young people that I sought to access was further subject to institutional gatekeeping control. I had no direct access to the young people as the NOMS personnel within each institution were tasked with identifying those 'suitable' for the research. Young people could have been deterred by this process of identification. The number of young people expected to transition from the juvenile YOIs to young adult/adult institutions was not consistently shared with me, despite requests. Having such knowledge would have been preferable as it would have allowed me to determine any possible selection biases; including those who had been excluded by gatekeepers and those that refused to participate, but it was not to be. Within communication to the institutions I continually highlighted that I

wished to speak to any young people who were due to transition across institutions. As I was unaware of the number of young people who transitioned within the institutions, I could not be sure whether each young person was approached nor whether my sample was truly representative.

The gatekeepers ultimately decided who they would include or exclude from the research. There was a risk that gatekeepers' decisions could be based upon time pressures and convenience or other selection criteria. Wider delays in communication from the gatekeepers also may have impacted upon participants' inclusion and exclusion in the research as I was also denied access to young people over the month when Juvenile Institution One 'held off' transitions. I had to accept the influence that the gatekeepers had over the research as access would not have been granted otherwise. Gatekeepers' ability to decide who had the opportunity to participate within the research could have prevented certain young people from voicing their view. This presented a conflict between their rights and the gatekeepers' duty to promote their best interests (Heptinstall, 2000). This is discussed further within the ethics section below.

The 'success' of the research was also dependent on the retention of participants which was challenging. I asked the young people within their pre-transition interview if they would be happy for me to contact them in their new institution. Their response was documented within the consent forms and verbally at the end of the interview. With this research a conventional 'schedule-based' interview could not be arranged as the destination of the young person was not always known. I assumed that the juvenile YOI would provide the details of the gatekeeper in the receiving institution and therefore the young people would be 'easy to find' (Farrall *et al.*, 2016, p. 299) but this was not always the case. Juvenile institution One provided information about where the young person had transitioned to, sometimes a contact name and less often an email address. Juvenile institution Two finally shared the name of each institution young people had moved to but without any contact details. I finally received this information in a brief telephone conversation following weeks of unanswered emails and telephone calls.

The penal institutions and ancillary services that the young people were engaged with were stretched and this was demonstrated by the difficulties I encountered whilst attempting to make contact with them (Ward and Henderson, 2003). Participant follow up was extremely time consuming. I had to consider how much resource and persistence to commit in pursuit of 'hard to reach' participants. Within the young adult/adult institutions I made continued

efforts to secure initial contacts and subsequently arrange interviews. On one occasion I managed to speak to an Offender Supervisor on the telephone who scheduled the interview with the young person for the following week. However, requests for interviews with young people who later entered the institution were ignored by this member of staff and I continued with the approach I took in every institution: telephone calls, emails the Offender Management Unit [OMU] department and letters to the Governor before the head of OMU accepted a telephone call months after initial contact was made. Sometimes this process was deeply frustrating, but I always remained mindful that the issues with access were due to various gatekeepers rather than the young people themselves.

The majority of young adult/adult institutions requested that I conducted the interviews as a 'legal' or 'official' visit as they did not have the resource to facilitate the interviews. To do this I required each interviewee's prison number which brought further delays. Senior Officer One arranged three interviews within Young Adult/Adult Institution One and stated it was actually quite straightforward to schedule. Within my field notes I documented that they 'hinted' that the prison system was disorganised and commented that staff members from other institutions may have been more reluctant to meet with me and/or support/participate in the research. I felt that the young adult/adult institutions were not as invested in my research as the juvenile institutions as staff members were less inclined to agree to be interviewed; often citing a heavy workload as a barrier.

Ethical considerations

The involvement of young people within research that seeks to inform policy formation and practice responses is extremely valuable (Heath *et al.*, 2009). Children are considered to have structural vulnerabilities as a socially excluded group within the intensely governed environment of the CJS (Goldson, 2002). As a researcher I was required to take extra care when applying the principles of ethical governance to 'children' than 'adults' (Girling, 2017). All prisoners are considered to comprise a vulnerable group within professional codes of ethics which affects consent and safeguarding around them. The ethics application went to the University Level Ethics Committee and was granted approval subject to minor revisions in February 2017.

The nature of young peoples' lives within institutions means that adults continually present as decision makers who control access to young people and the opportunities they have to express their views (Masson, 2000). I therefore wanted to stress to each young person that they had the power over the decision to participate within the research. I formed the

judgement that the participants were competent in giving their own consent at age 17 years as this is typically an age in which young people are assumed to be competent in their decision making. All participants were informed of the full details of the study via a participant information sheet (see Appendices Three and Four). To acknowledge the varying stages of development and mental capacities of young people I adapted the participant information sheets from the University's template to ensure they were worded appropriately; neither patronising nor too adult-centric (Heath *et al.*, 2009). The nominated personnel within each establishment initially shared the participant information sheet with each young person identified for interview. If the young person agreed to participate they were then invited to sign a consent form.

Within the environment of a complex institution written consent may not be the most 'ethical option' (Moore and Wahidin, 2017, p. 67) as consent forms can be met with mistrust and informed consent can also be hard for those who are confused or traumatised (Bosworth and Kellizi, 2017). The nature of how the participants within institutions were approached by gatekeepers may have made them feel compelled to cooperate and unable to withdraw (Heath *et al.*, 2009). I remained mindful that participation should not compound the suffering of those already subject to the harms of imprisonment (Moore and Wahidin, 2017, p. 57) and sought to ensure that informed consent was achieved throughout the research process.

As I was not privy to the initial process of attaining the young persons' consent gaining their informed consent myself was therefore critical upon meeting with them. I verbally discussed the participant information sheet and consent form with the young person before the pre-transition interview to clarify their understanding, confirm consent and remind them of their right to withdraw at any time. Rather than continue an assumption of consent, I finished the first interview by asking young people if they consented to being approached later for the post-transition interview. This sought to show to the young people that I was fulfilling a 'basic principle' of research ethics by treating consent as an ongoing process (Neale, 2013). I also hoped this would assure young people that they had ownership of their involvement within the research (Heath *et al.*, 2009).

Upon meeting with the young people for a second time for the post-transition interview I found that none of them had been informed who was coming to see them. Some were aware they had a legal visit, but others had simply been taken from their activity to meet with me. There was the potential that the young people may have found the second wave of

interviews alienating (Heath *et al.*, 2009) if they felt their transition was not 'successful' (K. Allen, 2016). I felt the process of gaining informed consent was extremely important given these circumstances. The young people all remembered me either immediately or soon after I covered the information contained within the participation information sheet and consent form.

I reminded each young person that ultimately, I approached the interviews in a non-judgemental manner and was genuinely interested in hearing about their experiences (Biddle *et al.*, 2013; Moore and Wahdin, 2017). To create this atmosphere, I reiterated to the young people that I was interested in their views and experiences which would remain confidential and anonymous. On one occasion Darren responded to my request for his opinion by suggesting that even if he shared it, it would not make a difference. I told him that I was interested in hearing it and I hoped that I demonstrated to him, and all interviewees, that they were invited to be open and honest within our interactions.

Although child prisoners are considered a 'vulnerable group' requiring special consideration during the process of applying for ethical approval (Girling, 2017; Moore and Wahidin, 2017) additional ethical concerns are not as immediately apparent for research with individuals aged over 18 years. 'Outsider' key stakeholders who did not work in institutions were approached via email at which point they were sent the participant information sheet and consent form in advance. In line with the HMIP (2015b, p. 4) ethical guidelines every effort was made to preserve the "rights, privacy and dignity" of participants by applying consistent ethical sensitivity. I followed the process of ensuring informed consent with all participants whether 'children' or 'adults' (Chistensen and Prout, 2002; Girling, 2017).

The interviews within YOIs and young adult/adult institutions were arranged in conjunction with NOMS personnel to ensure they took place within a safe environment overseen by staff members (normally out of earshot). Interviews with key stakeholders took place at a location suitable to them; typically, their workplace. I had an obligation to disclose any child protection, safeguarding issues or illegal issues; (disclosure of criminal acts, disclosure from the young person feeling they were at risk of harm, risk of harming somebody else) to NOMS in accordance with NOMS (2014, paragraph 3.34) NRC Application Guidance. This was stated within the participant information sheet (see Appendix One and Two), consent form (see Appendix Three and Four) and the participant was verbally informed of this before the interviews began.

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Appropriate anonymity and confidentiality were incorporated into the transcription by removing identifiable information and using a unique study identification number/code into data storage formats. To protect the identity of the participants the young people were given pseudonyms which are culturally similar to their real names and the key stakeholders are referred to throughout the thesis by their employment (see Appendix 13).

Young people held in institutions are likely to have been subject to numerous assessments and interviews by different and unfamiliar adults who request information on personal issues (Goldson, 2002; Ellis, 2018). I wanted to ensure the young people did not feel objectified (Bosworth *et al.*, 2005) and avoided being 'voyeuristic' (Moore and Wahdin, 2017) through detailed questioning into their personal circumstances or offending (Goldson, 2002). The interview was deliberately designed to avoid the discussion of sensitive topics that would cause distress or embarrassment to the participant. The risk of physical and psychological adverse effects was deemed to be minimal, however, I could not predict with any degree of certainty the impact the research would have on participants. To take all reasonable actions to minimise risks I followed advice from establishments regarding the identification/selection of young people suitable to take part in the research and the services in place within the institutions to support them should it be necessary.

Within each interview I upheld the participants' anonymity and confidentiality and assured them of this. On five occasions within both juvenile institutions staff informed me that it was 'necessary' for them to accompany me during the interviews. Before starting each interview, I asked if the young person was comfortable that I was accompanied and conducted the interview with their consent. The effect of the staff members' presence upon the young person is discussed below. Three interviews within Young Adult/Adult Institution Four were conducted in the open official visits room where other official visits were being conducted, family visits were being held outside and the young people I was scheduled to interview were brought outside the room at once and despite being out of earshot were aware of who I was interviewing. This presented issues with confidentiality and anonymity (Liebling, 1999) although the young people did not appear to be uncomfortable with this, I reminded them that they did not have to answer any questions they did not want to and moved the dictaphone nearer to them to minimise the prospect of their responses being in earshot of others.

Ethical considerations extended beyond those anticipated within the scope of the University Committee application. Guillemin and Gillam (2004) have referred to these two different dimensions as 'procedural ethics' and 'ethics in practice'. Once the young person consented to participating within the project, I maintained responsibility for ensuring that the research was conducted in an ethical manner (Christensen and Prout, 2002; Ward and Henderson, 2003) and was mindful to recognise signs of potential harm to participants (Bosworth and Kellezi, 2017) and respond appropriately. I drew on previous experience of engaging young offenders through volunteer work as a community panel member within my local YOS. I was relaxed and friendly in an effort to create a non-threatening environment which hoped to make the young person feel as comfortable as possible. Young people were reminded that they did not have to answer questions if they did not want to and I remained professional by keeping the interviews structured and empathetic (Liebling, 1999).

The collaboration with HMIP gave an invaluable insight into the interview styles used by the Inspectors who often had a short space of time in which to follow up sensitive issues with young prisoners. They were professional and honest about their subsequent actions and capability to provoke change - something which I hoped to adopt. I applied this approach within interviews with key stakeholders also. Whilst discussing changes to the categorisation of the institution, Probation Officer Three from Young Adult/Adult Institution Two commented "I don't know if you've got any taps in Home Office..." and later stated they enjoyed the interview as they liked to 'rant'. Offender Supervisor Two from Young Adult/Adult Institution Three similarly joked once the interview was no longer being audio recorded: "can you get us more staff?". I reminded the interviewees that I was independent and reiterated the information as contained within the participant information sheet about the purpose of the research.

I aimed to strike a balance between empathetic interest and encouraging agency and maintaining an appropriate professional distance (Phelan and Kinsella, 2013) by enquiring about the young person's views but not being over friendly in my responses. I remained aware that a young person could divulge sensitive or upsetting information within the interviews and might require support beyond my training or role as a researcher (Byrne, 2004). If it appeared that they may become upset about something I changed the topic of conversation and later referred to the debrief sheet that all young people received reminding them of the various services they could contact within their institution. There was the potential that the young person would be concerned about their upcoming transition (pre-

transition interview) or upset about how their transition was handled (post-transition interview). Although this did not occur, in the event of the young person becoming upset I would offer the opportunity to stop the interview and return to it at a later time or date (where practically possible) and inform the gatekeeper so that they could follow-up with the young person to offer support.

Research with all human participants creates 'ethical tensions' as participants are approached to take part in research that they did not request (Heath *et al.*, 2009) and both young people and especially young prisoners have been sceptical that their involvement in research could evoke change (Ramsbotham, 2005; Voice, Barnardo's and YJB, 2012). Gatekeepers have a duty of care to protect young people from unnecessary research (Heath *et al.*, 2009). The perception of certain groups of young people as particularly vulnerable, and therefore in need of protection, may have meant that gatekeepers decided to exclude them from this research (Heptinstall, 2000). I was not aware whether or not this occurred. The emotional and social 'harm' that could be caused by their participation (Guillemin and Gillam, 2004), was acknowledged (as discussed above) but gatekeeping young people from research needs to be sensitive yet not excessive (Biddle *et al.*, 2013). I took the view of Girling (2017, p. 38) that there would be "ethical implication[s] of NOT conducting the research". The qualitative accounts of their experiences was of vital importance in the production of knowledge which can inform both policy and practice (Hammersely and Traianou, 2012).

[Thematic analyses / framework for analysis](#)

I took a thematic approach to analyse the results. This was one of the most common inductive approaches to qualitative data analysis based upon Glasser and Strauss' (1967 cited in Gibbs, 2012) *grounded theory*. The interviews provided a wealth of information about the interviewees' social world and attitudes and I examined it to draw out key themes (Bryman, 2016). By using a thematic approach, the views and voices of the young people are retained in the analysis and subsequent findings, in this way the young people could be said to have co-constructed the findings (Hammersley, 2003).

The use of open questions within semi-structured interviews allowed for a more 'natural' approach of 'gathering' data based on the interviewees' responses (Warren, 2001). As soon as possible after the interview I transcribed the audio recording and documented my field notes (Walsh, 2004). The use of audio recording equipment allowed for a more accurate account of the conversation to be captured (Yin, 1994). I found transcribing the interviews myself useful as it enabled me to become immersed in the data and become familiar with

each account and reflect on the interviewee's experiences (Harvey, 2012; Paulsen and Thomas, 2017). I revisited each encounter and made a provisional note of any initial and emerging/prominent themes. These themes were identified based on what the young people said and they were additionally informed by relevant documentary, statistical and research literature (Ryan and Bernard, 2003). By interviewing young people about their transitions, I hoped to allow them to directly voice their views and understandings of their experiences rather than base it simply upon a practical level and adult interpretations (Eder and Fingerson, 2001). I feel that the thematic analyses enabled me to do this.

This process of revisiting the data and immersing myself within it formed the 'familiarisation' part of the qualitative data analysis (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994). I then began to identify codes and categories which were determined by the individual accounts of transition. This rigorous strategy of reflection and analysis meant that the categories were continually developed and refined (Searle, 2004a). The use of follow-up interviews allowed me to consider the narrative before and after the transition. As further interviews were completed, I followed the same process and built up a sense of recurrent themes but also noted any significant divergences between what the young people and key stakeholders reported.

Once a number of transcripts were completed, they were added to the software NVivo 10 and I used the initial notes to begin to identify overarching nodes and constructed a coding frame that was applied to subsequent interviews. Where new coding themes emerged during later interviews, they were applied retrospectively to ensure the analysis was not biased towards themes that emerged during the initial stages of the study. I later returned to the initial transcripts and revisited the themes within the context of the full record of conversation to ensure the data had not become fragmented. This process of 'checking' and reflecting added to the data's validity (Wong *et al.*, 2017).

The thematic analyses provided a 'useful starting point'. As Bazeley (2013, p. 191) has argued, however, that the data must be used to "build a comprehensive, contextualised, and integrated understanding of what has been found, with an argument drawn from across the data that establishes conclusions drawn". Once I had identified the themes, I then considered the meaning or sentiment of what was said and how they overlapped with the data from other sources. The data generated from interviews with young people were triangulated with key stakeholder interviews, secondary analyses of HMIP data and field notes. This process added depth to the social meaning and validated the findings within this context (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

Reliability and validity

The quality of research has typically been judged by its reliability (the consistency of the research procedures in delivering the results) and its validity (the 'truth-value' of the results) (Searle, 2004b). Some qualitative researchers have rejected the application of this realist criteria in favour of a naturalistic approach to quality assure research to review how 'dependable', 'credible' and 'transferable' the results are (Guba, 1981; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Academics have argued that 'reliability' and 'validity' remain relevant (Searle, 1999) and the verification strategies that subsequently emerged should continue to be used to ensure rigor (Morse *et al.*, 2002). This section focuses primarily on the interviews with young people but demonstrates how the mixed methods employed within this research were specifically designed to ensure a rounded sense of quality and robustness.

The reliability, or replicability, of prison research is difficult due to the changing nature of it as a setting. Seale (1999, p. 157-158) has suggested that a "fully reflexive account of procedures and methods, showing to readers in as much detail as possible the lines of inquiry that have led to particular conclusions" ensures that the research is supported by adequate evidence. As a researcher (as discussed below) and employing a triangulation of methods I sought to mitigate researcher bias where possible (Becker, 1967; Liebling, 2001).

Treating all interviewees fairly and respectfully was crucial to their engagement within the interview (Schlosser, 2008). Young people are more likely to trust adults who demonstrate a commitment to them (Urry, Sanders and Munford, 2015). I was extremely conscious that I had a duty to pursue the post-transition interviews as the participants had consented to a second interview and therefore would be expecting it to take place. Although the participants may not have held me as significant as I did them (K. Allen, 2016), I felt I had a moral obligation to follow-up the interviews as promised especially as young people held within institutions may have had their trust violated by adults previously (Urry, Sanders and Munford, 2015). To my regret, the delay of nearly a year trying to contact Young Adult/Adult Institution Three meant that I could not complete a follow-up interview with Sadir as he had been released (although this in itself was welcome news).

There was a constant negotiation across sites including difficulty making initial contact with an institution, agreeing to wait until a legal visit became available (in one instance two months) which resulted in delays between pre-transition and post-transition interviews. The interviews with each young person were intended to be two months apart however they varied from three to five months. This could have impacted upon the young person's

recollection and account of their experiences due to the time that had elapsed. The only positive conclusion I drew from this is that time between interviews allowed me to maintain “regular injections of ‘involvement’ and ‘distance’” as expected from a credible researcher (Liebling, 1999, p. 164). I had greater time to reflect upon the content of the pre-transition interviews in preparing for the post-transition interviews, including thinking about potential follow up questions.

Guba (1981, p. 84) has suggested a number of techniques to assert the credibility (pertains to internal validity) of the research and address any ‘problems of interpretation’. This includes the process of triangulation: using different sources of information. The use of six well established components demonstrates a commitment to conducting credible research. The documentary analysis, statistical analyses and literature searches provided a detailed context whilst the fieldwork notes, aggregated/thematic analyses of secondary quantitative HMIP survey data and qualitative data, and the primary qualitative data collection and analysis gave an in-depth exploration of the transition experiences being studied. The primary data gathering was conducted in a consistent and robust manner through the use of audio-recording, a fieldwork diary and transcription of interviews which were analysed using a thematic approach (Boyatzis, 1998; Nowell *et al.*, 2017).

The selection of participants affected the extent to which the result could be considered transferable (external validity) across the juvenile secure estate population. Females were deliberately excluded from the research and the juvenile YOI establishments were selected following consultation with NOMS personnel. Previous HMIP reports have indicated that these institutions had transition programmes/procedures in place.

Shenton (2004) has suggested that results must be considered within the context in which they were carried out. Background data and detailed descriptions of the phenomenon, as contained within the literature reviews, allowed comparisons to be made. The validity of information was also judged on “its relevance and appropriateness to [the] research question and the directness and strength of its association with the concepts under scrutiny” (Pierce, 2008, p. 83). As this research was specifically interested in how young people experienced the transitions between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult penal institutions, sequenced semi-structured interviews offered insights than any other methods previously employed (Heath *et al.*, 2009), and they spoke directly to the research questions.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a continual process of researcher scrutiny and sensitivity of ones' work to consider how its intervention may impact upon those involved (Byrne, 2004). I have engaged with reflexivity throughout this chapter, and as a reflexive researcher, I was continually aware of my status and role within the research process (Moore and Wahdin, 2017) and its potential impact upon the participants (Gullemin and Gillam, 2004). By drawing on this awareness I was able to acknowledge and uphold the ethical dimensions within social research (Christensen and Prout, 2002). As data is "subjectively filtered through our own emotional lens" (Phillips, 2012, p. 61) reflexivity must be attended to by the researcher throughout the research process and within the impressions and subsequent representations of participants presented within dissemination (Phelan and Kinsella, 2013). Below I consider my role within the research and the wider social circumstances that may have affected the knowledge created by the research (Gullemin and Gillam, 2004) and this was discussed in supervision at regular intervals throughout the fieldwork process.

Researcher role

As a researcher it was important, albeit a challenge, that I was accepted within the prison (Beyens *et al.*, 2015, p. 68) by both prisoners and staff, otherwise they would have been resistant or reluctant to participate (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Liebling (1999, p. 159) has suggested that the investment within the institutional field is most vital in negotiating the environment. However, these relationships can also be obstructive. If I appeared 'overly associated' with the prison staff (Phillips, 2012), which may have been the case as they escorted and introduced me to young people, the prisoners may have been less inclined to open up and talk to me. Once on a one-to-one with each young person I reminded them of my independence from the institution. Conversely, staff shortages and prison lockdowns affected movements on a visit to Juvenile Institution Two which meant that a staff member escorted me to each wing to interview the young people. The research would simply not have taken place without their investment in the research.

The 'non-negotiable' ascribed characteristics such as gender, age and ethnicity shape expected social interactions as they are institutionalised within society (Walsh, 2004). The potential effects of this during interviews with young people and key stakeholders were considered (Health *et al.*, 2009; Bergman Blix and Wettergren, 2015; Beyens *et al.*, 2015) but I cannot be sure whether different responses from the interviewees may have been elicited from a male researcher (Gooch, 2017). Young people with a different ethnicity than myself

as the researcher may have felt that I may not identify with their experiences of racism and discrimination within prison (Phillips, 2012). The implications of these characteristics upon the research could not be escaped (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). I sought to establish common ground and familiarity with the interviewees using techniques described above and below.

The inequalities in age and status between gatekeepers, myself as the researcher and participants (including young people) presented challenges (Heath, *et al.*, 2009, p. 31). As an adult researcher I inevitably operated from a position of privilege to young people. There was an additional power dimension to the adult/child relationship as there is 'the researcher' and 'the researched' (King and Liebling, 2008). The young prisoners held a subordinate relationship to all adults (Urry, Sanders and Munford, 2015). It was therefore important that I acknowledged this power imbalance (Eder and Fingerson, 2001) and built suitable rapport (Mitchell, Jones and Renema, 2015) that served to minimise this in respectful and non-judgemental ways. I used these techniques in an effort to minimise the inequalities as much as possible by reiterating that I was interested in the young persons' individual experiences and views which would remain confidential (Urry, Sanders and Munford, 2015). Outside of the interview I would pick up on neutral topics they had indicated that they enjoyed such as playing football and this led to complementary conversation.

Within the imposed confines, taking the time to build a relationship with interviewees (Liebling, 1999) improves their experience of participating "helps a person feel a bit closer to home, a bit more like a human being and a bit less than a prisoner." (Bosworth *et al.*, 2005, p. 258). I had limited time with the young people and sought to be relaxed and friendly and build a suitable rapport to reduce the formality of the interviews (Cohen and Taylor, 1977). Upon meeting the young people again, I re-established this familiarity by reminding them of caveats from our previous interview. This aimed to make the interview feel more like a conversation or discussion of their experiences (Laws and Crewe, 2016). I hoped that by making the young person feel at ease they would be more comfortable engaging with the research and sharing their experiences with me. I similarly engaged key stakeholders in friendly conversation outside of the interview.

The rapport between myself as a researcher and the young people and stakeholders as the researched, was important to ensure the interviews were frank and honest and yielded in-depth detail about their views and experiences (Newman, 1958). Within the interviews I sought to develop an empathetic understanding of the young person's social reality within

the institutional world (Liebling, 1999). As an 'outsider' to the prison environment I was sometimes unsure of a term, acronym or situation. In this instance, I would ask the interviewee to elaborate on what they meant. This meant that the interviewee saw that I was genuinely interested in their knowledge and understanding. When appropriate I would use language like 'pad' rather than 'cell' and repeat terminology when talking to the young person to establish familiarity and minimise the power differential between us (Jewkes, 2011). By operating from this position, I simultaneously retained a credible distance as a researcher and resisted any temptation to fully align with normative prison language (especially pejorative language) (Walsh, 2004).

The young people interviewed were at varying stages of emotional, cognitive and social development. The capacity and competency of participants was considered for each individual and contextualised within the research (Girling, 2017). I drew on previous experience working with young people and adapted the interviewing style to the individual (Heath *et al.*, 2009). Whilst introducing myself to the young person within informal opening conversation and verbally going through the consent form, I built up a sense of the individuals' capacity and adapted questions accordingly. For example, when asking the young person to state their ethnic origin I would state; "my ethnic origin is white British, what is yours?" so that they would not be embarrassed if they did not understand certain terminology.

Narrative

I was aware that within each interview, the interviewees could have portrayed a constructed identity of how they wished to be seen (Phillips, 2012) and prisoners may have attempted to "establish [...] toughness, strength and masculinity" (Claes, *et al.*, 2013, p. 62). Equally, they may have 'hidden' vulnerabilities and acted according to the macho behaviours 'expected' of them within a prison environment. Although I aimed to create a space where young people could discuss their opinions and experiences their managed impression and regulated stance may have remained during the interview (Laws and Crewe, 2016). I sought to minimise this through open questioning that asked the young people their views, for example, "if you were in charge of YOIs" (see Appendix Five). These hypothetical questions allowed young people to explore their feelings by removing the first person and therefore reducing the masculine bravado which may mask vulnerabilities (Crewe *et al.*, 2014). I felt this question was particularly effective in eliciting a more honest account from Noah about how he felt about his transition, for example. Although accounts from interviewees could have been subject to

their concerns about self-preservation, I still considered these constructions to represent their social world, understanding and reflections of their experiences (Hammersley, 2003).

Interviewees' accounts of their transitions were subject to their "own peer cultures and life experiences" (Eder and Fingerson, 2001, p. 118). When asking each young person about their experiences of transition I was also asking them to self-report emotions which could present difficulties for numerous reasons; it relied upon young people being aware of their emotions and accurately recalling them. How the young people felt and experienced their emotions may have been articulated differently within the interview due to their translation from 'affect to language' or self-censorship as they were asked to retrospectively discuss their feeling across time (Laws and Crewe, 2016, p. 534). Within follow up interviews there was the potential that young people would have provided new or contradictory information (Farrell *et al.*, 2016; Bosworth and Kellezi, 2017). This research was indicative of changes to the individuals' social circumstances (MacDonald, 2011) in the event of new or contradictory information I would ask why differences were reported but accepted that it could represent a change of view, opinion, or more trust towards me as a researcher.

As a researcher, it is important to continually reflect and acknowledge that there may have been a gap between the interviewee's words and actions (Laws and Crewe, 2016) and differences in the interpretations of young people and key stakeholders. Some key stakeholders maintained that young people were informed about aspects of their transitions yet 'may not remember'. The voices of young people were extremely valuable and could not "be dismissed as being merely subjective views from the detained children" (Peter Clarke cited in HMCIP, 2016a, p. 5). I hoped that involvement within the research allowed the young people to articulate their perspectives unchallenged and would offer welcome relief from other negative relationships, especially with adults, within their environment (Cohen and Taylor, 1977). Despite their more authoritative status as 'officials', key stakeholders accounts were not given any extra weight than that the accounts of young people (Becker, 1973; Liebling, 2001). Beyens (*et al.*, 2015) has warned about the importance of distinguishing between the voices; worries, experiences and constraints of prison staff alongside their power and the language of 'officials'. I reiterated to the key stakeholders that their responses were confidential, anonymous and would not be traced back to them.

I was conscious of my role as interviewer that I might influence the interviewee, whether a young person or a key stakeholder, by informing them about the research and therefore guiding the "definitions of reality" that I wished to hear about (Cohen and Taylor, 1977, p.

73). Young people tended not to question their performance within the interviews, but key stakeholders often remarked: 'I hope that was helpful'. I was keen to emphasise that I was interested in their knowledge and experiences and informed them that there were no 'right or wrong answers'.

Institutional environments

The differing composition and characteristics of prison populations make individual institutions culturally very different (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). I approached the 'complex' environment (Beyens *et al.*, 2015) as an 'outsider' which made it difficult to adequately understand what each prison is 'truly like' (Bosworth *et al.*, 2005; Phillips, 2012). As the research was conducted across seven penal sites my ability to build a suitable perception of the culture and environment of each institution was restricted to the short window and space in which interviews were conducted. To adequately develop an 'interpretive understanding' of each prison a long-term approach would have been more effective in allowing me to pay attention to the formal and informal interactions, routines and social environments (Beyens *et al.*, 2015).

I sought to be as flexible and unobtrusive as possible and so interviews were pre-arranged to mitigate any resource demands. I was aware that as a researcher, I became an active participant within the research; its context and analysis (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). My physical presence could have been disconcerting (Bryman, 2012) within an environment which is continually subject to internal and external dynamics and external political pressures (Liebling, 1999). Staff members may have perceived me as an additional 'risk' to manage within their everyday responsibilities (Liebling, 1999). Four staff members within Young Adult/Adult Institutions Four and Five simply refused to be interviewed citing heavy workloads. Announcement of the research topic itself within an environment also created difficulties (Ali and Kelly, 2004). When Juvenile Institution One paused transitions for a month during fieldwork the gatekeeper advised me that they did not want the research to go ahead as it had the potential to 'cause confusion' and 'unrest'. It would have been of great interest to me to have accessed the institution during this period, but I understood why it was denied.

The prison environments were interesting places to conduct the research due to the contradictions and concentration of "power, justice, authority and care" (King and Liebling, 2008, p. 447) within them. I was typically expected to act competently although the environment (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007) could be uncomfortable (Wacquant, 2002). As I had no access to keys whilst conducting my fieldwork whilst waiting to be escorted

around the prison by NOMS personnel I would simply wait (sometimes up to an hour) and I found myself more sensitive to the sounds particularly of keys. My access to institutions whilst completing fieldwork was restricted to what was deemed relevant (Hannah-Moffat, 2010) and my physical journey was choreographed. Alternatively, shadowing two HMIP inspections enabled me to develop a more in-depth understanding of prison environments due to the unrestricted access to the institutions over week-long periods. Therefore, whilst conducting my fieldwork I was able to 'look beyond' the directed access I had (Moore and Wahdin, 2017) by asking the young people about the environments in which they lived-out their day to day life.

I was unable to select the spaces to hold interviews as this was arranged by the gatekeepers. Ideally, I would have provided a neutral physical space that minimised discomfort for the young person and reduced the power differentials between us. I was required to adhere to the safety and security advice of NOMS personnel in institutions (Heath *et al.*, 2009) and the interview spaces differed between institutions; interviews were held on the wings, in psychology departments or within visitors' centres distinct from the wider prison. I made every effort to ensure that interviews took place in suitable locations and were appropriately supervised with staff out of earshot yet on hand should any safety concerns arise (Moore and Wahidin, 2017).

The setting may have affected the young people as they may have struggled to relax. Some locations had panic alarms, staff members were sometimes visible outside, in others staff members could be heard outside and this was captured on the dictaphone. This may have meant the young person was conscious of their responses in case they could be overheard. In one instance, a staff member knocked on the door mid-interview to check that I was alright. I continued with the techniques identified about to try and ensure the young person felt at ease.

Emotions: researcher and participants

Academics have previously noted that as an 'outsider' to the prison environment the intensity upon entering it can leave the researcher feeling uncomfortable or 'marginal' in their position (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p. 89). Conducting research within a prison environment is an emotional experience. Anxiety, vulnerability and trauma are ever-present (Jewkes, 2011) in institutions which are "designed to expel and hurt" (Bosworth and Kellezi (2017, p. 131). To retain an awareness of the impact the demands of the environment had upon me (Jewkes, 2011; Beyens *et al.*, 2015; Bosworth and Kellezi, 2017) I documented my

observations, reactions and feelings during my time within the institutions (Abrams, Anderson-Nathe and Aguilar, 2008) and I was able to reflect upon them during academic supervision.

Previous research has acknowledged that interviews with young people may be laced with humour and emotion (Gooch, 2017), however, it can also be complicated and difficult (Halsey, 2007). There were numerous factors that may have enhanced or inhibited the interview due to the young person being distracted. These included the presence or awareness of nearby staff members, interruptions and noise. Similarly, recent emotional events or distress could have shaped the interactions beyond my control. When I was introduced to Noah in his post-transition interview his offender supervisor took the opportunity to inform him of his parole date which was later than he expected. I could sense that he was frustrated about this and once the offender supervisor had left, I sought Noah's informed consent and checked that he was comfortable with the interview going ahead. I also reiterated my independence from NOMS and the institution as part of the opening conversation prior to the interview. I anticipated emotional challenges as an expected consequence of such sensitive research (Sanders *et al.*, 2014, p. 245) as documented within the ethics section above.

It is difficult to compare one's own emotional threshold to that of others. Jewkes (2011) has suggested that our emotional states can be considered socially constructed through our own biography and experiences. They are subjective particularly to what is considered appropriate at the time (Crewe, 2014). How I made sense of young people's responses was subject to my own subjective knowledge and experiences. Previous researchers have documented how challenging the process of interviewing and hearing the, often painful, personal story of young people (Goldson, 2002; Moore and Wahidin, 2017) sharing 'sad and anguished' stories exacerbated by their incarceration (Phillips, 2012). As the young people told me difficult stories about themselves which they told me was 'alright' or simply understood to be their norm it would have been inappropriate for me to demonstrate anger or upset. However, in remaining too unemotional I was aware I could have appeared complicit in accepting that such circumstances were to be expected. Liebling (2001, p. 474) believes that "the capacity to feel, relate, and become 'involved'" is a key part of the overall research task. I tried to strike a balance by asking young people how they felt about the accounts that they shared with me.

Emotions are integral to rational behaviour and those experienced within the research process can be a “vital source of information” (Bergman Blix and Wettergren, 2015, p. 688). It was important that the ‘enormity’ of prisoners’ pain as felt by the researcher (Phillips, 2012) was acknowledged from a methodological perspective (Liebling, 1999). Demonstrating emotional management meant that I built a rapport with participants and this interaction had the potential to improve the quality of the research. By being reflexive as a researcher and holding an awareness of emotional labour, which I documented in field notes and discussed in supervision, I was able to understand its value as a source of information (Bergman Blix and Wettergren, 2015, p. 701). Empathising with the young people as they experienced difficult processes meant I was sensitive to such experiences whilst I reminded myself of the importance of adequately reporting and representing their views (Bosworth, *et al.*, 2005, p. 258).

Conclusion

This research fills a gap in academic literature and knowledge by exploring the pathways and experiences of young people transitioning from juvenile YOIs to young adult YOIs/adult prisons. Semi-structured interviews with a cohort of young people before and after they transferred between institutions has allowed for a detailed account of how they prepared for, negotiated and experienced such transitions. This gave young people the opportunity for their - often marginalised – views about the practices that affected them to be heard and will hopefully inform future policy and practice. Their evidence was supplemented with five additional qualitative and quantitative components including professional views; independent and official statistics and policy, academic and research literature. The analyses shows how processes of transition are presented, understood and experienced through four different lenses: (i) the official guidance (ii) ‘insider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working within penal institutions, (iii) ‘outsider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working outside of penal institutions and (iv) the experiences of the young people. These perspectives are outlined and explored in Chapters Five and Six.

Chapter Five. Life in the juvenile YOI: pre-transition

Introduction

The data presented and analysed within this and the following chapter offers distinctive and timely insights into the experiences of transitioning between the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate. The structure of Chapters Five and Six are closely mirrored according to four overarching themes: (i) reception and induction, (ii) assessment, (iii) doing time and (iv) preparation (Chapter Five), (iv) future transitions (Chapter Six). Both chapters illustrate how processes of transition are presented, understood and experienced through four different lenses: (i) the official guidance (ii) 'insider' key stakeholder perspectives: those working within penal institutions, (iii) 'outsider' key stakeholder perspectives: those working outside of penal institutions and (iv) the experiences of the young people. Exploring transitions in this way reveals the gap between rhetorical representation and reality. Although there are differences within these lenses, the principal focus within Chapters Five and Six is the differences between the categories.

Each section opens with an outline of the relevant guidance and is followed by analyses of the perspectives of the 'insider' key stakeholders, 'outsider' key stakeholders and the young people. The chapter explores the dissonance between the official guidance, the operational reality and the lived experiences of young people undergoing transitions. The views of 'insider' key stakeholders typically aligns with the intentions of the official guidance and those of 'outsider' key stakeholders tends to echo the experiences of young people.

The main guidance documents relevant to transitions and referred to through Chapters Five and Six are *The transitions process* NOMS (2012) and the *Joint National Protocol for Transitions in England* (YJB, 2015, 2018d). Wider documents are also referenced including the *National Standards for Youth Justice Services* (YJB, 2013), *Custody and Resettlement: Section 7 Case Management Guidance* (YJB, 2014b) and relevant PSIs.

The analysis in this chapter follows the young peoples' journeys through the juvenile secure estate before transfer into the young adult/adult estate. The principal guidance (NOMS, 2012, p. 1) outlines how the transition should be "completed as smoothly as possible" however the data analysed here shows the reality for young people who are processed through the juvenile secure estate. The young people interviewed felt uninformed about their transition and sought to focus on what they considered to be positive aspects of the transfer including the view that they would be treated like an 'adult' within the young

adult/adult estate. The 'insider' key stakeholders prioritised the perceived security risks to the institution – these will be discussed later – over the concerns of young people which was characteristic of their experiences within the juvenile secure estate. The vulnerability of young people held within the juvenile secure estate is well documented within academic literature (Goldson, 2002), highlighted within policy documents (NOMS, 2012) and is a constant theme through this chapter. The 'insider' key stakeholders largely claimed the processes in place to assess and support young people are sufficient and fulfilled whereas 'outsider' key stakeholders suggested that institutions overlook the wider needs of young people and exacerbate their vulnerabilities.

Reception and induction

Official guidance

The YJB (2014d, p. 9) state that it “may be beneficial [to move males from an SCH/STC to a YOI] in order to plan and prepare the young person for transition into the adult estate. It may be appropriate that some young people transition directly into the adult estate”. NOMS (2012, p. 5) maintain it is “essential” that these young people receive appropriate support to “address any issues that arise”. When a young person arrives at the YOI they should be met by a reception officer who is expected to conduct an interview with them (Gov.UK, 2018a). The YJB *National Standards for Youth Justice* (2013, p. 17 and 38) state that the reception interview should be held within two hours of the young person’s arrival to assess their needs and risk of harm. The person conducting the interview should have access to any records that are shared by the YJB placement service along with post court information (YJB, 2013). A Comprehensive Health Assessment Tool [CHAT] of the young person’s health including mental health and substance use should be conducted by a doctor or nurse (YJB, 2013). Upon arrival, young people aged under 18 years should receive a level A rub down search (see NOMS, 2016).

For induction, the PSI *Care and Management of Young People* (MoJ, 2012) states that young people should receive a full structured programme that informs them about the establishment, the regime and the advocacy services available to them. All available information regarding the young person should be considered whilst planning their programme of activities and they must receive written information about their training/sentence plan (MoJ, 2012).

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

When asked about reception and induction within the YOI the 'insider' key stakeholders focused on the procedures followed to receive young people and process them through reception and on to induction. Their accounts tended to follow an administrative checklist of what is required:

Caseworker Two: "It's normally a two-week process, they get seen on reception, they get seen as soon as they land by the first night induction officer who'll go through all the paperwork, all the risk factors, give them a phone call home. If there's nobody in at home for the next of kin they'll make that phone call in the morning. [They] go to the unit, but we've got a lot of people coming in now, because juvenile estate don't lock out they can come anytime, we've had people arrive two o'clock in the morning, so they'll come straight into reception, go straight into their room, go to bed. They'll see the GP first thing in the morning, then the assessment process starts, they'll see GP, CAMHS, substance misuse, and then the induction starts, the education, the CHATS assessments, gym inducted then get tested, then placed in the suitable education room." (Juvenile Institution Two)

Safeguarding Worker: "Induction, they come through reception, and obviously they do all the reception process [...] with their clothes, and everything, and they get explained [...] what wing they're going on, they get explained about [...] letters, property cards, phone call, then they go onto [name of wing] which is our induction wing. Then they get seven days induction, they get to meet everyone; they meet YOT worker, us, safeguarding, they meet education to see what education needs the young person requires, you've got an induction officer there who gets them to fill in the forms who do they want to visit them, who do they want to make phone calls to, how to fill a canteen sheet in" (Juvenile Institution One)

The process of induction extended over up to two weeks despite the official guidance stating this should be completed within 10 days of entry (MoJ, 2012). Only Caseworker Three raised concern that whilst awaiting each element of the induction process young people are held in their cells for extended periods of time:

Caseworker Three: “I think the induction process used to be three weeks, which was far too long, because the boys used to be behind their doors, so you know quite a lot of the time they’d just be sitting there by themselves. First time in custody, behind their door, all the time, and just getting out you know when other people want to see them, I think it needs to be quicker and more structured really.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Caseworker Three also outlined how staff shortages could directly affect processes of induction:

Caseworker Three: “[...] I don’t think it is consistent really, I think it depends on which staff are on duty, if there’s lots of staff shortages and if they’re induction staff, obviously if they’re on leave, it’s always bad in the summer because various people have their leave and things like that and, I think, maybe not enough people are trained in it”

The practitioners’ accounts show how rather than focusing on the young person, they are focused on fulfilling the institution’s processes and procedures with the staff available (Carlen, 2008). The “institutional imperatives” at reception “produce inhumane procedures” (Goldson, 2002, p. 138) as the arrival process is focused simply on receiving the young person and allocating them to their next location. Academics have noted the unsettling nature of entry to the prison environment (Goffman, 1961; Gibbs, 1982; Harvey, 2012) and the ‘insider’ key stakeholders reported how young people are immediately isolated within it as they await induction. This serves to compound their shock and distress (Harvey, 2012) of entering the YOI as detailed within the young peoples’ perspectives section below.

‘Outsider’ key stakeholders’ perspectives

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders outlined the developing argument about the additional transition from a SCH or STC to a YOI in anticipation for the transfer into the young adult/adult estate. They were conscious of the vulnerabilities of these young people, and recognised the ethical problems in reducing support upon transition:

Academic Two: “[...] there are some interesting debates about how you can prepare children from moving from an environment which has quite a good child focus, to one that’s a really poor child focus, which in effect [is] what’s going to happen if you’re going to move from a STC to a young adult YOI”

Inspector One: “[...] Fundamentally you’re preparing a young person to have fewer resources so that’s how people graduate through the system so if you come in at 12 you would have money spent on you and you get progressively less as you become an adult and you’ll be out your cell for less time, so there’s an argument that you should get them used to it before they go, and I’m not really sure I buy into that because I sort of think that’s quite a harmful regime, and so you should provide sort of the best regime you can, and talk them through what the YOI’s going to be like before they get there in a sort of realistic sense”

Civil Servant Two: “There are a select few vulnerable young men, either it gets to the point where they’re doing unbelievably good work in the establishment they’re in that would be put at risk if they moved to a YOI. So for example we’ve got a young person doing like almost mobilities in the establishment that he’s in at the moment, so he’ll go out and get the shopping for the establishment, or physically go to college, do all those bits and pieces that if we put him in a YOI they wouldn’t allow him to do, so it’s better for him to do that and get more life experience than go to the [young adult/]adult [institution] [...], but it is going to be a humongous jump for that young person”

There was an awareness of the substantial difference between the operational regime of a SCH and a young adult/adult institution. The Civil Servant reported that in order to try and ease this change upon transition the staff working with the young person in the quote above had made efforts to re-model aspects of the SCH regime to that of a young adult/adult institution.

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders were conscious that upon arrival to the YOI the “‘first impression’ is almost always one which intensifies trepidation, escalates fear and consolidates anxiety” (Goldson, 2002, p. 140):

Lawyer: “[...] what you’ve got to remember that for many young people, just being given a load of leaflets and information all in one go when you’re feeling, just come out of the sweat box, and you’re feeling pretty overwhelmed and new kid on the block, it’s probably not going to be effective.”

Academic Two: “[...] speaking to young people, kind of like, transport to the YOI and the first couple of days are the worst for most of them.”

They felt that the move from reception to long periods of lock-up during induction was also problematic:

Inspector One: “I think that it’s a missed opportunity [at induction] because what you could be doing is being out and about and talking to people and not just being bored in your cell asleep, which is some of the issue”

Previous research has highlighted how the experience of entering prison is a time of heightened vulnerability (Ramsbotham, 2005; de Viggiani, 2018) and young people ‘struggle’ with confinement (Goldson, 2002). Whilst most ‘insider’ key stakeholders aligned with the official guidance processes, the ‘outsider’ key stakeholders considered wider factors and the complexities associated with transition. They suggested that the reception procedures are not effective in identifying and addressing the needs of young people and any so issues can manifest as they are held in their cells whilst awaiting induction.

Young peoples’ perspectives

Four of the young people made a transition from an STC to a YOI. Sadir’s moves were somewhat disjointed, Noah was subject to a discipline transfer which meant he was moved abruptly due to his behaviour and not informed in advance of this transfer:

Sadir: “I moved, I got remanded and then got bailed then got remanded again back here”

Noah: “They kept just like shipping me out, obviously I’d get involved in loads of like fights so if you have too many fights and that, if you go down to the block more than 10 times they ship you out to another YOI”

The quotes show how the young people were managed through the system in a re-active way. Only Christopher received a pro-active move and he was prepared for entry to Juvenile Institution Two with a restricted regime within the STC:

“Christopher: [...] it were just like spending less, like more time in room, less time out of it.

[...] R. How/when did you find out that you were coming here?

Christopher: Just after Christmas

R. Okay so like three, two months before you were going to come?

Christopher: Yeah, they wanted me to have a nice Christmas before I came here

[...] R. So, did they tell you that you were moving just to a YOI or did they tell you that you were coming here? Did you know you were coming to [Juvenile Institution Two]? Did they tell you which one it was?

Christopher: They just said I were coming here, because it's closest"

Christopher's experience demonstrates how young people are prepared to have lower levels of support and resources as they progress through the system, particularly as he was held longer to have a 'nice' Christmas within the STC. Christopher and Casper were both moved simply to the nearest YOI. Casper was subject to an additional transition into Juvenile Institution Two as it was identified that it had a suitable offender behaviour programme for him:

R "So was your transfer anything to do with you turning 18?

Casper: No, it was so I could do this, [life minus violence] course, the psychology course."

Their comments highlight how all the moves felt abrupt, disjointed and without any apparent consistency or continuation of care.

Beyond the transitions from SCHs and STCs, some young people reported their initial shock of entering the juvenile YOI as they did not expect to receive a custodial sentence. They felt poorly prepared upon arrival, this corresponded with the secondary analyses of HMIP data which revealed that only 14.9% of those aged 17–18 years reported receiving information which helped them prepare for entry into the juvenile YOI⁹ which implies that 85% of young people felt unprepared upon arrival. When the young people interviewed were asked what they knew about the juvenile YOI prior to arriving, they based their knowledge on what it would be like from various sources including YOT workers, the media and peers:

⁹ These figures include those arriving from court and other establishments.

Craig: "Just that it's horrible, and like you get into fights every day and saying that there's [...] big kids that bully people and that"

They were also concerned about violence and these fears were compounded at reception as they *all* reported that a member of staff informed them to keep a low profile:

Warren: "Just spoke to the staff and that, they asked if I was going to argue with them, I said no I'll be sound with you all"

R: "Okay, so was it helpful, them just saying 'keep your head down'?"

Casper: No, what kind of advice is that? That's, don't help me here, it's like the out, you're there and you've got to fend for yourself and learn for yourself what to do, what not to do."

Craig: "Yeah, the staff at the gates just said 'ah keep your head down, and you'll be alright' that was about it

R: Was it helpful?

Craig: No

R: So how did it make you feel?

Craig: Don't know, like, feeding me false information, because at first when I came onto the wing, I was trying to be humble with everyone and then, someone came up to me and said 'you owe me this now' so I turned round and punched him and since then, just been getting into fights and that, so it hasn't, it didn't make a difference like, I don't know."

Rather than seek to identify and meet their needs, as outlined within the official guidance, the reception process at the institution endorsed the view that the YOI would be violent and created an expectation of fights. The young people were therefore keen to establish their credibility and 'right' reputation as 'tough' (Gooch, 2017) as Craig did.

The young people were asked how they felt when they first arrived:

Luke: "Nervous, depressed really because knowing that I wouldn't be able to see my family"

Lewis: "I was just in my cell

R: So how did that make you feel?

Lewis: A bit upset, but I sort of liked being in my cell, because I don't really like associating with people

[...] R: What were you feeling when you arrived here? Those first few nights when you were on the induction wing? Is it how you expected it to be?

Lewis: I felt, annoyed, I was really upset when I first came in

R: Why?

Lewis: I don't know, I didn't know what to expect really, and I was upset because I couldn't ring anyone or see anyone"

Christopher: "Well, I wasn't, at my best, it's a new environment, it's nothing like secure in here, but, like, I didn't know anyone in here, so

R: So when you say weren't at your best, what do you mean?

Christopher: Like a bit, like, upset and that"

The secondary analyses of HMIP data reveals that only 31.4% of those aged 17-18 years arriving at juvenile YOIs reported receiving any information about what they should do about feeling worried or upset upon arrival. The way in which the young people interviewed recounted their direct experiences depart from the official guidance and perspectives of the 'insider' key stakeholders and demonstrates how the processes the young people were subject to overlooked their wider needs, a conclusion drawn by the 'outsider' key stakeholders also.

Whilst waiting for their induction the young people were typically held in their cells in the induction wing. They had little knowledge or information about the institution and continued to be nervous:

Niall: "See, I came in on a Friday, it's the worst day to come in a Friday. Because you've got the weekend regime, which is so confusing, especially when you're new, so, I were basically sat in my pad for most of the day, except when you come out for [association] and that, but when it's your first ever [association] they don't tell you:

'oh yeah, showers are here, phones are here', [...] I didn't get a shower for four days because I didn't even know where they were, I [was] looking for the showers

R: Did you ask anyone?

Niall: No, I didn't, I [was] too nervous to ask anybody, you know, don't want to get on the wrong side of people

R: And did anyone come and see you and say, 'oh you're new...'?

Niall: No, no."

The reception process heightened their fears, nerves and apprehensions and the period of induction served to intensify concerns they had about the institution. Academics and official discourse have outlined 'risk' factors and vulnerabilities associated with entry (see Goldson, 2002; Harvey, 2012; MoJ, 2013a; NOMS, 2015b) which were found within the interview data analysis to be exacerbated by the procedures followed upon arrival. The interview and HMIP data analyses show that from arrival, young people did not feel that they received appropriate support to address any issues as expected within the official guidance. Whilst waiting for a 'structured programme' (MoJ, 2012) of induction rather than being engaged in supportive services the young people felt isolated. The experience of reception and induction served to "symbolise all of their [worst] fears" (Goldson, 2002, p. 107) about the institution.

Assessment

Official guidance

Young people involved with youth justice services are assessed by the AssetPlus¹⁰ planning and interventions framework (see YJB, 2014c) which is designed to follow them through their time within the YJS (YJB, 2018f) and should be continually reviewed and updated (YJB, 2013). The information drawn from their AssetPlus informs the assessment they receive as part of the reception process. The MoJ (2012, p. 33) state that "within 10 working days of the young person's reception, formal consideration of the Asset is undertaken, having regard to the health, social, education, vocational, accommodation and any other relevant needs of the young person". The YJB (2013) repeat this instruction.

¹⁰ Assetplus was said to be a more comprehensive successor to the Asset assessment framework (YJB, 2014c).

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

The staff within institutions focused on the use of assessment tools to capture 'vulnerabilities' and 'risks' of young people. From their perspectives 'vulnerability' could be identified through the institutional practices in place (Sim, 2008):

Caseworker Two: "[...] the first night in custody officer will pick up any trigger, could be mental health, could be drugs, substance, alcohol, could be self-harm or just normal vulnerabilities first night, first night in custody" (Juvenile Institution Two)

Caseworker Two's appraisal of assessments conducted by YOT workers in advance of young people arriving at the YOI highlighted how the assessment process could be problematic:

Caseworker Two: "You can pick up a lot of it in the paperwork when they first come into custody, but our assessments are only as good as the assessments that have been completed before. [...] it's now going from Asset to AssetPlus, the AssetPlus is a larger document which is a 2-300 pages, trouble is, that's got to be up to date, got to be concise, got to be accurate, how can we get a true reflection if that information's not there?" (Juvenile Institution Two)

'Vulnerability' is a contested term and Brown (2011) has argued that it is used to manage people and allocate resources. Caseworker Two felt that the processes of assessment could be manipulated in this way to allocate provision:

Caseworker Two: "I think I've got a good understanding of the young person from experience so I can gauge, I can realistically gauge, whether that young person's going to be vulnerable or whether to put it bluntly, they're bullshitting. Some people use it to get what they want." (Juvenile Institution Two)

Making judgements based on whether a young person is 'going to be vulnerable' or 'bullshitting' reflects an ignorance of the impact prison can have on young people (Gooch, 2017) and demonstrates the blunt nature of these assessments (Goldson, 2002).

Staff members were most concerned with 'vulnerability' when they felt it would affect the young person's ability to cope within the institution:

Safeguarding Worker: "[...] you can spot, people who are not going to fit in, who are going to be vulnerable, however that can come from someone who you think is coping who actually is having a meltdown inside and being really vulnerable and

doesn't want to talk about it, [they] take all that burden on themselves, so sometimes you do get the odd one who you miss." (Juvenile Institution One)

Safeguarding Worker: "[...] vulnerable are those who are not fitting in to the normal conformity of prison service" (Juvenile Institution One)

Engagement and Resettlement Worker: "[...] I think most of the [young offenders] that I have come into contact ... they're not vulnerable when they go, they're sort of hardened to it to be honest" (Juvenile Institution One)

'Vulnerability' is complex (Brown, 2011) and understandings of risks and best interests are subject to the environment in which it is situated (Thomas and Kane, 1998; Daniel, 2010). From the perspectives of some of the insider key stakeholders' 'vulnerability' was judged on the young persons' presentation of self to cope, survive (Willow, 2015) and adapt (Harvey, 2012). These assessments were made when the young people arrived at the institution and did not appear to be continually reviewed as expected from the official guidance (YJB, 2013) as the 'insider' key stakeholders assumed that the young peoples' experiences within the juvenile YOI would make them *less* vulnerable as they learned to appear to cope.

'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives

Key stakeholders outside of penal institutions challenged institutional understandings of vulnerability and felt that they undermined broader definitions of the term:

Lawyer: "There isn't a, clear definition, clear working definition of what vulnerability means in this context"

Inspector One: "[...] they have a problem that everyone's vulnerable, so if everyone's vulnerable no one really is"

Inspector One: "[...] they're sort of doubly vulnerable because once you're in an institution you lack credibility, so if you complain about your vulnerability once you're there, you're less likely, I would say, to be taken seriously for that than if you were in the community saying the same thing."

Leaving Care Expert: “[...] to the prison system [vulnerability] means that they’re ‘risky’ to me that just means that they’re ‘needy’ and their needs are complex”

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders recognised how understandings of vulnerability are constructed by assessments conducted within institutions and believed this is problematic, as Goldson (2002) has identified, as this allows for a ‘hierarchy of vulnerability’ to emerge:

Academic Three: “I think we start from a false premise in custody [...] we assume that they should cope, and so we then look for people who can’t cope. Whereas our starting point should be that this is quite an artificial, unique environment and we should assume that this is a difficult environment to cope with and we should be making that better, and what tends to happen is [...] when they’re looking for vulnerability, they’re looking for the most vulnerable and I think that is a misnomer, or dangerous or risky perhaps, risky is a better word because, it’s difficult to predict how someone might respond”

Goldson (2002, p. 7) has argued that that assessment checklists are “exceptionally limited” and “crudely instrumental”, ‘outsider’ key stakeholders supported this view and felt that assessment tools used across the prison estate are futile if they are not followed through appropriately to ensure adequate care for young people:

Academic Three: “I think the idea, having a kind of checklist or an identification toolkit is useful, but I think it could give you a false sense of security in that ‘oh we’ve checked everything off and he’s not vulnerable’ and then miss the way in which that has to be continually considered and reassessed I guess.”

Academic Three “[...] just because it’s on a computer doesn’t mean that anyone who’s on the wing who’s caring for someone will know. So, I, I’m not sure, I think if you combine that with long periods of time locked up in a cell, not a lot of activity, I’m not sure if we recognise [vulnerability] enough or have the conditions to recognise it really.”

Academic Two: “[...] it’s quite hard to have a tick box assessment process which is sufficiently nuanced to pick up on those kind of complexities”

Inspector One: “[...] a real problem within custody and within children services generally of over-assessment and under-delivery”

They sought to look beyond specific and narrowly defined indicators of vulnerability advising that doing so could better meet the needs of the young people held:

Leaving Care Expert “[...] it’s like anything else in wider society, you take care of someone’s needs, you decrease their vulnerability, therefore, you decrease their risk, it’s common sense it really is, desistance theory has got it written all over it. You know desistance theory in the criminal justice system, I think is read by everyone, except those that work with it.”

‘Outsider’ key stakeholders were sceptical that the assessment tools used were adequate in fully identifying the needs of a young person and suggested that the system was inherently flawed in what it sought to measure and how it responded to issues.

Young peoples’ perspectives

The young people were invited to recall what happened when they arrived at reception as this was their first experience of assessment within the juvenile YOI:

Craig: “Got to reception, they asked me if I’d had some food and that, said yeah, and went through the process of asking if I was gang related and that, asking if I knew anyone, allergies and that and after being in reception for like 20 minutes, brought me down to the wing”

Lewis: “They took a picture of me, as ID, and asked like, if I’ve got any mental health issues and stuff like that and they took me, I was going onto [wing], and that’s it really”

Casper: [About his arrival to an STC prior to entering Juvenile Institution Two] “It was late, must have been like, 10, half 10, you got there they ask you these questions like: ‘ah do you have these drug dependencies, alcohol dependency, do you self-harm?’, they ask you these questions, I was like: ‘nah’ then they said: ‘wait outside’. Then they discuss what unit you’re going to move to, for like what area you’re from, which will be like the safest, safest one to move you [to]. Then they [came] and said I’ll

move to a unit called [name of unit], so they came and said: 'you're moving to [name of unit]', that was it. They asked me the questions then put me on the unit"

These accounts show how the experience felt inhumane as the young people were invited to share deeply personal information during a brief interaction with a member of staff who quickly determined their 'risk' and moved them onto a wing or unit (Goldson, 2002).

When considering the assessment of their vulnerability, some young people acknowledged that being within an institution rendered them vulnerable (Goldson, 2002, p. 2):

R: "Do you feel safe here?"

Niall: No

R. Why's that?

Niall: Because it's jail, not supposed to feel safe in jail

R. Why do you think that, has someone said that to you or?

Niall: No, it's just how jail is ... so it's violent, loud, why would you feel safe?!"

Casper: "Yeah, they're in prison, everyone's going to be a little [vulnerable] bit aren't they"

The young people identified ways in which they, or their peers, sought to mitigate these 'vulnerabilities' by avoiding interaction within the institution:

Luke: "I keep myself to myself, I don't open up to people. Like if you open up to people it's more things for them to target. Like, I've got things going on in my family I don't let anyone know about 'cos then they can't say anything to piss me off and get into a fight. Like with drugs and that people say: 'do you take drugs and that?' I just say: 'no' because it's nowt to do with them"

Noah: "Yeah you see that all the time [...], people [...] call it voluntary, people [...] in their cell not coming out, my wing I think there's like 12 people who haven't come out their pad since they've been here. They just say: 'I just don't like it out on the wing'."

Previous research has discussed how young people struggle with the realities and inherent problems of prison (Gooch, 2017). From entry the young people saw their identity formalised

to an assessment (Crewe, 2011a) which focused and legitimised risks the might pose *to the institution* rather than the risks the institution might pose *to them* (Case, 2006). The young people aligned with institutional constructions of ‘vulnerability’ and sought to appear to cope. Therefore, the very nature of the assessments - to identify and address the needs of the young people - is undermined by the process of conducting them. The experience of incarceration exacerbates the vulnerabilities the rhetoric of the official guidance seeks to address.

Doing time

Official guidance

NOMS (2012, p. 3) state that “the transition process should begin as soon as a sentenced young person enters the custodial system” and identified within their initial assessment and sentence planning process. Whilst held within the juvenile secure estate young people should have a training/sentence plan which has targets linked to their ‘identified needs’ and “build[s] upon strengths in the young person’s life” (YJB, 2013, p. 40). The YJB (2014b) state that there must be: “a focus on successful resettlement from the very outset” and secure estate practitioners are meant to be assigned to work directly with the young people and support them through their sentence plan. As part of the young person’s resettlement they should be engaged in ETE and offending behaviour work (YJB, 2013). As highlighted in Chapter Three, juvenile YOIs have better resources than the young adult/adult estate reflected by the costs per place per annum at £82,639 in 2017/18 (MoJ, 2018d). The figures for the young adult/adult estate are discussed in Chapter Six.

‘Insider’ key stakeholders’ perspectives

Key stakeholders within both juvenile institutions felt that the young people received a full regime, subject to staffing levels, but acknowledged that the provision and regime may not be appropriate, particularly for those who have previously struggled within education:

Engagement and Resettlement Worker: “[...] they have 30 hours a week, education, 27 hours education and three hours for the gym” (Juvenile Institution One)

Safeguarding Worker: “I know our kids don’t like education, you know, we take it from somebody who has never been in a mainstream school since they were quite

an early age, for whatever reasons, and we force them into education” (Juvenile Institution One)

Caseworker Three: “The problem we have is lack of staff” (Juvenile Institution Two)

The day following the interview Juvenile Institution Two cancelled the regime to allow for staff training.

Practitioners felt that the wider support available within the institution met the day-to-day needs of young people:

Caseworker Two: “So the caseworkers have got time to get to know the young person, get to know the issues, get to know the family.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Engagement and Resettlement Worker: “[...] they get a lot of support, here, there, they don’t. They [are] more or less, how do I say, not mollycoddled, but they [are] really sort of ... supported really (Juvenile Institution One)

Despite this position of perceived support Caseworker Two revealed that fights could be responded to with punitive sanctions:

Caseworker Two: “[...] we had a zero tolerance to violence, young person had a fight with another young person, you went on straight back behind your door after the fight [...] they automatically went down to the level, the loss of association, the loss of dine out and the loss of television” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Academics have argued that challenging and difficult behaviours expressed by young people may be an attempt to overcome their frustrations of day-to-day life in the juvenile YOI (Gooch and Treadwell, 2015; Gooch, 2017; Laws, 2018) reflective of their developmental maturity (Hart, 2017; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018). Previous research has found that prisoners felt they were entitled to feel “frustrated, disgruntled and aggressive” (Liebling, 2000, p. 343) and expected that staff could understand it as a manifestation of the pains of imprisonment. Whilst some ‘insider’ key stakeholders acknowledged that the regime may be a source of frustration for those held, other practitioners failed to recognise this and outlined how they have responded punitively to young people.

'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives

The 'outsider' key stakeholders' implied that juvenile YOIs do not provide an adequate regime for the young people held due to staffing issues and safety concerns:

Academic One: "[...] you've not got enough officers for the vulnerable, traumatised young people, again you hear that, you know young people are having to stay in cells longer and not being allowed some of the basic human rights like exercise often, when they are in this situation where there are simply not enough officers to allow them out, to allow them to have the activities that they need to have access to and should have access to"

Inspector One: "[...] a sort of classic example would be a child or an adult what was self-harming, who gets some sort of mental health input, well that's all great but then you look at the regime they're put into and they're just locked in a room all day every day which is undermining anything, any sort of therapeutic input into their ... anything which has happened through the mental health support"

Academic Three: "[...] they have kind of keep apart lists that tie themselves up in knots which end up meaning that you only have very small numbers unlocked [...] although that even in juvenile [YOIs] the regime looks better, it can quickly change."

This view was supported by the secondary analyses of HMIP survey data which showed that less than two-thirds of those aged 17 and 18 years in YOIs reported being able to have association (66.2%) and exercise (61.5%) daily. The 'outsider' key stakeholders questioned the suitability of YOIs for young people:

Young Adults in the Criminal Justice System Expert: "[...] all of those children in custody will be released at some stage, so, we are not keeping society safe with the current regimes that are in place, nor are we proving a safe space for those children while they are there or for the staff."

Academic Two: "Certainly young people within the custodial environment, [it] is bound to slow down the maturation process significantly as it takes away

responsibility, you don't make decisions, it's a very odd kind of environment in which to grow up"

As discussed in Chapter Three, academic evidence (Edwards, 2009; Prior *et al.*, 2011; Hanham and Tracey, 2017) - endorsed by independent reviews (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and official discourse (MoJ, 2017a) - reveals the differing needs and behaviours of young people during their developmental maturity. The 'outsider' key stakeholders felt that institutions do not respond to this population appropriately:

Academic Three: "It's that unpredictability of, children with a lack of future orientation, of an inability to see through consequences and often inability to communicate their anxieties and frustrations and feeling powerless, act in ways that are difficult to predict and I think, that's why I think, it's always tricky when we're talking about vulnerability and who's most vulnerable because I just think children in custody are really, just by virtue of their status and where they are"

Academic Three: "I think it's very easy to get caught up in their bad behaviour, and, [...] I think that that authoritarian approach makes it more difficult to see when behaviour is not about just being a bad kid and when it's about vulnerability being expressed."

Academic One: "[...] many juvenile YOIs I don't think should be YOIs in the first place. I've met a number of staff who you know work hard in the conditions they're in to do what they think is the best for young people but this is a place of punishment, it's a place of control at the end of the day, it's not a welfare oriented provision"

The 'outsider' key stakeholders' looked beyond the official guidance to identify the particular needs of the young people held within YOIs which they felt are not addressed due to the limited regime and inadequate care. They felt that, despite the resources available, the institutions in which young people are held are inadequate and ultimately, harmful.

Young peoples' perspectives

Less than half of the young people within the secondary analyses of HMIP survey data stated that they had a training/sentence plan (47.2%) and only half of the young people in this research were aware that they had a plan:

Niall: “No. I’d have liked to plan that actually, because you’d be out your cell more, no, but, nowt ever happened”

Christopher: “Oh nah, I know I’m going to get one when I move, but I ain’t done any courses here or anything

R: Why is that?

Christopher: Because I’m not here long enough.”

Although transition planning should form part of the young peoples’ plans (YJB, 2013, 2015, 2018d) the prospect of transition disrupted Christopher’s ability to engage in the YOIs regime and restricted opportunities for progression and resettlement work (Ofsted, 2010; CJJI, 2012; CLINKS, 2016).

The sentence planning procedures provided in the official guidance have continually not been met as 17.9% of those aged age 17-18 years in the juvenile YOIs reported over the three-year period within the secondary analyses of the HMIP survey data that they were engaged in offender behaviour programmes. Only two young people interviewed in this research were completing specific programmes linked to their offence:

Alejandro: “No, I only got put on STAG [offender behaviour programme] because like, in here, all the stress and that when I came in [...] I was kicking off at the staff and walking out on education and being sent out, and they said ‘do you want to go on STAG’ and I was like ‘what’s that?’ and they said ‘it helps with your anger and all that’ so I was like ‘yeah, yeah I’ll do that yeah’. I do my psychology because I’ve got obviously anger and that’s it really.”

Casper: “Yeah, I like doing the psychology, it’s nice to have someone to chat to and that so if I’m annoyed and that, when they bring me over here, I chat about it and I feel better, but I think I finish it now, got like two more sessions now, then I finish it”

As the ‘outsider’ key stakeholders identified, the young people were not engaged in a regime as expected from the official guidance. The young people reported restrictions placed on the regime due to resource issues and punitive sanctions:

Christopher: "Just been bored a lot, education being cancelled all the time, yeah, it's kinda what you rely on to get you through the day."

"R: Is there anything you are looking forward to?"

Christopher: What leaving?

R: Yeah

Christopher: Dunno. Just, just getting some more qualifications really because I haven't been able to here, wanna make the best of it so"

Noah: "Yeah, if you're on basic, or like sometimes they just don't put you in education for weeks, you know, all the classes are full so you're just sitting there doing nothing in your pad."

Edward: "Because like, my Mum said it's like stuck in limbo, because I've got such a long sentence, I've got two and a half year left, so while I'm here it's just like waiting but once I get to [Young Adult/Adult Institution] I can do like anger management courses and things to see my daughter and all of ... just keep my head down and do my sentence isn't it."

Their limited ability to engage in ETE opportunities due to moving institutions, risk levels or cancellations exacerbated feelings of powerlessness (Halsey, 2008) and meant that their resettlement and rehabilitation was being undermined. There is a rich literature on the experience and passage of time within prison (see Jewkes, 2005a; Crewe, 2009; Harvey, 2012; Schinkel, 2015; Mehay, Meek and Ogden, 2019) and although there is not the scope to fully explore these themes here, the concept of time was evident in the young people's accounts of their experience. They had an imagined sense (Carlen, 2008) that the young adult/adult estate would be much better and so focused on the future as a way of managing frustrations and the slowness of time.

Only three young people were aware who the practitioners (caseworkers and personal officers) assigned to work with them through their sentence were. There was inconsistency of staff available and Noah felt that this damaged relationships and wished for better interaction with staff as he had experienced within a STC:

Noah: “[...] in here the staff are all over the place, one minute they’re going from prisons up the road to prisons down south so you don’t know who you’re going to see tomorrow so you [...] can’t just go outside your pad like shake someone’s hand, you don’t even know him. You know when you see the staff over and over again you can say ah ‘how was your day? How was your day off?’ and that, some kind of relationship there and makes you feel better inside, in here no one wants to know you, no one wants you to know them”

Noah: “I was on a unit with 10 people and it was the same staff week in week out yeah they were the ones, I felt, if I could go back there, I’d change everything to go back there because they like actually wanted to help you”

The role ‘trusted’ adult is key to young people particularly during their maturation (Hughes and Strong, 2016) but such relationships had rarely developed. Although the majority of young people identified that there was a member of staff who they could speak to if they had a problem, they did not pro-actively seek support:

Edward: Nah. they don’t do nothing for you here they don’t give a shit about you in here.

Edward: These won’t help, but I’m going to change myself. These won’t help you. These don’t give a shit whether you change or not.”

Sadir: “Yeah there’s loads, there’s loads of people to speak to, but it’s like most things is in here really you have to keep to yourself, you don’t wanna speak if you know what I’m saying.”

Niall: “Just never talk to anybody, there’s always issues

[...] R: Is it because you just don’t want to speak to them, or you don’t trust them, or...?

Niall: Nobody I trust, definitely, nobody I trust”

The young people repressed their emotions for fear of appearing vulnerable (de Viggiani, 2012) and had learnt to try and be ‘self-reliant’ (Harvey, 2012).

Vulnerability can manifest itself in several different ways, as one individual reported to Gooch and Treadwell (2015, p. 49): “everyone in prison has scars”. Despite not identifying themselves as vulnerable the young people recognised times when they required particular support from the institution:

Craig: “There are certain staff who did treat me different, and they’ve said it’s because [...] I’m more confident in myself and the way I carry myself on the wing, I’m more confident about it than [...] the other people, [...], some staff that treat me different because [of] that, and they treat the quieter people a lot different than they treat me, just because I’m like more confident and that, but I don’t think that should be the case [...]

R. So you think you need that [treatment] from them too?

Craig: Yeah.”

The young people revealed that they did not feel they received consistent support and did not have trusting relationships with staff members. There was an institutional pretence that the resources and regime expected to be in place were sufficient but the accounts from ‘outsider’ key stakeholders and young people provide examples that demonstrate how the young people had learnt that the institution could not support their needs (Harvey, 2012; Laws and Crewe, 2016).

Preparation

Official guidance

A ‘suitable placement’ should be identified “through a multi-disciplinary approach to ensure the views of all staff involved with the young person are taken into account and due consideration is given to issues such as health, education, offending behaviour and security” (NOMS, 2012, p. 3). The YJB (2013, 2014b, 2015, 2018d) outline the responsibilities for each practitioner working with the young person. YOTs are expected to work with the NPS or CRC that the young person is allocated to in order to assess their needs with regards to the placement. This planning should take place no later than when the young person is aged 17 years and six months (YJB, 2015).

The progress of the transition is expected to be reviewed every three months in sentence planning meetings (YJB, 2013). Young people should be “fully involved in discussion about their transfer” (NOMS, 2012, p. 4) and informed about the difference between the juvenile

secure estate and the young adult/adult estate. All relevant information the juvenile YOI holds about the young person should be shared with the young adult/adult institution prior to the transition taking place; ideally in a planning meeting attended by staff from both sending and receiving institutions (NOMS, 2012). The NOMS (2012, p. 1) transition guidance acknowledges that upon transfer to a young adult/adult institution young people may be particularly 'vulnerable' and highlights the importance of coordinating a transition that gives "particular consideration to safety and security". 'Violent and/or disruptive' young people can transition in advance of their 18th birthday in exceptional circumstances (NOMS, 2012, p. 2) – this move is commonly known as a discipline transfer.

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

When asked about the transition process there was a sense that practitioners followed internal custom and practice rather than official guidance:

Caseworker One: "I think, I think it's good at the moment, sort of four months prior to transition we make contact [with the young adult/adult institution], we discuss it at reviews with the young people, we get try and get family involved where possible, we get, YOT obviously are involved" (Juvenile Institution One)

Caseworker Two: "[...] so at the six months before, I send out information to the psychology team and the caseworker saying 'Joe Bloggs is due for transition in six months' time, can you please let me know the suitable establishment', then at the four month stage I can then send paperwork out" (Juvenile Institution Two)

The Head of Casework within Juvenile Institution One reported in email correspondence that their 'transition window' - when they 'focused more on the institutional needs of a young person' - was at age 17 years and eight months. To prepare the young people the key stakeholders reported that they had developed a series of initiatives such as booklets containing information about individual establishments' regimes and facilities. Telephone and video conferences led by a caseworker/offender manager from the receiving institution were also held to inform the young person about the establishment and give them the opportunity to raise any questions. Caseworker One gave the example of a planning meeting which was attended by a young person, their mother, YOT worker, Offender Supervisor and Probation Officer. This transition followed the official guidance (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015; 2018d) and was cited as best practice:

Caseworker One: “[...] I thought that was really helpful, but obviously, in an ideal world where there was staff at every turn and stuff like that, we could do that [...], but obviously [the young adult/adult estate] resource is a lot tighter than ours so it’s not always possible.” (Juvenile Institution One)

Practitioners suggested that transition planning was hindered by the availability of staff members from within young adult/adult institutions to attend relevant meetings and facilitate conferences:

Caseworker Two: “[...] [Young Adult/Adult Institution Five] don’t do anything, they haven’t got the staff. I think they’ve only got two Probation officers and they just haven’t got the staff or the time to do it.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Caseworker Three identified further barriers to the transition process due to the continuing re-categorisation of institutions and the impact this had upon a young person:

Caseworker Three: “We had one young person, he, we wanted to, apply for open conditions, [but] because [of] the nature of his offence, the only place that would take his type of offence - which was a sex offence - they were changing their criteria, so the family were very upset because we tried so hard, [...] but because he was a sex offender; nobody wanted him and I think that’s bad practice because we struggled, and we went to every single place and they couldn’t because of his age. [...] they just made all sort of different reasons and excuses not to take him and, you know, in the end we did manage to find him, because he had to go somewhere, and that was so difficult, and it was so stressful for the young person and his family, and I was dishing out booklets, every time we found a new place, I said ‘right going to try and get you into this place’, ‘oh can I have a booklet?’ so he’d have a booklet, read up about it and then ‘oh no, you’ve been knocked back we’re going to try and find a different place’, very stressful for him” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Staff from both Juvenile YOIs reported that they had visited a couple of young adult/adult institutions to meet with young people who had transitioned, review their processes and gather an understanding of the prison. Their reflections showed that they had low expectations of the young people in their care and indicated that communications could be improved between staff and young people in advance of transitions:

Caseworker Two: "I think most of ours are good practice [...] but the young person, if you're going to talk to them, they probably say 'I don't know what you're talking about' because they've got very selective memory. But when I gave you that example, we went to [young adult/adult institution to] see people who had transitioned, the answers were 'we wish we'd listened', 'we thought you were talking a lot of bullshit but you weren't, 'we wish we'd asked certain questions but we hadn't'" (Juvenile Institution Two)

Their view of the differences across estates was extremely blunt and raises questions about how they would communicate this view with the young people:

Caseworker Two: "They want to get out of [Juvenile Institution Two] [...] they think it's the holy grail moving to the 18-21 estate. They think it's an open pot of money, they can do this, they can do that, but at the end of the day they don't realise there its short staff, horrible facilities, but the only advantage is, they can wear their own clothes and they can smoke." (Juvenile Institution Two)

Caseworker Three: "[...] the support, yeah, it's not daily like it would be here, and I think that, in a way, is quite detrimental, because all of a sudden, they've had everything in [Juvenile Institution Two] and when they get to the [young adult/]adult estate it just disappears, you know they can't come running to the gates every day, you know, 'can you do this' 'can you do that'" (Juvenile Institution Two)

The staff within both juvenile institutions claimed that the young people were continually informed throughout the process of transition:

Caseworker One: "[...] For them [...] we'll say if they've been accepted, we'll say if they've been declined, if they've been declined, where else we're going to be looking at, they should know as much information as possible really, you know including information on regime and stuff like that" (Juvenile Institution One)

Many 'insider' key stakeholders reported that the young people were well informed. However, it was an accepted practice, despite not being within the official guidance, that young people would not be told when they would transition:

Caseworker One: “[...] the only thing we don’t do is tell the lad is the date he’s moving for security reasons we can’t do that but we tell them where they’re going, so we say yeah ‘you’ve been accepted at’ but we can’t tell them when we say next week or so” (Juvenile Institution One)

As Caseworker Three acknowledged, lack of information about transition can be frustrating and stressful for young people. Wright, Liddle and Goodfellow (2016a, 2016b) have outlined how undertaking a transition during the life course whilst held within an institution is traumatic and affects behaviour. However, if young people express their frustrations through challenging behaviour, they can be subject to a discipline transfer, in line with the official guidance (NOMS, 2012):

Caseworker Two: “If it’s a discipline one, they can go anywhere in the country [...] if you were a Governor of an establishment, would you take someone with bad behaviour, would you want to take someone who staff assaulter, primitive fire starter and just basically a shit really? You wouldn’t want to take him, so then we’ve got to transition him to anywhere in the country. It’s a number game then, we’ve got to get him out.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Safeguarding Worker: “I mean, if we’ve ever moved anyone abruptly it’s always been a based on a disciplinary need for the safety and security of establishment, and I can understand where that is, where somebody just takes somebody out the system, say that’s is you’re going, I can imagine that can be very abrupt and really disorientating to the young person” (Juvenile Institution One)

The practice of subjecting young people to a discipline move highlights how the particular vulnerabilities of young people embarking on transition are ignored, particularly given Caseworker Two’s derogatory language. Many of the prison personnel, as decision makers, did not make the connection between a lack of information and the young peoples’ behaviour (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015; Laws, 2018) and the young people were punished. If staff fail to see the vulnerabilities and difficulties associated with these behaviours it will continue (Gooch, 2017). This creates a vicious circle of behaviour and punishment within the institution focused on control (Garland, 2001) particularly as the approach is endorsed by the official guidance (NOMS, 2012). Within the official transitions guidance, NOMS (2012) called for the consideration of safety and security but in practice

these considerations were found to be focused on the security of the institution rather than the young people which meant that the treatment of young people was “conveniently rationalised” (Goldson, 2008, p. 96) in these accounts despite the disruption and harm it can impose upon young people.

Young people pose another ‘risk’ to the institution if they are aged over 18 years and involved with an altercation with a young person aged under 18 years as they are liable to be convicted of assaulting a minor. The Safeguarding Worker stated that young people may choose to self-isolate as their status as an ‘adult’ could leave them vulnerable to bullying:

Safeguarding Worker: “We’ve got a young man who’s turned 18, who I’m dealing with and he said ‘ I’m not coming out of my cell’ ‘why?’ because they’re already shouting ‘we know you’re 18, we’re going to get you, because this will get you extra years’ so he’s absolutely terrified to go out of his cell in case he gets into trouble, ends up fighting with a young person and gets a load of stuff coming his way.”
(Juvenile Institution One)

The arbitrary nature of the CJS, institutions and practices means that young people can fundamentally feel less safe than their peers and behave accordingly. Subject to their age, the institution is unsupportive and expects young people to act differently. These accounts show how young people are held responsible for their behavioural actions but not considered responsible enough to be involved within their transition planning (Barry, 2006; Halsey, 2008).

‘Outsider’ key stakeholders’ perspectives

Key stakeholders from outside institutions identified the difficulties in adequately preparing young people for transition but felt that planning went against the official guidance as it was rarely focused on the individual:

Lawyer: “Yeah, I mean the nature of the secure estate at the moment is so chaotic and unstable that it is very hard for proper planning to take place. So, a good caseworker, and there are some very good caseworkers in establishments even though they are working in very difficult circumstances, will start thinking very early on about where they will be going to, what is available for the person in the adult establishment, how there can be continuation of education, of offending behaviour type interventions, mental health support and all of those things. Invariably, what

happens is there ends up being a short list, of a list of prisons that they can go to, and they might not know until the last minute which will be the one”

Academic Two: “[...] although there is a sense in, however many times you told something you still, till you actually, actually experience it’s quite hard to get your head round”

Civil Servant Two: “It’s one of those sort of ‘heads in beds’ kind of situation with the adult and it’s very much ‘well that’s your catchment so you’re going there’ and there isn’t much of the looking into the individuality of the person themselves”

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders believed that preparation was also undermined by young people not being told when or where they would transition which they argued was to the detriment of young people’s behaviour and well-being in anticipation of their transfer:

Civil Servant One: “There is a reluctance to let individuals know about their moves well enough in advance for them to prepare and tell their family, because there is concern that somebody might try to spring them when they’re transferring from one place to the next and I think that they have to balance those risks against what that individual needs, because the impact of being locked up 24/7 I don’t think we properly understand the psychological impact of this, and by taking all control away from people - over things that they could have some control ... - I think, the negative impact of that is even greater.”

Academic Two: “[...] I think there’s been a reluctance in the YOIs in particular, and the STCs, to do any proper planning, because they don’t ever want to tell the young person that they have no investment left in the establishment because they’re worried about deteriorations in behaviour so it’s quite common to tell the young person the day before without any preparation at all.”

Leaving Care Expert: “You switch your mind, you prepare yourself, it’s the same thing, you go from, you move from the juvenile estate, to the young adult estate, you

prepare yourself, you know, you get ready for it because you have this expectation of the worst, the environment lends itself to expectations of the worst.”

The transition between services is also subject to arbitrary age-determined restrictions and ‘outsider’ key stakeholders felt there was no joined up approach to managing the transition:

Academic Two: “From what I can gather, it’s pretty hit and miss, and varies dramatically from where you start and where you end up. [...] And certainly, because the Governors arrangements up until, well more or less now, have meant that the YJB has had responsibility for the secure estate for children, but has no responsibility for the young adult estate, it’s been, quite difficult, as far as I understand it, to get NOMS - whatever they’re called now - to agree in advance where young people will be moved to or when, so there’s been genuine difficulties I think from the children’s side of the fence in planning that process in a sensible way”

Inspector Two: “[...] CAMHS, can be quite naughty about, ‘well you’re 17 and a half, if we get a referral, were not going to see you before you’re 18 so then you need to go to adult services’, and adult services say, ‘well no you’re 17, you come under CAMHS’ be referred to CAMHS and so these young people fall through that gap”

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders identified how issues between services - which ‘insider’ key stakeholders felt hindered their transition planning process – meant that the ‘multi-disciplinary’ approach to transfers as expected from the official guidance (NOMS, 2012, p. 3) did not take place.

As discussed in Chapter Two, understanding of ‘childhood’ and ‘adulthood’ are socially constructed (Goldson, 2013). Inspector One felt that a broader approach in treating young people would be more effective for their treatment and care (Sawyer *et al.*, 2018), particularly for considerations of an ‘adult’ assaulting a ‘minor’:

Inspector One: “[...] is it any different from when they’re 18 to when they’re 17 and 11 months? It’s exactly the same, someone getting hit by someone else and they should be treated as such, I would, I contest, that if we were saying that they’re not mature enough to move into another estate, we shouldn’t be getting too concerned about those issues”

The quotes above demonstrate how the institutions and services fail to provide developmentally appropriate support for young people and instead follow arbitrary age-determined restrictions which are legitimised by definitions of 'children' and 'adults'. Institutions and services appeared to focus on their needs and resources rather than the needs of young people. This is fundamentally to the detriment of the young people and exemplifies how the institutional transition experience compounds their vulnerabilities.

Young peoples' perspectives

The pre-transition interviews took place between one and three months before transition and the young people did not report consistent planning practice as it is detailed within the official guidance (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d). Although most had planning meetings every month to three months and were aware that they would transition or 'get shipped' to upon turning age 18 years they did not have much more information and expected that they would simply move to the young adult/adult institution nearest to their home town. The young people were asked what they knew about their transition:

Christopher: "I don't know. Just, get moved, whenever they want, whenever there[s] anything available, go there [laughs] and just do the same thing that I've done here."

Sadir: "Dunno get shipped"

R: So when you say 'get shipped' where to?

Sadir: Haven't got a clue yet"

Noah: "About getting transferred? [Caseworker] just said that it's going to happen, can't tell you when, just will come to your pad in the morning and tell you to pack up your stuff"

Casper: "That, when I turn 18, anytime from then they can, they're just gonna come and tell me that 'you're going'."

The young people expected staff to inform them on the morning of their transition:

Edward: "When you get shipped, they come for you first thing in the morning, no one tells you you're going, you don't find out, they just come and get you randomly, pain in the arse that, because you can't get ready for it can you

R: So how do you feel about that?

Edward: I don't know, like it's just weird isn't it because you don't know when you're going to go."

"R. Do you know when you might move prison?

Christopher: Nah. They just rock up at your door don't they, and say 'you're going'

R: And why do you think it will be like that?

Christopher: Because that's what happened last time, before I got moved"

The accounts of young people show how they did not feel involved or about their transition. They felt alienated from the process and expressed a resignation that they were powerless over their situation (Barry, 2006; Gooch, 2016).

The sense of being removed from their transition meant that the young people were nervous about their moves and were sceptical about staff seeking to place them in an institution that would meet their needs. This contradicted the expectations of the official guidance and the views of 'insider' key stakeholders'. The young people were also frustrated about gaps in information and took it to understand that the staff were careless about their transitions:

Niall: "[...] I was supposed to get shipped 12 days ago, [but] they cancelled it, then they cancelled it again, and then they turned around and said, 'we're not booking anybody's transport until 1st August

R: So you've got to wait until ...

Niall: Which is really doing my head in, because I'm going to an open jail, and, I had it all planned out, if they'd sent me on this specific day I was supposed to go, I'd have been out on my brother's birthday, now I can't."

HMIP Survey Comment – YOI: “My home town is [Town] and I’m 18 soon, to be shipped after my GCSEs. I’m trying to get to open jail so I can begin my new career, but staff just don’t care!”

HMIP Survey Comment – YOI: “I am 18 on remand. I should not be here I should be shipped, and my caseworker isn’t doing anything about it at all. I’ve seen her once since I’ve been here.”

The young people were also sceptical about the information they did receive:

Warren: “[...] this prison like was trying to ship me off somewhere near Scotland [...] and it’s my Mum and my caseworker that knew about it and [...] when I told them [...] my YOT worker and my caseworker [...] booked a visit for me with the staff - with the member of this prison who’s trying to get me near Scotland - and they said ‘he isn’t going that far, he’s going to [Young Adult/Adult Institution Two]’”

Casper: “I’ve been asking, [my caseworker and they] say they’ve been looking, but [it] can’t be that hard. The YOT and Probation, this is their job, to work this all, don’t take this long to find another jail so I don’t reckon I’m going to go to a different one.”

Casper: “[...] they’ll always tell you the good things on these, on the forms and that but when you go there its nothing like how they say it is, so you kind of go there and see for yourself”

Instead the young people drew knowledge about young adult/adult institutions from their peers which made them apprehensive and nervous – much like their experience of entering the juvenile YOI:

Luke: “Well obviously they’re young people aren’t they, they’ll get told stories themselves [...] just say ‘you’ll get beat up because you’re small’, sometimes they’ll even come out with the odd ‘you’ll get raped’ and that, but it won’t happen”

Noah: “[...] everyone always thinks they’re top dog, this what my brother says, everyone thinks they’re top dog, here, it’s not really anything, you know, but when you go there people always think that they’ve got something better than you, like they’re

always better than you, so that's why there's fights, people smoke that spice so they're off their head, so they're just fighting with you for no reason. Too much testosterone, too much bang up. I think my brothers been in his pad more times than he's actually been out of it"

To avoid appearing weak, prisoners work to place themselves "above the line" of vulnerability (Crewe, 2009, p. 257), the young people sought to suppress their fears by being prepared to turn to violence to defend themselves:

Craig: "[...] when I go into another jail, I have to prove myself again, like try and get the respect level, because all they see is a little 18-year-old who's just come from a YOI, like, these are all grown men like 30-odd year olds and that

R: So, when you say prove yourself, how do you think you're going to do that?

Craig: Like don't know, don't know because, on one hand I just wanna calm down and that, on the other hand I don't want people to look at more like I'm an absolute idiot, I don't know, think I will end up fighting a bit."

Willow (2015, p. 221) has argued that the environment of institutions is dependent on; "boys being invincible rather than needy". The young people had learnt to expect violence in the juvenile YOI and so "maintain[ed] a tough, aggressive, and strong demeanor to acquire status and mitigate harm" (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015, p. 505) which they intended to continue within the young adult/adult estate.

The young people had some reservations about settling in, meeting other people and their transition generally. When asked whether they had raised these issues the young people felt their concerns were dismissed:

Christopher: "Said it to CAMHS and all that.

R: What did they say?

Christopher: Can't remember, just, something you have to get on with, innit, just get to know people"

Luke: "Yeah spoke to an officer she said don't worry about it it'll be the same as here really you've just got to find your feet in them sort of places like I did here like I thought

this would be bad but it isn't, that's basically the sort of message you've got to face head on really"

Again, this demonstrated to the young people that the staff and the institution was not able to help them and they had to be self-reliant (Harvey, 2012). Noah did not wish to admit his concerns for fear of appearing vulnerable:

Noah: "I'd actually talk to them, tell them what's actually going on, not just surprise someone, you know because not everybody is like, is kind of like, not everyone doesn't care about what's going to happen to them, like they're actually worried, you know so I'd actually like help them through you know, tell them something about the prison, so, not just leave them guessing in their pad, you know I've been waiting almost 10 weeks to go you know if that was somebody else, they'd be, they'd be thinking what the bloody hell is going on, you know and actually talk to them, talk to ... my caseworker ain't talked to me about anything."

The message the young people received reflects how expectations change from age 18 years and they are expected to be more autonomous (MoJ, 2013a) however it conveyed to the young people that they had no choice but to 'get on with it' and take responsibility for their own circumstances (Bullock and Bunce, 2018).

The young people felt that they would have more choice and control over their regime within the young adult/adult and perceived this to being treated more like an 'adult' – something that they were looking forward to:

Sadir: "In a lot of ways like this is from what I'm from what I've heard, they don't treat you like a kid"

Sadir: "[...] obviously I've grown up, but I've still got my little, little childish ways sometimes so when I go to adult jail I'll be around adults there, know what I mean, so it'll get the childish out of me, yeah"

R: "And when you say get treated like an adult, what do you think that means?"

Nabi: Trust you with more, more things, there, you can dine out with everyone, you can mix with different wings, here, you can't do that"

Craig: "I'm excited for it like, can't wait to go, because, there's certain stuff I want to be able to do and you can't do here, like, it's just, I think, it's better than being in here, because its more freedom and more relaxed, like here, I'm with loads of like boisterous 15-18 year olds and if someone says something I just snap, but like in adult jail, everyone's' just told me, its calm and that, there's hardly any fighting like. I wanna go there because it's a lot better for my licence if I don't fight, so like, just wanna go there."

Darren: "[...] I heard that's if, you're not doing education [...] if you're not doing any of that stuff then its 23 hour lock up, if you wanna do that stuff then you're out your pad"

Their perspectives supported Coyle's (2019) view that young people unable to make 'normative' transitions reconcile this with a sense of progression away from their sense of being a 'child'.

The young people's desire to move was also influenced by their concern about the consequences of an altercation with someone aged under 18 years:

Darren: "[...] I said to my caseworker, 'okay, so try get me out of here as quick as I can, I'm 18, if I touch one of them lot, it's an assault on a minor [...] forget that' [laughs]"

There was a clear divergence from the expectations of the official guidance and experiences of young people. The official guidance (NOMS, 2012) and 'insider' key stakeholders constructed a negative view of the prospects upon transition and 'rationalised' (Goldson, 2008) the prioritisation of the perceived security needs of the institution over the needs of young people. The young people sought to reconcile their problems within the institution (see also Mehay, Meek and Ogden, 2019), and lack of information by focusing upon their positive expectations about progressing into the young adult/adult institution.

Conclusion

The experiences of young people within the juvenile YOIs has been explored within this chapter. From entry their experiences departed from the expectations of guidance and views of 'insider' key stakeholders. This chapter has outlined how there are four understandings of transition: (i) the official guidance (ii) the 'insider' key stakeholder perspective: those working within penal institutions, (iii) the 'outsider' key stakeholder perspective: those working

outside of penal institutions and (iv) the experiences of the young people. From entry the official guidance expects that the needs of young people are identified and met through a structured induction programme and regime. In reality, young people are processed according to institutional rather than individual needs.

'Insider' key stakeholders reported how the vulnerabilities of young people are 'identified' at entry but 'outsider' key stakeholders challenged narrow assessment tools and institutional definitions of 'vulnerability' suggesting that the processes followed were insufficient to support the young people. The young people were reluctant to acknowledge their vulnerabilities and distanced themselves from institutional constructions of vulnerability by appearing to 'cope' within the YOI. When they recognised that they required support from the institution it was often not available. Although some 'insider' key stakeholders acknowledged that the regime did not adequately support young people this was not addressed in practice and the needs of the population continued to be overlooked.

The frustrations about the lack of information regarding their transition exacerbated the young peoples' frustrations with day-to-day prison life. As considerations of 'risk' were institutionally rather than individually focused (Case, 2006) punitive responses to the behaviour of young people were justified (Goldson, 2008) as staff failed to acknowledge the developmental maturity of the young people and their concerns. The young people's preparation for their transition was in direct contrast to the official guidance (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2013, 2015, 2018d). In the absence of such information young people were prepared to be unprepared and informed on the day of their move. Their expectations were subject to information from their peers and they were concerned about the persistent risk of physical harm (Sim, 2008).

Being an 'adult' within a young adult/adult institution may be seen as making a transition to a 'safer' masculine identity (Robb *et al.*, 2015). Within the interviews there were many contradictions between how the young people wanted to be perceived and treated as they negotiated their identity between childhood and adulthood. From the position of those caring for the young people in custody their vulnerability decreased once they entered the institution and as they approached adulthood. However, the views of the young people and 'outsider' key stakeholders demonstrated how the impending transition served to make the young people more vulnerable as they received less support between institutions, limited sentence planning support and a lack of information about their transfer. The young people did not feel adequately prepared for the move, yet most staff felt the appropriate processes

were followed as institutional risk, safety and security concerns were addressed. The young people were 'structurally vulnerable' (Goldson, 2002, p. 7) due to their powerlessness within the circumstances in which they were situated.

The YJB state that (2018g, p. 4) "by the very definition and nature of custody, children within the secure estate are the most vulnerable and damaged." The juvenile secure estate aims to address the risks and needs of young people (Hinnigan, cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016a; YJB, 2018a) however this chapter has shown that from entry the YOIs failed to adequately provide a smooth transition process as outlined in the official guidance (NOMS, 2012). The gap between the accounts of key stakeholders and the experiences of young people echoes Sim's (2008, p. 139) argument the "official rhetoric of the institution based upon the essential benevolence, justice and accountability of its everyday operations, ideologically mystifies the grim reality faced by many of the confined". The transitions 'process' is managed subject to the institutions' resources and requirements. How the young people experienced the transition and entry to the young adult/adult estate is discussed through the data analysed in the following chapter.

Chapter Six. Life in the young adult/adult institution: post-transition

Introduction

The structure of this chapter mirrors Chapter Five in modelling four overarching themes: (i) reception and induction, (ii) assessment, (iii) doing time and (iv) future transitions and explores each through the lenses of (i) official guidance, (ii) 'insider' key stakeholders, (iii) 'outsider' key stakeholders and (iv) the young people.

The data presented and analysed within this chapter focuses upon the period following transition from the juvenile secure estate into the young adult/adult estate and so the perspectives of the young people are formed by their post-transition experiences. The analysis reflects on the continued dissonance between the official guidance and the lived experiences of young people and demonstrates how transition as 'imagined' (Carlen, 2008) in official discourse fails to materialise in reality as the institutions and services working with young people do not have the resources to provide appropriate support for them. Vulnerability remains a prominent theme throughout this analysis as young people negotiate their new environment. Poor communication between institutions and a drop in provision means that there is minimal continuity of care and the 'smooth' transition process (NOMS, 2012) as imagined in the official guidance is not realised. The 'cliff-edge' of services (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) experienced by young people is most evident in sentence planning and the transfer of supervisory responsibilities from YOTs to Probation Services.

Reception and induction

Official guidance

There is relatively little guidance regarding post-transition when compared to that which relates to pre-transition. To ensure that support for the young person is 'seamless' NOMS (2012, p. 3) expect that the YOI contacts the young adult/adult establishment prior to transition to share all 'relevant' information about the young person including their assessments. Furthermore, the PSI *Early Days in Custody* (NOMS, 2015b, p. 5) states that prisoners upon arrival should be interviewed at reception to "assess the risk of self-harm or harm to others by the prisoner, or harm from others". A basic custody screening should be

conducted to identify any immediate or resettlement needs of the young person (NOMS, 2015c).

As part of the reception process young people are subject to the security procedures of the institution. At their initial reception adult males should receive a full search and those transferring from another prison should receive a level B rub-down search and a hand-held metal detector search (NOMS, 2016). They should also receive a medical check and a telephone call. Their time at reception should be kept to a minimum (NOMS, 2015b).

The first night accommodation should “take account of their individual needs and risk” as identified at reception (NOMS, 2015b, p. 9). Young people transferring into the young adult/adult estate from the juvenile secure estate should receive a full induction and be informed about the regime and services available within the institution and wider estate (NOMS, 2012). Induction procedures vary by institution but within their first five days new arrivals should receive information about the prison and all the services available within it (NOMS, 2015b).

‘Insider’ key stakeholders’ perspectives

In anticipation of the arrival of young people from the juvenile secure estate ‘insider’ key stakeholders from young adult/adult institutions reported that the transition processes within their institutions had recently improved, yet some were unclear and unsure about specific official guidance. Senior Officer One had taken up a new role as transition lead within the institution to liaise with YOIs:

Senior Officer One: “The policy is very vague and [...] I don’t think it is a policy that is particularly embedded or, or sort of known about [...] there’s nothing sort of concrete in there which sets in stone what the process should be” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Practitioners from Young Adult/Adult Institutions One, Two and Three reported that they used telephone conferences to facilitate transitions. Senior Officer One outlined the importance of communication with young people, particularly as a juvenile YOI had contacted them as the behaviour of a young person scheduled to transition had ‘escalated’:

Senior Officer One: “I think that there was a lot of anxiety going on, I think that he wanted ... he’s the sort of lad that wouldn’t want to sort of say he was scared or worried about coming here, but I think that a lot of his behaviours were the anxiety

side about coming here and not knowing what to expect, not knowing how he was going to cope. He's had siblings' that were here and his siblings' experience of being here wasn't brilliant, so if that was something that was playing on his mind as well, I don't know, he wouldn't really admit it, but it seemed to calm him down after I spoke to him" (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Speaking to this young person was thought to have eased their apprehension about transition.

To prepare young people Probation Officer Three had previously visited juvenile YOIs to meet those scheduled to transition but felt this practice had been affected by a number of factors:

Probation Officer Three: "[...] it was a quite useful discussion with them all about how it worked here and questions about this here and where they were at the moment, that was quite good, happens rarely now, partly because, actually, the numbers, more dribs and drabs, and it's quite difficult to get up there to go and see one person. [We] try and organise a telephone conference but sometimes [...] a decision about transfer has been long been made before they come, before we get to that" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Concerns about poor communication between institutions were also highlighted by Offender Supervisor One who reported that it had taken a problematic serious incident at the institution to improve transition processes. They stated that the young person concerned had transitioned and there had been 'zero' communication between institutions. Independent reviews have highlighted the devastating ramifications of poor communication and post-transition support (Harris, 2015; Newcomen, 2017a) yet the account of Offender Supervisor One suggests that this continues.

The 'insider' key stakeholders also highlighted examples of young people receiving no communication when they were subject to discipline transfers. Upon arrival these young people were reportedly volatile and angry, particularly as some had transitioned between segregation units under restraint. The practitioners reported that such transfers were often rushed and uncoordinated as juvenile YOIs sought to move 'problematic' prisoners quickly. These transitions do not adhere to the official guidance, nor do transfers from court – a practice that should have ended in 2016 (YJB, 2016c):

Probation Officer One: "Especially, where they're problematic, and a lot of the lads we get here, from the juvenile estate are. [...] So they've been passed all around the

juvies and as soon as they hit 18, that's it. [...] we are getting more and more of those from court [...] we're not expecting them and they turn up at the gate. You know we've had instances where they've come up from court [and] as far as we're concerned, and the date of birth that we've got, they're still under the age of 18, contracted staff outside this establishment have then scribbled the warrant [and] changed the date of birth so that we would accept him as an 18 year old.

R: Wow

Probation Officer One: So you know, there's a lot of back hand things going on, [laughs] to move, problematic prisoners." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Probation Officer Three: "In an ideal world, yes, we'd be able to go over, do these transitions visits, anytime needed it, and have a good talk, you know, and it could be done six months before they turn 18, and it would be done in a planned way, not, from the juvenile estate: 'this one's a complete pain in the neck, adjudications, all the same, we need to get rid of him, will you take him?' [deep breath] not good." (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Probation Officer Three: "I do get the feeling that we can be a bit of a dumping ground" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Probation Officer Three said in these instances they had been 'sold a pup'. Their derogatory language reflects their frustrations with the juvenile YOI but also demonstrates how staff fail to acknowledge that the behaviour can be symptomatic of a young person's concerns about transition. The Offender Categorisation and Allocation Officer suggested that receiving behavioural information in advance of the young person's arrival allows the institution to prepare for their arrival, a practice which similarly appears to overlook the wider needs of an individual:

Offender Categorisation and Allocation Officer: "Before they come, I can see whether they're hot headed or how many adjudications they had while they were at [Juvenile Institution] or [Juvenile Institution] [laughs] so you get all that coming through which is quite good, but I don't speak to the lads themselves" (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

The Offender Categorisation and Allocation Officer was otherwise quite detached from the transition process and reported that from their perspective young people are a “name and a number” as they do not meet with them upon arrival. An Offender Supervisor from Young Adult/Adult Institution Five also declined a request for interview because Craig’s transition had been a ‘paperwork exercise’ from their perspective. Their views show how the transition procedures can be reduced to an inhumane, institutionally - rather than individually - focused process (Crewe, 2011a).

Information sharing between institutions was considered important by most ‘insider’ key stakeholders, however Offender Supervisor Two reported that it does not always take place. The fact that young people enter institutions which have less provision to meet their needs (Young, 2014) is exemplified by their account which implies that there might not be enough staff to address ‘vulnerability’ unless it is demonstrated to the extent that a young person is self-harming:

Offender Supervisor Two: “We’ve always got a name of who’s coming or who we’re expecting that day, but you might not have any more information, so sometimes they’re not even in our computer systems because different estates use different stuff, so, you won’t have anything, any, sort of history about them at all, so you’ve got to go all the way back through their court records and find out what you can.” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Offender Supervisor Two: “[...] we haven’t always got the staff to maybe, to take that phone call about that person unless it’s self-harm issues or something like that.” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Research has found that induction wings offer some support for young people upon entry to a new establishment (Liebling *et al.*, 2005; Harvey, 2012; Gooch and Treadwell, 2015). Although some ‘insider’ key stakeholders supported this view, several practitioners felt that the facilities can be detrimental to the well-being of young people:

Caseworker Two: “The induction at [Young Adult/Adult Institution Two] is that archaic [...] a lot of self-harm happens on the induction wing because they’re so primitive.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

Probation Officer Two: “They come here and it’s a bit of a shock [smiles] I had one guy recently, and I was involved in a telephone conference before he came here, [...] the day he arrived, no, it, I think it was quite late by the time he was processed, I went to see him in the morning, and he was like ‘[name] I can touch the toilet from my bed’, he was just shocked at the state of the cells” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

HMIP (2017d, p. 3) has found that living conditions for prisoners are poor and cramped referring to cells as: “in effect, a shared lavatory” in which they eat and sleep. Young people can be sharing a cell for the first time upon transition and are held in these conditions for up to a week whilst awaiting induction:

Offender Supervisor One: “[...] everybody that’s come in on the last seven days will go through that process together on a Thursday” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Whilst awaiting induction with no information the official guidance intention (NOMS, 2012) - that young people are aware of the regime and services available within the establishment - is unfulfilled. This time spent without activity can be extremely unsettling (de Viggiani, 2018) and exacerbate ‘risk’ factors (MoJ, 2013c) but the induction process as outlined above is subject to the institutional schedule rather than the immediate needs of new arrivals.

Practitioners did appear to appreciate that young people arriving from the juvenile secure estate may need additional support, but there was little evidence that such support is forthcoming:

Offender Supervisor One: “The induction staff, healthcare staff speak to them, every induction that comes through on the day that they land here, so it would be picked up by them if they had any immediate concerns” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Probation Officer One: “I think they do well, initially, because well, you know, they’ll send off loads of things, social services are involved, YOT are involved, there’s Probation involved, let’s all have a meeting, but once the meeting has happened, who actually questions the actions from that, and also as well, does the young person want them involved? Because actually we have all these conversations, but we forget an individual” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Offender Supervisor Two: “[...] they kind of get thrown in like everybody else.

R: Okay, do you think it should be any different?

Offender Supervisor Two: It would be difficult to be honest, to change it, because, it would be seen that that person was getting special treatment to the others bearing in mind their ages and that, probably should be, but I don’t know *how* you would make it different” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

HMCIP (2018a) have found little continued support for young people transitioning from the juvenile secure estate beyond their initial entry and this was evidenced within the research here. Transition to a new establishment is ‘stressful’ (Harris, 2015, p. 95) and identified as a risk factor for suicide (MoJ, 2013c). Despite this, communication between institutions does not fulfil the expectations as set out in official guidance documents (NOMS, 2012; MoJ, 2013c). The mechanistic process of reception and induction is focused upon the institutional resources and regimes which ultimately risks the safety and well-being of young people.

‘Outsider’ key stakeholders’ perspectives

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders described how entry to a young adult/adult institution repeats the ‘bewildering’ experience (Goldson, 2002) of entering the juvenile YOI and is fundamentally unsuitable for young people making the transition:

Civil Servant One: “[...] I think there shouldn’t be any assumptions made about a young person moving from another secure establishment that they know all the routines and because they’ve got experience of being in a secure establishment, they know it all, they may give the impression that they do, but actually, every place is completely different and will have a slightly different way of doing things”

Inspector One: “When you talk about what happens in a prison in terms of someone’s early days, their first night, their reception experience [...] you process people, and they go from one place to another to another and some of those processes are meant to support them, but fundamentally you’ve got to get this person through this production line and off the first night induction wing and onto the prison [...] I don’t think that there is enough consideration paid to the fact that if you’ve been in

custody since you were four, and a lot of people who are transitioning have been in custody for a while or they're transitioning on quite lengthy, sentences and I don't think that there sort of a is an acknowledgment that they are different from the other vulnerable people that are coming into these [young adult/adult institutions]"

HMCIP (2017b) have found reception procedures that are focused on processing individuals rather than identifying vulnerabilities. 'Outsider' key stakeholders suggested that institutions fail to acknowledge the additional vulnerabilities of young people upon transfer due to the lack of post-transition support:

Inspector One: I think that lots of work goes into planning and then nothing happens when they transfer, so you have a wonderful plan that's normally worked up by the sending establishment, they might get a visit, to the, or a visit by the receiving establishment, but when they get there, that sort of all amounts to nought, because what happens is nothing changes [...] you just go in and do what everyone else does when they come into this prison so to a certain extent what is the point? Is my fairly cynical view of it, because what you would want is for them arrangements to smooth that transition, [...] it's not really, as sort of linked together as it should be."

Academic Three: "[...] it just feels that that information is quickly overlooked and they just go through a very normal kind of induction process, a very normal reception process, nothing that really is tailored to the fact that you've got someone who maybe a day before was 17 and now they're 18, they're suddenly a different person and [in] a very different environment"

'Outsider' key stakeholders' were conscious of the 'cliff-edge' of support (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) young people experience due to the lack of adequate information and provision which undermines pre-transition planning.

Young peoples' perspectives

The young people typically moved within a month of becoming age 18 years and continued to have limited knowledge about their transition until this point. Only five young people moved to the institution that they hoped, and half moved to a different institution than they expected at the point of pre-transition interview. As the young people predicted they tended

to be woken on the day of their transition and told that they should pack as they were moving:

Luke: "I got up [...] then they told me I [was] [transitioning], just chucked me some bags and said 'you're getting shipped' and so, got ready, packed my stuff and then waited about two hours and then

[...] R: So how did you feel when you were told it's today you're going?

Like: Obviously I was gutted it were my birthday and I [was] moving prison, because obviously that's not the best birthday present"

Kendrick: "Just woke up, they said 'here's your bags, you're getting transferred', packed my stuff"

Warren: "[...] I woke up, the 2nd, on Monday morning, and they just chucked bin bags in my room and said 'pack your stuff, you're going'"

Edward: "They come and opened my door [...] said 'pack your stuff, you're going', I said 'why?' they said: 'you're getting shipped'. Little bit of a shock"

The secondary analyses of HMIP survey data shows that just over half (59.4%) of young people aged 21 years and younger within young adult establishments reported that they were told where they were going to, with a mere 7% receiving written information in advance of arrival. Although these figures include those arriving from court and other establishments, this implies that 40% of young people arrive at young adult/adult institutions with no information in advance of arrival. For those transitioning this contradicts good practice outlined within the official guidance (NOMS, 2012, p. 5) which suggests that young people receive "an induction pack on the young adult YOI that has been specifically tailored for this purpose prior to transfer taking place", a further example of how young people are unprepared for the transition.

The young people interviewed were nervous, apprehensive and frustrated that they were not informed about their transition, findings which mirror those contained within the CJI (2012) inspection report:

Noah: “Yeah when I got to reception, they said ‘you’re going to [Young Adult/Adult Institution]’, so that’s when I found out there

R. And that was on the day that you went?

Noah: Yeah

Lewis: “Just the waiting made me more anxious, and a bit more worried”

Alejandro: “It’s just the waking up isn’t it, and like; ‘am I moving, am I not’ because you don’t really, because they don’t tell you”

Harvey (2012) has found that upon entering young adult/adult institutions young people are fearful for their safety and feel like outsiders with a loss of control. The young people in this research articulated similar feelings:

Alejandro: “Tired [laughs] in the van for two hours [...] so you’re quite tired and in the van, you’re just thinking [...] you’re just like ‘oh, what’s it going to be like’ and all that. You’re not nervous you’re more like anxious”

Lewis: “I was nervous at the start, but, once I got here, I was still a bit nervous and still a bit worried for the first couple of weeks, but then I started to talk to a couple of people”

Warren: “Well, there’s this lad [Niall] he came with me, and he told the prison staff that I was feeling low and everything, I wasn’t feeling myself, so, just like he told them like

R. And are you glad that he did?

Warren: Yeah, yeah, because I didn’t want, don’t, speak to no one about it, so”

Many young people considered the reception process dismissive and felt that the staff were not there to engage in positive relationships with them:

R: "Okay. Here, is there anything have could have happened here to help you better understand it [Young Adult/Adult Institution One]?"

Noah: I don't know, not at reception, because you're not at reception to even talk, all that happens is, you sign a bit of paper and go straight onto the wing, so if there was, then somebody on the wing"

Kendrick: "Didn't say anything, second I got here - because it was lunch - they just sent me straight to the wing"

Rather than identify and meet the needs of the young people, the appearance, advice and actions of the reception officers served to exacerbate fears the young people had about the institution as they were again told to 'keep their head down' and maintain a low profile:

Craig: "They just said: 'it's not a child's jail no more, you're in the [young adult/]adult estate and if you wanna cause a problem for us, we'll cause a problem for you' other than that, it was telling me to keep my head down and it'll be alright

R: So, what do you think about what they said to you?

Craig: [...] part of me just wanted to get up and punch him, because I felt like he was trying to threaten me, the other part was like he's obviously worked here for a bit knows what he's saying and that, so I just left it"

Casper: "They just say the normal 'be good and keep your head down'

R: Yeah, what do you think about that?

Casper: Just, useless advice really

[...] R: And when they asked you how you were feeling, what did you say?

Casper: Said fine"

The staff wittingly or unwittingly constructed a 'culture of fear' (de Viggiani, 2018) which meant the young people internalised their concerns as a coping mechanism to be as inconspicuous as possible. The young people continued to maintain a 'tough' front and suppress any emotions as they did not wish to appear weak or 'vulnerable' (de Viggiani, 2012; Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015). Rather than creating an environment where

the young people felt they could articulate their needs and express their concerns, the young people reported that the staff instructed them how to present themselves, be less vulnerable and appear to 'cope'.

The young people expressed feelings of powerlessness upon arrival, exacerbated by the process of being strip-searched:

R: "So, you don't have to talk about this if you don't want to, how did that make you feel?"

Kendrick: "Not fussed, I knew they were going to really, it happened on the out, in the police station, so, not a big deal"

Alejandro: "[...] No, at my old place, yeah, the first time it is awkward you know what I mean, like, it's not nice getting ... in front of two guys [...] [pause] you don't really get used to it, but, it's, it's something that happens"

This process furthers the inhumane, mechanistic nature of arriving at an institution, as young people are treated as a commodity and processed. The practice of strip-searching illustrates how institutions exercise power over young people in the most intrusive and traumatising manner; a stark reminder that they are subject to the procedures of the young adult/adult estate. The young people sought to appear to cope by maintaining that they felt they were treated 'alright' at reception.

Following reception, the young people were moved to the induction wings which they found to be of differing standards:

Alejandro: "It is a big change like from [Juvenile Institution Two] you get a shower in your pad there and then you come here, you've got to shower with two other lads on the wing so, it is a big change, and the pads are small"

Niall: "I'd, I'd prefer to stay on the induction wing me, induction wing is the nicest wing, well, the quietest wing."

Craig: "As soon as I hit the induction wing, I told them I've been in jail for long enough just put me straight on main site, because I don't like induction wings"

R: Why don't you like induction wings?

Craig: Dunno, just a weird feeling about them, just don't like them"

The young people found the changes to their environment extremely unsettling. In previous research prisoners have reported that it is at this time when they felt that they had: "lost their sense of autonomy, accountability and personal responsibility" (de Viggiani, 2018, p. 100). These feelings are exacerbated during long periods of 'forced idleness' as Noah was informed to expect:

Noah: "I asked. As soon as I got off the bus I was like 'what's the bang up' he goes '23 hours'

R: Who said that?

Noah: That's what the officers said [...] because it takes a while to get a job, need to get risk assessed"

Only three young people, across both juvenile institutions who moved to Young Adult/Adult Institution Two, reported that telephone or video conferences had taken place. They had differing reflections about their value, Kendrick felt it was misleading:

R. "And has it been as he [caseworker] told you?

Kendrick: No [...] regime is a joke in here, cancelled all the time, a lot of bang up"

The process of reception and induction was again focused upon the risk *of* the young people, now as adults, rather than risk *to* the young people. The young people were informed to expect a violent environment which was isolating, and they did not receive a supportive and informative arrival as suggested within the official guidance (NOMS, 2012).

Assessment

Official guidance

NOMS (2012, p. 1) acknowledge that young people undergoing the transition are "likely to be especially vulnerable and present an increased risk of self-harm". The MoJ (2013c) *Safer Custody* PSI states that existing support and care for this group should be maintained within their new environment. Adults held within institutions are deemed to be vulnerable if they present as "at risk of bullying, suicide or self-harm" (Gov.UK, 2018b) and early days in custody and recent transfer to a new establishment are considered triggers for these risk factors.

Prisoners identified as at risk of suicide or self-harm should have their risk monitored and reviewed through the ACCT document (MoJ, 2013c).

The AssetPlus assessment framework includes a Youth to Adult module to 'facilitate' case transfers (YJB, 2014c, 2018d). Adults are subject to the OASys assessment tool which should be completed by the Probation Services (NPS or CRC) working with the young person (NOMS, 2015b).

Young people leaving the care system are also considered vulnerable and can receive support from a PA provided by their local authority until they are aged 25 years (HM Government, 2017; Department for Education, 2018). The PA is expected to prepare a pathway plan and support the young person through their transitions to adulthood regardless of any other services that they may be involved with; including custody (Department for Education, 2015b).

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

Practitioners identified numerous issues with the transfer of assessments as information can be lost and there are key subjective differences between assessments:

Offender Supervisor One: "Sometimes we get an Asset, sometimes we don't and then an OASys is started from scratch again, taking the information from ..., unfortunately it doesn't migrate across and the information goes in, it's like a totally new assessment" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Offender Supervisor One: "What's important to me might not be important to somebody else, if you've got all that information there, I don't see why you can't update, like if you renew, you take away bits of the juvenile that are not relevant once they turn 18 but it would be easier if it just transferred through, much easier" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Offender Supervisor Two: "It would be nice if we were all on one big computer system so we were allowed access to everything, so we knew that the guy coming in had issues with family or whatever, that something was going on, rather than asking them; 'oh what's going on' especially if it's quite traumatic, they've got to tell another person, and they've already told five people already, and nothing's happened, so they get quite frustrated about it as well. So, we're trying, and I completely

understand it, it's really annoying when they have to tell people three, four, five times and nothing's happening because we're not given that handover." (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Probation Officer One: "They need to merge the systems, or have one consistent system, I don't understand, why, you need Asset and OASys, OASys is good enough to cover all the juveniles, it's exactly the same question, just in a different format" (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

The lack of information sharing, and disjointed assessment systems means that transition is not as individually tailored as the official guidance expects (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2013; 2015; 2018d):

Offender Supervisor Two: "in [...] prison sometimes, you kind of lose your identity, prisoners lose their identity, they're a number" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Probation Officer One: "[...] Social Services at the moment, aren't really helping, even though they've extended the services to 25 it's very limited, and half of them, don't even want to know because they've been in custody for so long," (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Information sharing is fragmented and the disjointed nature of the systems highlights how key information about young people can be lost, particularly if young people do not feel comfortable articulating, or reiterating their needs at the young adult/adult institution (Goldson, 2002; Fitzpatrick and Williams, 2017). These poor planning procedures can result in institutions being unable to arrange appropriate support for young people, as has been found in independent reports (IMB, 2016b, 2017a).

When considering assessment processes, the staff from young adult/adult institutions acknowledged that vulnerability is complex and may be exacerbated by transition:

Probation Officer Three: "I think, yeah they are potentially more vulnerable at one level when they come here because they are the little fish in the big pond" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Probation Officer Two: "I suppose it can be many things, but when I see vulnerable it's those that could be socially isolated, might be fearful to come out of their cell, fearful to socialise with other prisoners, [...] might not want to approach staff [...] could be self-harmer, lots of different ... and I think as well [...] purely for the fact coming from the juvenile to young adult[/adult] estate - that can make them vulnerable in themselves; they are used to a regime [where] they've got a lot more support coming up to young adult/adult estate where [there is] less support, bit more scary I think for them, as well, which [...] I think compounds vulnerability I guess" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Although independent inspectorates and reviews have highlighted the importance of support during transition (HMCIIP, 2014a; Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) from the practitioners' perspective the transition is 'imagined' (Carlen, 2008) due to the drop in available staff and provision between estates which means there is little they can do to adequately support young people:

Probation Officer One: "I think at the moment, whether you would class an individual as vulnerable or not, as prison estate, we clearly fall down on being able to support those individuals whether that's staffing levels or what we have available within the prison itself, we don't have enough to give them." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Probation Officer One: "The training isn't, no way near sufficient enough to deal with half the issues we have in the estate, especially going back to vulnerability and also self-harm. So last week, I had an incident where one of the new officers turned round to a lad, who had just cut his arm, very superficial [he said]; 'you can do better than that', so 10 minutes later, he slashed his arm open." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Probation Officer One: "You have to look at how efficient that ACCT process is, and what's been done, because if you look at quite a lot of the deaths in custody, especially the last one in this establishment, you know, because even though the person was on a ACCT, what was on the ACCT document being recorded wasn't of any use, so again, we try, but I don't think we can be, as effective as we want to be." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Young people are sometimes assumed to be less vulnerable upon transition and require less support as they are no longer a 'child'. Probation Officer Two reported that it was important to make young people aware that they should be more 'responsible' within the young adult/adult estate. They were conscious that they had not seen a young person for three weeks:

Probation Officer Two: "No, no. He's definitely not vulnerable [laughs] as, you know, additionally vulnerable [...] no, very confident [...] it's just more that, the last time he said 'don't forget me' so like, you know" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Despite his transition, Probation Officer Two did not consider the young person to be vulnerable. This quote again highlights how vulnerability is constructed by the institutions with reference to how young people appear to cope. Probation Officer Three, alike Caseworker Two from the juvenile secure estate, felt that the processes used to assess vulnerability can be manipulated:

Probation Officer Three: "ACCT is good. And can be very supportive [...] for the most vulnerable, it can also be abused by certain prisoners because they want to get their way and they'll threaten this [...] to get the extra attention and so sometimes it can be about attention seeking behaviour rather than self-harm, or, suicide that is likely to occur. [...] it's a bit of a warped system, really, well prison is a warped system really [...] prisoners learn the rules of survival in prison [...] which aren't necessarily the rules which they need to survive outside" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

This view demonstrates the significant risk institutions pose to young people as there are inadequate approaches taken to identify, address and understand vulnerability. When practitioners identified young people as vulnerable they were resigned to the fact that the estate was unable to address it.

'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives

'Outsider' key stakeholders acknowledged the importance of information sharing between institutions but were cautious about the practice of sharing behavioural information as they felt it could impact upon the treatment the young person received within their new institution:

Academic Two: "[...] I think there is a risk [...] to the young people where information is known about young people then they are treated in a particular way which can

reinforce the problems which originate, which manifest themselves in the last establishment and prevent the young people having a new start, and that's certainly the case where young people have reputations for being difficult to manage, so I'm not so keen on behaviour management information being transferred."

'Risk', alike 'vulnerability', is constructed and interpreted according to the institution rather than the individual. These narrow risk assessment procedures have been heavily criticised by academic commentators for their standardisation which prevent a 'human' and 'meaningful' relationship between the young person and their assessor (Goldson, 2002; Crewe, 2011a). As 'insider' key stakeholders confirmed in the section above the behaviour records of the young people can precede them, their 'risk' to the institution can be assessed prior to their arrival. This shows how the system is based upon security and management rather than care and vulnerability.

When considering the differences between assessments in contrast to the view of Probation Officer One (see page 148) the 'outsider' key stakeholders did not think assessments in the young adult/adult estate were sufficient to identify vulnerability and identified how the processes followed overlooked specific vulnerabilities of young adults:

Inspector Two: "The OASys system doesn't have a vulnerability section, so you'd just have to be clever and winkle it into, 'family' or 'employment' or something, it, it doesn't have a block all its own, so immediately, all of that, section, just, where do I put it? As a newly trained, newly qualified CRC representative where do I put it? Somebody has given me all this lovely information and I have no idea where to put it, and it's going to get worse because the CRCs are developing their own systems, they're not necessarily going to use nDelius"

Young Adults in the Criminal Justice System Expert: "Currently, there is [...] far too little done to identify vulnerability of young people in prison and even where vulnerabilities have been identified, for example in court, there is very little follow through, even though [...] in policy it's very clearly stated that there should be. There are prison service rules about the treatment of young adults and one of them is identifying vulnerability and that isn't done in the majority of cases and when it is done there is very little within the prison to actually respond to those needs."

Inspector One: “[...] so virtually what happens as when you get older, you get less money spent on you and you’re expected to be less vulnerable”

Many key stakeholders from inside and outside institutions agreed that the young adult/adult estate and services simply do not have the tools and resources to adequately meet the needs of young people.

Young peoples’ perspectives

Noah initially moved to another adult institution before receiving a discipline transfer to Young Adult/Adult Institution One. He felt his assessments were made before he arrived based on his behavioural records:

Noah: “They always read off people’s files, so look at my file from [previous institution], it’s not, not squeaky clean, you know, so then they’ll be like ‘oh you need to watch him’”

The official guidance (NOMS, 2012) states that all ‘relevant’ information should be shared, however Alejandro found some had not, which disrupted his care. Although he had met with the mental health service within two days of making an application to see them, they were yet to receive his records from the juvenile institution:

Alejandro: “I’m seeing mental health – well I did see mental health for my ... [...] I get like really angry easy, you know what I mean, so they said like they want me to do [...] mental health in my programmes for when you turn 18, so I need to speak to my OMU [worker] about that”

Alejandro: [...] “I think mental health is trying to get my, psychology records down to it”

The information shared between institutions and given to the young people is focused upon the perceived risks they are deemed to pose to the institution rather than the risks faced by the young people themselves (Case, 2006). The assessments young people receive are reportedly little more than short interactions during their reception process:

Casper: “[...] they asked me, asked me how I was feeling and that”

Craig: "They came and asked me a couple of questions, like, I can't even remember what they was asking me"

When asked about vulnerability a 'hierarchy of vulnerability' (Goldson, 2002), constructed by institutional practices, was again evident:

Craig: "At risk of being like, harmed or something, I don't know

R: Well you know like you said there was VPs [vulnerable prisoners] on that wing, why were they VPs?

Craig: Well, because of their offences, most of them"

Niall: "There's a few people on the wing, there's a lad next to me, [pauses] he's self-harming all on his legs and its fucking ... it's horrible like when I see all on his legs in the showers like, it's horrible. So, I've been speaking to him about it like because I've been telling him I had it in [Juvenile Institution Two] and I told him it's not good [...] then he said he's never done it before, just first time, because [...] he's getting bullied [...]. So he moved next door to me, and I've been speaking to him last couple of weeks and I've been getting like positives off the staff because I've been speaking to him, and I've been talking to him about [...] how life is in jail and that's, he's first time in jail and that, it's my first time in jail but he's only been like a month now, that's it"

Nabi: "They aren't really used to this kind of life

R: So, prison do you mean, or?

Nabi: Yeah"

The young people adopted the institutional understandings of vulnerability and the view that greater prison experience as something that reduced their vulnerability however, the unpredictability and insecurity of their environment (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015) and the unsettling nature of transition can exacerbate vulnerabilities. Institutional understandings of vulnerability are narrow and imply that it is defined simply by those requirements i.e. self-harming, being held on the VP wing. 'Vulnerability' is viewed as a

weakness (Brown, 2011) and hugely problematic within the prison estate (Crewe, 2009) and young people wanted to distance themselves from any notion of being vulnerable.

Lewis outlined how he was considered vulnerable when he arrived and initially received additional attention, but it was not consistently followed through:

Lewis: “One of the officers at reception said that he wanted to keep an eye on me, so they put me in the first cell on [name] wing, and then I got unpacked and then, no one really talked to me that day, but, the officer from the reception came and spoke to me and like reassured me that things would be alright once I’d settled down

[...] “R: So you know you said about the bloke who said about extra checks and he came and saw you when you arrived and he saw you that night and spoke to you, has he been to see you since, or spoken to you, or helped you in any way since then?”

Lewis: Not really, he’s seen me like, once, since then, he’s not spoke to me”

From age 18 years, young people are viewed as ‘adult’ regardless of their maturity or vulnerability (Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2016). The lack of post-transition support demonstrates how the young people, and in particular Lewis, were expected to cope. Despite official guidance (MoJ, 2013c) institutions overlook how transfer to a new establishment can be a trigger for individual risk factors.

Much of the transitions literature, as documented within Chapter Three, focuses upon the abrupt transition out of care services. Only four of the nine young people who were involved with care services at some point during their lives had retained this contact:

Christopher: “She’s supposed to come see every two months, she’s supposed to come in December, but she never came and I think she’s booked in for February”

R: “[...] do you know when they’re meant to be coming to see you?”

Darren: Soon, very soon, now that I’ve been settled in, they said they were going to come when I was settled in”

Although Christopher and Darren had met their leaving care workers as part of a transition handover meeting, they were yet to have a subsequent meeting with them three and five months respectively after transfer. Only Craig had been visited within the institution by his

leaving care worker and he met with them every six weeks. Niall suggested he no longer wished to have a relationship with them, but it was otherwise unclear why support was so inconsistent. These services are intended as a continuation of support, but this role was not fulfilled. In effect the drop in services was already apparent as Darren was expected to 'settle in' rather than be supported during his adaptation to the new institution.

Doing time

Official guidance

Young people can transition to institutions holding adults of all ages (NOMS, 2012). Young adult/institutions have lower staffing ratios which means that "staff may not be so readily accessible" and the NOMS (2012, p. 4) guidance recommends that young people are informed of this and other differences in the regime so that they are "aware of what to expect". The investment in young adults is just over half that spent on those in juvenile YOIs, with the annual cost for an individual held within a young adult YOI at £47,391 in 2017/18 although it can be as low as £29,967 across the wider adult estate (MoJ, 2018d).

The YJB (2018d, p. 9) state that "plans in the NPS/CRC and the adult custodial estate must take account of information from youth based services, to ensure that any interventions remaining outstanding are implemented". Offender managers and offender supervisors should oversee sentence planning which should be informed by assessment of the young person's 'criminogenic needs' and associated risks. The sentence plan is important for "reducing the likelihood of reoffending and, in custodial cases, promoting resettlement" (NOMS, 2015c, p. 5) and should be reviewed throughout the sentence.

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

HMCIP (1997, 2015b, 2016b, 2017h, 2017i, 2018c, 2018h) have raised concerns about the impact of mixing younger and older adults in institutions and the House of Commons Justice Committee (2018c, p. 4) stated that HMPPS appeared to be making institutions with mixed populations work "as well as they can". Practitioners were conscious about the impact that mixing with older adults might have upon young people and their ability to safeguard themselves:

Probation Officer One: "[...] they can be easily led into other, criminal activities."
(Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Senior Officer One: “They don’t want to be a target, so therefore they’ll end up gravitating towards somebody who might be able to protect them, but makes them more vulnerable in the process anyway, because they’re going to be getting themselves involved in, all sorts of, of dodgy stuff” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Aside from these concerns about the safety of young people, there was a responsabilising discourse regarding how the young people were expected to conduct themselves within the young adult/adult institution and how they were treated. ‘Insider’ key stakeholders took quite a blunt view about how the young people are expected to understand these differences:

Probation Officer One: “Obviously because they’re entering into the [young adult/]adult estate, I’ve found a lot of the juveniles almost mummy-cuddle, whereas as soon as they come to the [young adult/adult estate] it’s very different they have to make their own choices. They have to stand on their own two feet. [...] I’m quite straight to the point with my lads, and most of them like it because it just kind of helps, reaffirm the boundaries that they’ve lost” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Offender Supervisor One: “We expect them to take a lot more onus, all of a sudden, from doing everything for them to ‘well, you’re 18 now’” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

R: “Who has overall accountability for the transition arrangements and experiences for young people?”

Probation Officer Three: [sighs]. I think that’s shared. I think the prisoner has a lot of responsibility for it, in terms of their behaviour” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

A key area where young people saw a drop contact and support was their sentence planning. Offender supervisors fulfil the role of caseworkers upon transition but have higher caseloads and are not expected to see young people as frequently:

Senior Officer One: “The caseworkers at [juvenile institution] have a caseload of about 20 lads whereas we have a caseload of about 60, 70, so in terms of your time, we just don’t have it. It would nice to be able to go and see your lad every single week and that would be at [...] most really, whereas here you don’t really see, you only go and see them if there’s a reason to go and see them” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Offender Supervisor Two: “We only *have* to see a prisoner every 12 weeks as an offender supervisor, and I never stick to that, that is a minimum, and that is minimum for everybody, but you don’t have to go above that” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Probation Officer Two: “I do probably do a bit too much, not just for juveniles, well, ones that have transitioned, for a lot of them, it’s been said [laughs] by staff, that I do, do too much” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Prison officers have reported to the Howard League for Penal Reform (2017) that conditions within prisons, including low staff and high workloads, mean that they cannot form quality relationships with prisoners, a finding repeated in this research:

Offender Supervisor One: “You can put as many policies in place as they like but if they haven’t got the staff and the funding to do it ... there’s only so many jobs that one person can actually do, and do them correctly, effectively, and [...] if you’re doing that, there’s something else that you’re not doing. [...] you couldn’t stretch us any more, so it’s really hard” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Offender Supervisor Two: “When I first started the job, you’d have five or six people to a wing, of 70 and you’d be leaning over the railings, chatting away [...] I knew everybody’s name on that wing I could tell you something about every single person. Now I go on a wing, I haven’t even got a clue who they are” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Probation Officer Three: “My experience here at [Young Adult/Adult Institution Two] is that they do try very hard to support young people making transition, give them a fair chance [...] but [...] resources are a big issue [...] cuts were quick, over years” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

This further demonstrates the ‘imagined’ (Carlen, 2008) transition as staff were aware that the resources within the young adult/adult estate are not sufficient to provide the level of support that young people require. However, given that the official guidance (NOMS, 2012) acknowledges the drop in support available to young people upon transition and offers no further provision, the loss of support and this responsabilising discourse is not conceptualised as problematic, evidenced within the quote from the Engagement and Resettlement Worker below:

Engagement and Resettlement Worker: “I think they take it upon themselves to safeguard themselves.” (Juvenile Institution One)

In an effort to mitigate some of the loss of support upon transitions, Caseworker Three had tried to offer some consistency for family members:

Caseworker Three: “I kept in touch with one of the parents with a boy who went to the [young adult/]adult estate, she rings me every now and then, and she’ll say, I’m trying to find information on such and such so I’ve given her information, on assisted visits and things, because she says I haven’t got any information from the [young adult/]adult estate, [...] because they’re adults they can’t just ring the offender supervisor and say you know ‘I’m worried about my son’ they just don’t do that, so she rings me, and I try and help as much as I can, but it’s sort of like all that support is cut off for the families as well.” (Juvenile Institution Two)

The drop in provision is also reflected in the lack of activity. Within the young adult/adult estate young people can be held in their cells if they are not engaged in ETE. HMCIP (2018j) found that only one of three young adult institutions had sufficient work and activity places for those held. Staff from Young Adult/Adult Institutions One, Two and Three confirmed this:

Probation Officer One: “The prison needs to be quite clear about what opportunities they’ve got here because it will only be a few weeks later when they’re allocated to an activity and they’re like ‘oh I didn’t choose this activity’ and they’re on it, because there’s a space and we need to fill it.” (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Perhaps the most shocking example of a responsabilising discourse upon transition is the stark difference in restraint procedures (see NOMS, 2015d; Simmonds, 2016) whereby young people are subject to the penal power exercised by officers (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015):

Senior Officer One: "I think, they're vulnerable in the sense that, they're quite naïve when they arrive here, [...] You get a lot of lads that come here, they get themselves in a fight or something along those lines and then they have to be, C&R initiated on them and they're just completely shocked and, you know, 'you've assaulted me, you've assaulted me', 'no, this is the, this is the techniques that are used when you arrive into an [young adult/]adult estate'." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Probation Officer One: "It can be quite a scary process so one was restrained the other day, [...] he's been in our establishment for over a year and was in a secure sentence before that, but was never restrained to that level until last week here, and he was literally dropped to the floor, taken off his feet and everything, face smack off the floor, but nothing's going to happen, because that's how we had to restrain him, and legally that's correct, morally didn't sit very well, because at the end of the day he's cracked his face off the floor, he's got a bloody nose [...] whereas in a juvenile you wouldn't be able to sweep their feet off them." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Official guidance (NOMS, 2012; MoJ, 2013c) expects young people to be more autonomous upon transition. The evidence from 'insider' key stakeholders shows how young adult/adult institutions present an increased amount of risks to young people who are required to accept these differences and are considered *less* vulnerable. A young person aged 18 years in the young adult/adult estate subject to a restraint no longer has the protections they did, potentially days before, within the juvenile secure estate. Within a YOI a procedure can be raised within a child protection referral (HMCIP, 2017g) however young adults are only eligible to complain internally (Edgar and Tsintsadeze, 2017).

'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives

The 'outsider' key stakeholders were conscious that the differing treatment and staffing levels meant that numerous problems could manifest within the young adult/adult estate:

Academic One: "As a young adult you could be completely left to your own devices and at that point all these resposibilitising discourses, individualising discourses come into play, 'it was down to you, you're on your own and you need to sort yourself out'."

Inspector One: "You're more likely in a young adult establishment, to find vulnerable prisoners locked up in grim conditions for long periods of time, and that not being addressed. So, rather than, at least in the juvenile estate they will know who those people are and they will try and do something, because there's enough people to notice and jiggle stuff around but, in the young adults estate I think there's much more of a problem"

Young Adults in the Criminal Justice System Expert: "[...] the general erosion of distinct provision has meant that the gap between the experience of the youth estate and [young adult/]adult estate has grown, so that you can have a good transfer protocol but whether that is actually any sort of managed transition in reality is questionable"

Most of the 'outsider' key stakeholders concurred that changes upon transition, which are outlined within the NOMS (2012) guidance, aggravate a number of issues but felt there was some ways in which this could be somewhat eased:

Lawyer: "I've got young people that I'm representing now and I'm the only professional that's remained consistent in their lives actually through all the twists and turns which I think is a very undesirable situation because I'm just a lawyer, that's all, that can be the case. One of the benefits, if a person is going to a new environment, where everything is alien to them, and they're at sea, you know having the consistent support from family, family being able to understand the differences in how they were, where they were and where they are now"

Inspector One: "Almost never do we see information that tells young people about the regime that they are going to get in terms of the day to day so think lots of people when they transfer are quite shocked, so they get there [...] so everyone knows that's

what going to happen, but no one will say. They'll give them an idea of what wonderful courses they can do, they'll give them a programme of induction that looks like they're out and about morning and afternoon most days but that's not actually what happens"

Some 'outsider' key stakeholders felt that relationships with staff members are important to support young people but suggested these relationships are affected by lack of training and use of restraint. They challenged the suitability of young adult/adult institutions for young people with particular needs and vulnerabilities:

Inspector One: "Potentially in the young adult estate [...] they've not chosen to work with young adults they just happen to live near that prison, [...] and in terms of training, as I said they get a lot of training when they join the prison service, in terms of ongoing training, that's much more hit and miss and in fact the only real training that the prison service [have] now is how to use force on people so apart from sort of online distance learning modules [...] I'm not sure that's sufficient to address the lack of sort of any entry requirements into the prison service."

Leaving Care Expert: "I don't think the prison system is the right place to be putting kids that have been through the care system, if their experience of care and childhood and abuse and neglect is just simply going to be mirrored in that institution whether that being inflicted upon them by other inmates or inflicted upon them by the staff through state sponsored abuse, through restraint, you know?"

The impact of limited relationships and a poor regime, is exacerbated by the severe change of restraint procedures between institutions, as asserted by the NPM (2017). 'Outsider' key stakeholders felt the environment serves to intensify previous traumas experienced by young people. The transition appears to exacerbate the harms caused by the juvenile secure estate (McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark, 2016) as young people experience a 'cliff-edge' of support (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015).

Young peoples' perspectives

All the young people moved to institutions holding adults of all ages as a number of institutions are no longer distinct young adult YOIs. Young Adult/Adult Institutions One and Two had started to accept those aged up to 28 years, Young Adult/Adult Institution Three

had recently begun to hold prisoners of all ages and those at Young Adult/Adult Institution Four reported that they were held with prisoners up to the age of 24 years. Craig was held in Young Adult/Adult Institution Five and he reported there were people on his wing aged up to 70 years:

Craig: "I think it's alright, because like the oldest people that you talk to are like 50, but they've got some good life experience, they've been in and out of jail, all the jails, so what they're saying makes sense, they don't want to come back to jail, so it's, good for like, motivation to stay out"

The age and experience of older prisons attracted 'respect' from some of the younger prisoners (de Viggiani, 2012) although some young people felt their new peer group was beneficial, others found that sharing cells and mixing with older people could be problematic:

Alejandro: "I think it's better because the old people try to look after young people"

Kendrick: "You think because there's older people here, you'd think it would be quieter and that, but it's not really, its similar"

Niall: "Most wings you get fights on them. But I talk to a lot of lads, you know, you can see them, shivering behind their door, because they're scared to come out. Talking to a lad before I came, talking to him for an hour, wouldn't come out his cell, hasn't had 'owt to eat in two weeks because he's going to get sliced up, or they've told him he's going to get sliced up, so he won't come out, been living on chocolate and stuff."

Within their pre-transition interview the young people welcomed the prospect of mixing with older adults, in reality, some of them found that, rather than a calmer environment as they expected, this population created a more formidable environment.

The differences in environment, peer group and lower staffing levels within the young adult/adult estate are acknowledged within the official guidance (NOMS, 2012) yet the impact this can have upon young people is not addressed. The lower staffing levels particularly affected the young people:

Edward: "Staff don't give a fuck about you here"

Craig: “[...] you don’t see staff that often, like, all they do is like, unlock your doors, and then put you back away”

Kendrick: “I’m on a big wing, you don’t like, its different, [Juvenile Institution One] there was 40 on the wing, now there’s 90, you just can’t talk to the staff as much”

Kendrick: “[association] is cancelled [...] visits have been reduced by 15 minutes”

Lewis [about being bullied]: “Because I don’t think the staff can do nothing, I think telling staff would just make it worse”

The lower contact with staff demonstrates how there is less staff available to follow up any issues that arise, however, Lewis also stated there were times when he preferred less staff contact:

Lewis: “[...] the officers here, know that I’ll need space to calm down, if I’m angry, but at [Juvenile Institution Two] they didn’t, they just wanted to keep asking and hassling me and stuff like that”

Official guidance maintains that young people should be supported throughout their sentence with a plan to support their needs and resettlement (NOMS, 2015c). Nacro and Centrepont (2018) have found that transitioning between prisons is disruptive to sentence planning, this was found within the interview data analysis and the secondary analyses of HMIP qualitative survey data:

Kendrick: “Think I was one day off, I had a little bit to complete, because I thought I was going on Thursday so I didn’t do it all in the one day, I thought I’d complete the rest tomorrow, and they said the morning; ‘you’re going’ so I don’t think they’re going to put the pass through, I don’t know”

HMIP Survey Comment – YOI: “I was transferred here from [STC]. There was a lack of communication between [STC] and [YOI], all [the] information I received was wrong and the transfer at the time set me back 12 months in my education.”

Previous research has also found that sentence planning can also be ineffective if it is reliant upon superficial behavioural courses (Schinkel, 2015) a finding which reflected Noah's frustrations:

Noah: "[...] every single time I've had [a sentence plan] they've always 'oh anger management, anger management, must attend' I've already done it, you know, so not really no point, I've already done it so many times, my fifth jail what I've been in, that's all what I seem to be doing every single week is anger management course, I already know what they're going to tell me so there's not really no point is there"

The plans young people receive in prison are important for their ability to take control over their lives (Parry, 2006) and to facilitate access to services they require (Maguire and Raynor, 2017). Only six of the young people reported that they had a sentence plan, similarly, the HMIP survey data revealed that 52.4% of those held in young adult institutions felt nobody was helping them with their sentence plan targets. Poor planning procedures have been found within a number of reviews and inspection reports to impact upon prisoners' ability to progress within their new institution (CJI, 2016; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016b; HMCIP, 2016b, 2017c). Having no plan has been found to be a source of anxiety for young people (Hanham and Tracey, 2017):

Alejandro: "She [OMU worker] was like 'don't know when you're going to be doing that [sentence plan]' [...] she said the best thing to do is get in work, so you're not behind your cell all day"

Niall: "Nothing, there's no support for people who are, to get rehabilitated, there's, there's people, in their cells, you know, like I said, nervous to come out, all the fucking worst people who are on bang up and everything are [in] their cells 24/7, you know, there's, [association] always gets cancelled"

Niall: "[...] you're still staring at the same four walls you were looking at yesterday, and the day before."

R: "Is there any other way it [Young Adult/Adult Institution Two] could help you before you get released?"

Darren: No, just engage in normal regime”

Evidence has shown that engaging in a routine and activity can distract prisoners from negative emotions and a restricted regime drives feeling of frustration (Laws and Crewe, 2016) particularly by creating rifts in staff/prisoner relationships (Halsey, 2008). The lived experiences of young people contradicts the intentions of the official guidance and sentence planning as outlined within the PSI (NOMS, 2015c) which was found in this research to be ‘imagined’ (Carlen, 2008) and undermined.

Another aspect of their day-to-day life that the young people struggled with upon transition was the impact to their visits. Five young people moved to an institution nearer home, six were further away and three were about the same distance. Some commented that their families struggled with the added expense and time of travelling to visit them and visits booked up quickly.

R: “Do you receive visits from your family?”

Niall: Sometimes

R: Is it enough?

Niall: No, not really, it’s too far away”

Lewis: “I ain’t had a visit for almost a month and a half now

R. So why haven’t you?

Lewis: I don’t know. My Mum told me that it’s just fully booked.”

Previous research has outlined the importance of family involvement (Liebling, 2008; Farmer, 2017; McCarthy and Adams, 2017) but transition does not appear to enable these supportive relationships. Although some young people moved closer to home their inability to arrange visits meant that the distance was meaningless and the provision of family support could be lost.

The differences between the institutions, including aspects of the young adult/adult estate being more punitive, led some of the young people to reflect that they preferred the juvenile secure estate:

Luke: “Enhanced is a lot harder to get in this prison, because you have to get, I think it’s like three months if good behaviour, like proper good behaviour, instead of three weeks, you have to go to through the Governor and that as well”

Kendrick: “I wish, miss it really, because you don’t realise how good you have it in there

R: And what was good about it?

Kendrick: “Dunno, you get, treated like, dunno, just, like everything nice, you’re guaranteed [association] every day, education all day, you have a lot of gym, in here you get gym once a week”

Noah: “What do I think is better? Nothing is better, it’s just got worse, I’m much more far away from home, I don’t think anything has got better”

Niall: “[Juvenile Institution Two is] smaller, it smells better, better jobs and stuff that like, and I only had like what, a year left to do.”

The young people keenly felt the rupture to their sentence due to their transition and the drop in ETE, support and staffing provision as outlined within the official guidance (NOMS, 2012). The changes further demonstrate to young people that the institutions in which they are held cannot meet their needs.

Future transitions

Official guidance

The custodial guidance (NOMS, 2012, p. 2) offers little information about future transitions and the role of Probation stating that “long term sentence YOTs will usually transfer responsibility to the Probation Trust on or near the young person’s 18th birthday”. This guidance was released before the implementation of *Transforming Rehabilitation* (MoJ, 2013b) whilst this is acknowledged within the YJB guidance (2015, 2018d) it is more focused on community transitions. The YJB (2018d) outlines the requirement for post-transition review meetings held in the community by the NPS/CRC and attended by the YOT and young

person to 'review' the transition. For custodial sentences the NPS/CRC should work jointly with the YOT to assess the young person's needs in terms of their placement and transition plan. The YJB (2018d, p. 10) guidance states that "where possible the identified NPS or CRC worker should meet the young person whilst in custody prior to release" and contribute to their resettlement plan.

'Insider' key stakeholders' perspectives

Concerns have also been raised within YOTs about the quality of care for young people when they transfer between services (Lepper, 2015) leading some YOTs to retain the care of some young people. Probation Officer Three was quite unsympathetic about the approach taken by YOTs:

Probation Officer Three: "This one that transferred last week, just transferred over here, I did a load of stuff, had a telephone conference and all that, he's here, I've seen him once, you know, just after he came in, and as far as I know, he's alright, got an email this morning from his former offender supervisor at [Juvenile YOI]; 'oh, I'm just wondering how he's getting on' WHAT? WHY? They've finished with him. It's almost like, they mother them so much in there, that they can't let go, and then when they come here, they don't know what's hit them, because they're not getting mothered anymore, they've got to be adults, they've got to make decisions for themselves" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

The IMB (2017b) have called for 'greater clarity' for the transfer of services between YOT and Probation and a number of practitioners within this research reported that they had difficulties contacting Probation Services:

Offender Supervisor Two: "Probation are quite difficult anyway to get hold of, because they view it as, when they're in here, they haven't got to worry about them, they're not out committing offences in the community" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Three)

Senior Officer One: "Finding out who someone's new Probation Officer is isn't always, easy, because it hasn't been sorted out yet hasn't, been handed over yet, but that comes with having a lack of Probation staff as well." (Young Adult/Adult Institution One)

Probation Officer Two was frustrated by delays and suggested they were due to 'chaos' in the Probation Service. As the young person's 'home' Probation Officer is expected to complete their OAsys assessment problems with this relationship directly impacted upon their progression within the young adult/adult institution and future transitions into the community:

Probation Officer Two: "The issue we have in the prison is that until they've got that, if they're high risk, until they've got a Probation officer, we do not get an OAsys assessment [...] so they can't be assessed for any sort of programme, because we need to OAsys assessment, which determines, suitability" (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

The lack of preparation in place for the transition between YOTs and Probation Services echoes Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation's (2016a, p. 6) finding that there is "insufficient timely sharing of information between the youth and adult based services to enable sentence plans to be delivered without interruption". Whilst the most recent official guidance (YJB, 2018d) outlines that the OAsys assessment should be completed by the Probation Service working with the young people, the data analysis here shows how this is unfulfilled in practice to the detriment of the young people preventing them from gaining the opportunity to progress through their sentence within the young adult/adult estate. As this element of support drops off upon transition, the rehabilitative and resettlement needs of young people are not met.

'Outsider' key stakeholders' perspectives

The 'outsider' key stakeholders felt that the arbitrary age-determined services working with young people are unsuitable, particularly as the juvenile secure estate population is increasingly older – and therefore more likely to experience the transition - with more complex needs (Bateman, 2015) and longer sentences (MoJ, 2018f; YJB, 2018b):

Young Adults in the Criminal Justice System Expert: "[...] the whole ethos of youth custody has been working with children preparing them for release into the community, and I don't see evidence that the system is geared up to this new challenge where the majority are going to spend their adolescence and formative adult years in prisons. So, there is a particular vulnerability for those children that are going to move across into the [young adult/]adult estate."

Academic Two: “[...] the potential to provide support to kids that will help them feel confident about having the protection to change when they are released is reduced”

Leaving Care Expert: “[...] if you integrate Probation within a Youth Justice Service, then that Probation Service almost has to come down to that level, if you take it out you have to come up to that level and its more difficult, sets kids up to fail you know”

They felt that the move to Probation continued the responsabilising discourse; the young people were suddenly expected to take greater ownership of their rehabilitation and resettlement (Bullock and Bunce, 2018) which exemplified the differences in treatment for ‘children’ and ‘adults’:

Inspector Two: “[...] the adult world is colder, and expects you to take responsibility for your own actions”

Inspector Two: “[...] the Probation Services are set up to deal with both an 18 year old, a 40 year old and a 60 year old, and one would hope that they would take account of maturity, but I did not see evidence of that in the documentation or treatment that we observed during the inspections.”

The drop in support offered to young people upon transition to Probation is also considered to be due to the resources available within the service:

Civil Servant Two: “I think sometimes YOTs and Probation share the information but don’t necessarily discuss much themselves [...] and there’s little understanding, that I think that’s more about the capacity that they have and again lack of funding and everything else, which makes them, their workload is pretty huge”

Inspector Two: “[...] [The Probation Service] don’t care they’ve got a 120 other cases in the CRC’s case, it’s too many other people really”

The ‘outsider’ key stakeholders felt that the disjointed nature between youth and adult services, along with the fragmented condition of the Probation Services due to the split between NPS and CRCs (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2015a, 2017a; Burke, 2016; CJJI, 2016; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018b) means that the transition between

services offers little developmentally appropriate support for an increasing number of young people. This can also be to the detriment of their future transitions.

Young peoples' perspectives

The young people found the drop in support between YOT and Probation to be profound, only five young people had met their Probation worker within their YOI and four had received telephone calls from them, but none had received a visit since they arrived:

Casper: "They were meant to come visit me in [Juvenile Institution Two], but they didn't, I spoke to them over the phone though, because they said it's too far they don't want to come up here just for a meeting and that, so I speak to them on the phone and that"

Casper: Yeah, my YOT worker always come, would always come to [Juvenile Institution Two], but that's when, you know when you're younger they have more care of you [...] they kinda have to, but because you're older, because I'm older now, they don't really have, don't really have to come see me"

Edward: "Nah, Probation won't come see me

R: Why?

Edward: They're saying it's too far [laughs]"

"Edward: [...] shocking, they just leave you don't they?"

Christopher: "No, they don't, I've not, they don't come visit you

R: At all?

Christopher: No, they just do phone calls once a year

R: Okay, and when are you expecting a phone call?

Christopher: Ah, no idea, whenever she phones innit"

The young people felt that the lack of relationships with their Probation officers meant that they were unable to progress within their sentence and in their future transitions into the community:

Casper: "I think, I've got to do that [thinking skills programme] course, I'm not sure though, because I done [Life Minus Violence] and it's basically the same thing, they're saying 'we're not sure if you have to do it, depends what your Probation said', but my Probation ain't come back on me yet, they ain't said anything yet, so, I'm guessing I don't have to so, I'd rather do it, rather be safe than sorry, rather, yeah"

Kendrick: "[...] I'm still on YOT at the moment, obviously Probation should have taken over but until they take over I don't have a sentence plan

R: Okay, and are you still in touch with your YOT worker?

Kendrick: Nah. I think my Mum is in contact with her she's, she's annoyed too that they haven't taken over, I think she's chased it up for me

Noah: "No, she [Probation worker] keeps on blanking my calls, my letter, she ain't replied to any of my letters, so I ain't going to hassle her"

The angst of waiting to hear about decisions regarding their parole or home detention curfew made the young people feel apprehensive:

R: "What are you concerned about when you leave the young adult/adult prison?"

Edward: Bit nervous, being institutionalised"

Lewis: "I have to go to [a] Probation officer in the town called [town] that's where I did the crime and the guy that I did it to lives down the road"

The lack of support and recognition the young people received demonstrated to them that they were not listened to or respected. This reinforced negative perception of the professionals working with them as careless and unreliable (Paulsen and Thomas, 2017). In

response the young people had resigned themselves to the fact that they had to be self-reliant (Harvey, 2012) and adapt as they had done many times previously:

Alejandro: “I’ve moved around a lot [...] so, I think I’ve got, I’ve gotten used to like packing everything up and going to a new place like so”

Noah” What my life? Nah [smirks] it ain’t changed my life, I’m just in a different prison, in a different part of the country, not arsed, I just get on with it wherever I go” (post)

The arbitrary nature of transitions has ramifications which compound its effects. Although the young people experienced a significant amount of uncertainty about their transition into the young adult/adult estate there was an inevitability that it would take place. In contrast the young people were filled with uncertainty about their next transition into the community upon release. The official guidance offers little intent to provide a holistic transition experience for young people who find a ‘cliff-edge’ of support (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) upon ‘adulthood’ and are further excluded (HMIP, 1999).

Conclusion

The young people were apprehensive about their arrival in young adult/adult institutions and their fears were aggravated with limited information during transfer and a hostile reception from staff. They attempted to distance themselves from any notion of vulnerability and sought to ‘cope’ within their new institution. As Gooch (2017, p. 13) has noted, coping is an ongoing, dynamic process which can be destabilised. Although the ‘insider’ key stakeholders identified that this population is ultimately vulnerable within the young adult/adult estate, the ‘insider’ key stakeholders felt that the circumstances within the estate limits their ability to address it. As support is not available for young people when they required it, the repercussions of transitions are felt across relationships with peers, contact with family and Probation for future transition and resettlement.

Young people undergoing developmental transitions may express challenging behaviour (Gooch, 2017) however the abrupt institutional shift in their identity from ‘child’ to ‘adult’ from age 18 years means that they have fewer people to voice their concerns to. Staff members were typically unsympathetic to this and took the view which aligned with the MoJ

(2013a) that young people should be more autonomous from age 18 years. As a result, the vulnerabilities of young people who are no longer considered to be particularly vulnerable post-transition as 'adults' are exacerbated as they face a 'cliff-edge' of support (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015) during the period of developmental maturity which actually magnifies their specific needs (Gooch, 2016, 2017; HMIP, 2017a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c).

Staff members within institutions felt as unprepared for the transition as young people due to limited information from the juvenile secure estate about arrivals and across systems. From the perspective of key stakeholders within institutions the young adult/adult penal estate does not have the resources to support young people through their transitions. Communication between institutions and shortage of resources means that transitions are "frequently abrupt and inadequately planned" (The Royal College of Psychiatrists cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61).

There is as Carlen (2008, p. 4) has highlighted previously "an observable contradiction between policy objectives and policy achievements". The official guidance expects that the transition is conducted as "smoothly as possible" (NOMS, 2012, p. 1) however the experience for young people is an abrupt transition to an institution in which they are expected to be more autonomous. The responsabilising discourse is evident as young people seek to 'cope' in their new environment but struggle with the realities of day-to-day life (Gooch, 2017). There is a limited strategy (Medlicott, 2008) post-transition which exacerbates the fundamentally harmful experience of imprisonment for young people drawn from particularly marginalised circumstances previously.

Chapter Seven. Pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult estate

Introduction

This chapter draws together the data presented and analysed within Chapters Five and Six which have addressed the second research objective to: *advance understandings of the means by which young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system.* Within this chapter the principal findings from this research are presented. It draws out six core themes and areas for discussion which lead into the concluding chapter and raise a series of policy implications. The six core themes identified are: (i) vulnerability, (ii) coping, (iii) distance between ‘child’ and ‘young adult’ (iv) distance between policy and practice (v) the impact of transitions and (vi) future transitions. Given the significant body of research regarding the vulnerability of young people held within the juvenile secure estate (see for example Goldson, 2002; Willow, 2015; Gooch, 2016, 2017) it is inevitable that this would be a prominent theme here. Indeed, the first objective of this research seeks to: *extend knowledge of the (seemingly compounding) vulnerabilities of child/young prisoners* in the context of their transition between the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate. The research themes in this chapter set out how the experiences of institutional transition serve to further the harms experienced by young people in penal detention. It is argued that the vulnerability of young people is exacerbated as they are subject to an arbitrary age-determined transition upon turning age 18 years and move from an institution intended to provide greater support for their developmental needs to one that has distinctly less provision to achieve this. The experiences have been found to depart from the expectations of the official guidance. Young people are expected to cope despite the detrimental experiences of transition and incarceration. The ramifications for their future transitions into the community are also considered.

Vulnerability

The YJB (2018g, p. 4) acknowledge that “by the very definition and nature of custody, children within the secure estate are the most vulnerable and damaged” and those held are expected to receive additional provision through regimes and staffing levels structured to support them in the juvenile secure estate (NOMS, 2012; MoJ, 2014; Department for Education, 2015a; Gov.UK, 2018a). Wider academic literature has suggested that “the vulnerability

evident in the child custodial population extends to young adults” (Bateman, 2015, p. 5, see also Inquest and Transition to Adulthood, 2015) but this is not fully considered in official guidance regarding adults (NOMS, 2015b). The assessment of a child’s vulnerability when they enter the juvenile secure estate (YJB, 2014c) differs to that within the young adult/adult estate (NOMS, 2015b) and is based on “judgements about whether the child is likely to harm her/himself or attempt to commit suicide” (Goldson, 2002, p. 7). This practice has been criticised in independent reviews (Newcomen, 2016) but was repeatedly found within this research.

Subsequent assessments intended to identify ‘risk’ factors have been found to be limited in focus emphasising first the risks young people present to an institution (Case, 2006). The ‘insider’ key stakeholders revealed how their assessments of vulnerability within both the juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult estate are based upon how young people present themselves upon arrival and whether they are deemed able to ‘cope’ within the prison environment. Being able to ‘cope’ is itself considered sufficient. In official guidance risk factors are taken to mean the prospect of suicide and self-harm (MoJ, 2013c) which demonstrates how institutions are principally focused upon processes rather than individual needs. Brown (2011, p. 319) has argued that “there is something *unrealised* about the state of vulnerability. Someone is not vulnerable if they are plunging off the edge of a mountain to their death; they are vulnerable if they *might*”, taking this perspective concerns about vulnerability should be identified and addressed before they accumulate into suicide and self-harm. However, in seeking to assess vulnerability through blunt assessment procedures institutions fail to acknowledge the ‘unrealised’ broader complexities of vulnerability, not least the vulnerability of young people by virtue of being held within an institution.

Academics have highlighted how the concept of ‘vulnerability’ within institutional settings has become an accepted characteristic of those held (Medlicott, 2008; Brown, Ecclestone and Emmel, 2017) and so its meaning has diminished, this resonates with Inspector One’s comment (see page 107):

“they have a problem that everyone’s vulnerable, so if everyone’s vulnerable no one really is”

As a result, a hierarchy of vulnerability naturally emerges within institutions (Goldson, 2002). This research has shown how the assessment of an individuals’ vulnerability is based upon their perceived ability to ‘cope’ and that ‘risk’ is constructed by an assessment which prioritises the ‘risks’ a young person may pose *to the institution* rather than the risk the

institution *poses to them* (Case, 2006). Goldson (2008, p. 89) has argued that: “the low level of social value afforded to such children (‘unsuitable victims’ with ‘lesser status’) renders them particularly prone, by omission or commission, to systemic maltreatment within socio-political contexts where those responsible operate with impunity.” The assessment procedures young people are subject to construct their identity (Crewe, 2011a; Warr, 2019). The institutionally enforced vulnerabilities are not addressed as they are an accepted feature of a period of incarceration. This research supports the view that the categories of ‘vulnerable’ and ‘risk’ overlap (Goldson, 2002) throughout a period of imprisonment.

In Chapter Six (see page 147 and 151) ‘insider’ key stakeholders revealed how ‘vulnerability’ is evaluated differently across estates:

Offender Supervisor One: “Sometimes we get an Asset, sometimes we don’t and then an OASys is started from scratch again, taking the information from, unfortunately it doesn’t migrate across and the information goes in, it’s like a totally new assessment” (Young Adult/Adult Institution Two)

Inspector Two: “The OASys system doesn’t have a vulnerability section”

Vulnerability is therefore constructed differently within the young adult/adult estate than the juvenile YOIs and young people, from age 18 years, are expected to be less vulnerable, despite the official guidance (NOMS, 2012) and independent commentators (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) acknowledging that the transition serves to exacerbate vulnerability. The young people within this research continued to be the most *at risk* but were considered as *the* ‘risk’ (Case, 2006).

As Goldson (2002) has asserted, how vulnerability will manifest cannot be predicted but ‘insider’ key stakeholders were found to focus upon the immediate vulnerability of young people as defined by blunt assessment procedures. The Engagement and Resettlement Worker (see page 107) outlined how they determine the ‘vulnerability’ of young people upon arrival and expect that this diminishes with prison experience:

Engagement and Resettlement Worker: “[...] I think most of the [young offenders] that I have come into contact ... they’re not vulnerable when they go, they’re sort of hardened to it to be honest” (Juvenile Institution One)

The official guidance states that assessments should be continually reviewed (YJB, 2013; NOMS, 2015c) however the assessment procedures are fundamentally flawed as they do not appear to be used as young people travel between the institutions. This is problematic pre- and post-transition as anxieties and frustrations can manifest and be expressed in numerous different ways (Gooch, 2017). The juvenile secure estate and young adult/adult institutions present 'omnipresent' risks (Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015) to those held and young people struggle within the prison environment per se (Gooch, 2017; Laws, 2018).

'Triggers' for risk factors within official guidance are largely based on historical factors which can be identified upon arrival such as offence status and recent transfer (MoJ, 2013c) however academic commentators have shown that adaptation to institutions (Harvey, 2012) and transitions (Dwyer and Wyn, 2001) are more precarious. These factors also present issues for vulnerability. Within the young adult/adult estate it is apparent that limited information and availability of staff means that any issues or concerns about vulnerability tend not to be followed up, unless they are explicitly related to suicide or self-harm. This practice demonstrates how "continuation of care" (NOMS, 2012, p. 1) as expected from the official guidance for the transition experience is 'imagined' (Carlen, 2008). 'Insider' key stakeholders within the young adult/adult estate suggested that their inability to provide appropriate post arrival and post-transition support is due to lack of staffing resource and adequate provision to continually address and identify vulnerability. Practitioners therefore "manage imaginary penalties" (Carlen, 2008, p. 5) to maintain their professional identities and adhere to the resources at their disposal despite the implications for young people.

The young people acknowledged that being within an institution renders them vulnerable (Harvey, 2012) and many were reluctant to be conceived as vulnerable as it implies weakness (Brown, 2011). Prisoners seek to place themselves 'above the line' of vulnerability (Laws and Crewe, 2016) by demonstrating that they are able to 'cope'. Although official guidance acknowledges that transition is a period of vulnerability (NOMS, 2012; MoJ, 2013c) adult prisoners are only deemed to be vulnerable if they are "at risk of bullying, suicide or self-harm" (Gov.UK, 2018b). The *Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006* (HM Government, 2006, p. 59 (1) (e)) states that a person aged over 18 years is vulnerable if "he is detained in lawful custody" although this was omitted under the *Protection of Freedoms Act 2012* (HM Government, 2012, p. 65 (1)). HMCIP conceive vulnerable adults by adopting the Department of Health (2000 cited in HMCIP, 2017b, p. 22) definition: "who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation". It is argued here that young people held within institutions are subject to harms from the

institution and therefore *all* young people whether in the juvenile secure estate or young adult/adult estate are vulnerable.

Throughout their sentence, young people can be held in their cells, effectively isolated. This initially occurs as they await induction but can continue due to restrictions placed upon the regime owing to staffing levels, insufficient places in ETE and safety reasons. A period of isolation is harmful to prisoners of all ages (NPM, 2017; PPO, 2017). For young people in particular, a period of isolation contributes to negative feelings and affects relationships with staff (Halsey, 2008). Young people upon transition can be held in isolation as the transfer disrupts their ability to start ETE within their new establishment. This fundamentally undermines the rehabilitative aims of both estates (Ofsted, 2010; CJI, 2012; CLINKS, 2016) and demonstrates the risks institutions pose to young people due to the effects of being held in isolation.

Coping

The harsh prison environment presents “a culture of mutual mistrust, fear, aggression and barely submerged violence” (Crewe *et al.*, 2014, p. 56). Within this study, the young people were informed by staff upon entry to the institution to expect violence and they responded to meet that threat. This initial negative interaction with staff coloured the relationships between them and the young people. The young people felt untrusting of staff, uninformed about their transition and generally powerless over their circumstances. To mask their vulnerability, young people in institutions seek to adapt by employing coping strategies (Harvey, 2012) to ‘survive’ (Schinkel, 2015; Willow, 2015). Young people learn these behaviours such as being self-reliant (Harvey, 2012) and keeping a low profile or fighting. These are learnt behaviours whether from their experiences prior to prison (Katz, 2001) or from previous prison experience. Young people utilise these techniques to appear to cope throughout their time within an institution and upon transfer. Assessment procedures assess how well an individual appears to be able to cope. However, coping, alike adaptation is “an ongoing, dynamic process” (Gooch, 2017, p. 13), whilst young people may learn how to appear to cope, it is argued here that vulnerability does not diminish across estates as the institutionally-inflicted risks continue.

Upon arrival the staff informed the young people to ‘keep their head down’, in doing so the staff instructed the young people how to appear to be coping. From entry young people learn to present themselves in a way that demonstrates that they can ‘cope’ in the “strong shall survive” setting (Bartollas, 1982, p. 165) of the prison environment. Social survival is based

upon avoiding victimisation and is achieved by containing and concealing any weakness (de Viggiani, 2018). Young people become compliant to the institutional expectations that they keep a low profile, do not challenge why they are given such limited information about their transition nor question why there is not appropriate support in place for them. They learn to adapt to the environment which continues their adverse life experiences. Young people draw on the perceived positive aspects of their transition; less education, more ETE opportunities, not being with 'immature peers', and use this to look forward to their transition as another means of coping whilst within the juvenile secure estate. This enables them to focus their identity on being an 'adult' – something the young people within this research associated with greater freedoms and better treatment from staff.

Young people who have had disrupted relationships previously (Harvey, 2012; Paulsen and Berg, 2016; Paulsen and Thomas, 2017) are likely to lack trust in people working with them. Perceptions of trust are associated with respect (Harvey, 2012). The young people in this research were not found to have developed trusting relationships with staff members within either estate, typically due their initial interaction upon entry and a desire to conceal any emotion and vulnerability within the institution as "seeking support [i]s not their usual coping strategy" (Harvey, 2012, p. 97). Young people may use aggression to express their vulnerabilities (Gooch, 2017) or as a coping mechanism but staff often respond to such behaviours with punitive sanctions. In the juvenile secure estate, the young people in this research felt that the staff were careless about their transition and were withholding information which impacted upon levels of trust and mutual respect. In the young adult/adult estate the young people tended to perceive the staff as unwilling and unavailable to meet their needs.

Distinction between 'child' and 'young adult'

Although there remains a 'statutory distinction' between young adult offenders (aged 18-20 years) and adult offenders (aged 21 years and older) (MoJ, 2013a) there appears to be little difference in their treatment (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c). One notable change in official guidance is how the language changes from 'child' and 'young person' (YJB, 2013, 2014c) to 'younger prisoners' (MoJ, 2013c; NOMS, 2015b; YJB, 2018d) reflective of the lesser investment in their needs as they assume the label of 'prisoner' (Crewe, 2011a; Warr, 2019). Young people move from juvenile institutions that are supposed to provide individually focused support into harsher, more punitive, adult-orientated institutions (Barry, 2006; Prison Reform Trust and Inquest, 2012; Jaspers *et al.*, 2017). Research has shown how

punitive treatment of young people is ineffective; it intensifies previously difficult circumstances and does not provide appropriate support to aid authentic resettlement (Katz, 2001; Goldson, 2002, 2015). The experience of imprisonment ‘stalls’ maturation (Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform 2015) but upon transition young people, as adults, are expected to become autonomous (MoJ, 2014), and at the same time, have no opportunity to demonstrate any control over their lives. They remain powerless over their circumstances (Wyn and White, 1997).

As highlighted in Chapter Two, the movement between childhood and adulthood is a crucial period of identity formation (Benson and Elder, 2011; Arnett, 2015) and young people may not wish to adopt the terms placed upon them based upon their age. The view of most of the young people within this research that they were ready to leave the juvenile YOI and enter a young adult/adult institution appeared, in many cases, to be a front to mask their fears or vulnerabilities (Jewkes, 2005b; Crewe, 2009, 2011b; Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat, 2015). The young people aligned with the view that they should be progressing into adulthood at age 18 years although this view was subject to some contradictions as they still desired some level of support. Their claims that they felt ‘ready’ to move and progress through to the young adult/adult estate suggests a sense of being in ‘limbo’; not quite a child but also not quite an adult (Heinz and Krüger, 2001). In articulating this, there was also a sense of inevitability; that the move would happen and so they wished to get beyond the uncertainty of ‘when’ and move as soon as possible.

Those working with young people often make decisions about their lives and circumstances (Mary, 2014) in ways that neglect young peoples’ perspectives (Griffiths, 1996). This research highlights the importance of listening to the young peoples’ views, particularly as they were found to differ so much from the rhetoric of official guidance and ‘insider’ accounts. Within institutions young people are aware that they operate at an inferior social position (Heinz and Krüger, 2001; Halsey, 2007; Goldson, 2008; Mary, 2014) and are deemed “lesser social objects” (Crewe, 2009, p. 161) consolidated by the fact that penal institutions make lower investments in their care as they grow into adulthood.

Youth justice intervention is said to give young people “the space to mature and where possible to promote mechanisms that support that process of maturation.” (Bateman, 2017, p. 57). The social constructionist perspective discussed in Chapter Two outlines how the wider social context of an individual affects their sense of being ‘adult’ (Bryan-Hancock and Casey, 2011; Bessant, Farthing and Watts, 2017; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018). However, the

distinction between 'childhood' and 'adulthood' within institutions is absolute, meaning that young people are expected to leave the juvenile secure estate upon turning age 18 years. These arbitrary age categories are reductionist (James and James, 2004) and biologically grounded which "undermines the complexity of issues" (Ellis, 2018, p. 156) young people experience. Dr Phillip Lee, then the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the MoJ, acknowledged (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017, p. 6-7) that setting an age limit is arbitrary but argues that they must 'draw the line' and that age 18 years is suitable given the societal context of adulthood being set at this age: "the Department has to recognise that society broadly thinks that at 18 you can make decisions for which you take responsibility." This research demonstrates that in many cases this distinction is unsuitable and compounds problems.

Young people are not afforded the human and social capital that supports their transitions to adulthood (Nacro, 2001; Roberts, 2009; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) within penal institutions. Indeed, Barry (2006) argues that the CJS tends to erode any capital that has been attained previously. The 'usual markers' of transition and 'adult' status: leaving home, starting an occupation and marriage (Wallace and Kovetcheva, 1998; Blatterer, 2007) are out of reach for young people held in institutions and so their 'sense' of being 'adult' is defined in respect of their status as offenders and prisoners. As 'childhood' implies factors which do not help young people to survive in prison: "vulnerability, dependence, immaturity and inexperience" (Gooch, 2017, p. 15) they wish to distance themselves from the notion of being a 'child' (Coyle, 2019). Despite still requiring support young people often become 'disenfranchised' from supportive services (Ellis, 2018, p. 156) and desire an environment in which they feel like they are treated like adults. The 'insider' key stakeholders were found to follow the rhetoric of official guidance and promote an abrupt distinction between estates whilst 'outsider' key stakeholders thought that there should be more flexibility across estates.

HMCIP (2008) reported over 10 years ago that young adult institutions had reduced regimes and policies orientated for adult population. This finding has been repeated in more recent inspection reports (HMCIP, 2017a, 2018j; NPM, 2018) but in a context of a declining dedicated young adult estate (Nacro, 2001; Bateman, 2015). The data presented within Chapters Five and Six demonstrates how this continues as regimes across estates are frequently cancelled and restricted. The young adult/adult estate has less of a focus upon the ETE opportunities in place for young people, lower provision and limited relationships between young people and the Probation Service which means that opportunities for rehabilitation and resettlement within the young adult/adult estate are largely ignored.

The significantly lower staffing levels within the young adult/adult estate means that staff do not “have the time to build positive, effective relationships with young people.” (HMIP, 2018, p. 22). There is a lack of individualised and developmentally appropriate support which affects how young people are responded to. Young people and key stakeholders agreed that the specific individual needs of those transitioning cannot be addressed with the resources available. The angst and uncertainty for young people undergoing developmental transitions to adulthood within a chaotic environment leads to frustrations and disruptive behaviour (Gooch, 2017). However, staff members fail to see difficult behaviour as an expression of frustration. Young adults require positive interactions with staff and opportunities to help them with impulsive control and emotional maturity, but this is not afforded to them within the institutions in which they are held (McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark, 2016). Their circumstances are ultimately aggravated by their experiences of incarceration and transition.

There is a profound shift in the treatment and management of young people as they transition into ‘young adults’ within the CJS. The responsibility for their care and rehabilitation moves abruptly from a more welfare based juvenile secure estate supported by the YOS to a more responsabilising, control based young adult/adult estate in which the presence of the Probation Service is more remote. As Garland (1997, p. 207) has highlighted these differences mean that the “responsible offender is thus conjured in and out of existence by the different working ideologies of criminal justice agencies.” Young adults are lost. There is on one hand a recognition of the requirements for young adults within independent reviews (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and government documents (MoJ, 2015b, 2017a; Stewart, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018a). But on the other hand, the systems operate from a position where institutions previously designated specifically for young adult offenders are mixed with prisoners of all ages. The Probation Service is further stretched and, in many cases, fails to adopt a developmentally appropriate approach to managing caseloads of young adults.

Distance between policy and practice

This research demonstrates how there are essentially four understandings of transition: (i) the official guidance (ii) the ‘insider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working within penal institutions, (iii) the ‘outsider’ key stakeholder perspectives: those working outside of penal institutions and (iv) the experiences of the young people themselves. There is a discernible distance between the system and processes of transition as laid down in the official guidance and the lived experiences of the young people. The *‘Transitions Statement’*

which declares that the transition process “must be managed safely both for the young person and their community” (YJB, 2018d, p. 4) is not the reality. As Carlen (2008, p. 4, see also Goldson, 2019) has acknowledged “there is nothing new about the existence of an observable contradiction between policy objectives and policy achievements”. The findings from this research reveal a more complex picture; ‘insider’ key stakeholders both maintained that the official guidance is adhered to and young people have an experience that meets the policy objectives – despite the accounts of young people who reported otherwise – and reported that appropriate support that provides a ‘seamless’ transition (NOMS, 2012, p. 3), particularly in the young adult/adult estate, is not available due to the lack of resources and provision available. Therefore, ‘insider’ key stakeholders simultaneously acknowledged and denied that the official guidance is not adhered to. There is a sense that each institution follows institutionally determined practices and initiatives that depart, or are interpreted in particular ways, from the official guidance.

Young people, as prisoners, have little opportunity to express their views (Crewe, 2011b) about their transition. Although the official guidance states that young people should be involved in the preparation for their transfer (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d) it is an accepted practice that they are informed on the day of their transition that they are scheduled to move. Within this research, this was typically in a cold manner with staff members unlocking their doors in the morning, informing them to pack their bags and taking them to reception. The practice of informing young people on the day symbolises the blunt and abrupt nature of transition. Limited information leads to frustrations, challenging behaviour (Gooch, 2017) and can invoke discipline transfers as discussed below. This demonstrates how penal power (Crewe, 2011a) is used to manage rather than engage young people (Thomas and Kane, 1998; de Viggiani, 2012; Adler *et al.*, 2016). Their specific needs and developmental immaturity are overlooked despite a growing recognition of this within official discourse (MoJ, 2013a; NOMS, 2015b; MoJ, 2017a).

Within this research ‘insider’ key stakeholders reported that other institutions or services hinder transition procedures. They felt that better communication between institutions could improve transitions; particularly as practitioners from the young adult/adult estate appeared to believe that the juvenile secure estate does not share information and arranges discipline transfers for young people exhibiting the most challenging behaviour. This research found evidence of discipline transfers in the cases of Casper and Noah within the juvenile secure estate and Noah between young adult/adult institutions. By conducting these transfers the institutions again work in accordance with institutional interests rather than the

young person's interests. Discipline transfers, particularly between the juvenile secure estate to young adult/adult estate, quite simply move young people from an estate that should acknowledge and accommodate their developmental needs to one that cannot or does not. This research shows how such transitions further exacerbate the harms caused to young people held within penal institutions (Bartollas, 1982; Goldson, 2002; Willow, 2015; Bosworth and Kellezi, 2017; Gooch, 2017). There is a clear gap between policy aims and practice and inconsistencies between institutions largely due to poor communication and insufficient resources.

Resource pressures across estates limit adequate regimes and staffing levels which means that from entry to the juvenile secure estate young people are without the resources that are meant to support them. The lack of individually tailored, reliable transition planning and lower standards of care is evident throughout their period of incarceration. The prospect of transitioning further ruptures the rehabilitative prospects for young people as they find fewer resources as they progress through the juvenile estate or are prevented from beginning certain programmes due to their limited time within the YOI. Upon transition, their regimes are further reduced because of the nature of the young adult/adult estate, lack of places on ETE programmes and limited sentence planning. Young people also have lower contact with staff, a practice acknowledged in the official guidance (NOMS, 2012) and by the 'insider' key stakeholders. The denial of appropriate relationships is reflective of institutional power (Sim, 1994) and the assumption that as adults they no longer require such support. The young people are 'catapulted' into adult identities and must accept their circumstances (Longfield and Casey, 2018).

The impacts of transitions

The second principal research objective of this thesis is to advance understandings of the means by which young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system and this was explored within the data presented and analysed in Chapters Five and Six. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the experiences of imprisonment are often harmful, particularly for young people at a 'formative' age in the life course (Gooch, 2017; Hanham and Tracey, 2017). The prospect of transition serves to further such harms due to the uncertainty, placement disruption and rupture in the support available to young people. They feel isolated, lost (Barn, 2010; Harvey, 2012) and vulnerable (HMIP, 2016a). As previous inspection reports have found many young people feel 'unprepared' for the reality of the

move (CJI, 2012; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2015b) and unclear about the change of service and the change of expectations of them (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a).

Harvey (2012) has outlined how prisoners make numerous transitions; from the community to the YOI: from court, to the prison escort vehicle, to the reception, to the induction unit and to other spaces within prison. He explains how such shifts are all signal points of vulnerability, and for present purposes, such processes are repeated as young people make a further major transition to the young adult/adult estate. In this research, the young people expressed their concerns and anxieties about transitions, but they were often quickly shut down by staff members. In effect, the transition evokes further uncertainties within an already uncertain prison environment (Gibbs, 1982; Crewe, 2011a).

As young people negotiate their transitions to adulthood, they also have to navigate a new institution with new challenges, risks and uncertainties and the young adult/adult institution adds to these "complexities of normal adolescent development" (McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark, 2016, p. 5). The young people in this research were prepared to have lower investments made in them and fewer resources available to them and in many respects this symbolises their lower social standing (Goldson, 2008). The regimes, institutional contradictions and the treatment of the young people based on their age and their experiences of transition is ultimately determined by the needs of the institutions rather than the needs of young people. Young people have no choice but to engage in a 'fast-track' transition (Jones, 2002; Bynner *et al.*, 2002; SEU, 2005) into adulthood. Young people "appear to lose their status as children when they enter the very 'adult' prison environment" (Gooch, 2015, p. 5) and they assume identities constructed by the institution (Warr, 2019) such as: 'offender' and 'risky' (Gooch, 2015).

Transitions are disruptive, fraught (Hughes and Strong, 2016) and require adjustment; "some are successful, some are painful and require coping resources" (Gibbs, 1982, p. 33). Young people are told to expect violence, are expected to 'cope' and learn to adapt within the power structures that exist within the institutions in which they are held. Academic Two questioned how well young people can be prepared:

"[...] there is a sense in, however many times you are told something you still, [un]till you actually experience, it is quite hard to get your head round" (Academic Two)

Despite receiving little information about their transition young people try to mentally prepare for the transition. Upon transition they have to negotiate their identity in a new establishment whilst experiencing transitions into adulthood. By denying young people a fresh start within their new establishment due to sharing behavioural records institutions exhibit further “psychological power” over young people (Crewe, 2011a, p. 518).

Opportunities for individually tailored support reduce upon entry to the young adult/adult estate where the young people reported minimal post-transition support and disruptions to their ETE. ‘Insider’ and ‘outsider’ key stakeholders acknowledged that the dropping away of resources available to young people in the young adult/adult estate serves to exacerbate their vulnerability. The official guidance (NOMS, 2012) and the institutions offer little by way of post-transition support, leaving young people to ‘cope’ alone. They are simply expected to adapt and conform to the new environment with limited information and minimal support. The institutions essentially endorse the view, which young people have to accept, that risk and responsibility are placed at an individual level (including responsibility to adapt and accept their circumstances) rather than at an institutional level eased by appropriate resources (Liebenberg, Ungar and Ikeda, 2015).

Future transitions

From entry to an institution a prisoner’s identity is constructed by the institution (Warr, 2019). Young people, during the formative stage of their life course, seek to develop and form their identity whilst incarcerated (Hulley, Crewe and Wright, 2016). The identity they are supposed to have whilst held can be ambiguous (Warr, 2019) this research supports the view of Halsey (2007, p. 362) that:

“custody confirms – in the most visceral of ways – that they are offenders first and foremost and only secondarily (and incidentally) people dealt a rough hand or start to life, or who made bad ‘choices’ at ‘critical’ moments, or who could indeed ‘make good’ given half a chance (given the kinds of support desired by each young person).”

The harms of imprisonment continue as young people seek to improve their future circumstances (Irwin and Owen, 2005). The prospects for a positive future are difficult to attain, however (Bateman, Hazel and Wright, 2013). Prisoners have limited control over their circumstances during their passive experience of incarceration which infantilises rather than empowers them (Miller, 2000). They do not ‘do time’ as this term implies’ “some kind of action, some kind of engagement in an activity to assist with passing the hours, days, months,

and years” (Halsey, 2007, p. 353). The young people in this research were especially concerned about their uncertain future, particularly due to the lack of consistent relationships with the Probation Service and the relative absence of support upon release. This inevitably continued to invoke the harmful uncertainties, insecurities and frustrations of prison life.

The restricted and limited structure of institutions “steadily erodes the skills prisoners will need to cope with life in the outside” (Irwin and Owen, 2005, p. 100). As Carlen (2005, p. 437) has argued “prisons cannot plausibly claim to rehabilitate at the same time as their primary custodial function necessitates regimes which debilitate.” The IMB have found a number of problems regarding subsequent transitions from the young adult estate and into the community due to the lack of a central strategy (IMB, 2017a, 2017c, 2018b). These issues demonstrate how poorly managed transitions are detrimental to individuals but continue across the wider prison estate. Penal transitions set young people up to fail. The relationships young people aspire to have with their Probation workers are important to them (Halsey, 2008) but are not realised ultimately impacts upon future desistance (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016b) and transitions into the community. The lack of relationship with the Probation Service and limited engagement in ETE demonstrates how young people are often ill-prepared for life upon release (Ellis, 2018).

The concept of ‘resettlement’ has been challenged as: “it implies that the aim is to help someone get back to where they once were” (Goodfellow and Liddle, 2017, p. 34) but “most prisoners have never had a ‘settled’ existence even before imprisonment” (Ramsbotham, 2005, p. 146). This research demonstrates how any notion of ‘settlement’ or ‘resettlement’ is unlikely to be achieved by young people unless they are supported to forge links with the Probation Service to achieve their next transition to another institution or into the community.

Conclusion

This research has shown how the experience of being within the juvenile secure estate and transitioning into the young adult/adult estate exacerbate the vulnerabilities of young people held. From arrival they are processed and assessed largely in accordance with the needs of the institution. Upon turning age 18 years they are ‘deemed’ adult and no longer viewed as ‘vulnerable’. This study has shown that for those expected to transition, support declines from entry. The depleting support starts for those within SCHs and STCs when restrictions are placed upon regimes to reflect a juvenile YOI or young adult/adult institution. Juvenile

YOIs have also been found to provide an inadequate regime. The limited regime young people are informed to expect upon transition into the young adult/adult estate (NOMS, 2012) paired with lower staffing levels overlooks the developmental needs of young people transitioning into adulthood. The official guidance (NOMS, 2012) and 'insider' key stakeholders acknowledge that such changes are simply an integral aspect of transition. The arbitrary age-based differentiation between estates and the fragmentation of services means that institutions fail to see the individual needs of young people and make any suitable provision for their life-stage but instead emphasise individual responsibility (MoJ, 2014). It is argued within this research that the institutions in which young people are held are fundamentally harmful to their wellbeing.

The experiences of transition, therefore, compound vulnerabilities and uncertainties. It is as The Royal College of Psychiatrists (cited in House of Commons Justice Committee 2013, p. 61) reported "frequently abrupt and inadequately planned". Whilst the concept of 'youth transitions' through the life course implies a steady progression to adulthood (Wyn and White, 1997) young people feel stuck in limbo in juvenile YOIs as they await the inevitable rupture into the young adult/adult estate. Young people receive limited information about their transition which aggravates feelings of loss of control and exacerbates the difficulties of being imprisoned (Harvey, 2005). Young people rarely experience positive relationships with the officers that hold and reinforce power over them (Irwin and Owen, 2005). Despite not being considered able to assert any control over their lives - other than their behaviour - young people are expected to be responsible for their own penal journeys (Irwin and Owen, 2005). The experiences of incarceration and transition often demonstrate how those who require the most support actually receive the least (Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018).

Substantial literature (Goldson, 2002; Goldson and Muncie, 2015; Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018; End Child Imprisonment, 2019), volume of policy documentation (YJB, 2013) and international frameworks (UN, 1989) have focused upon children's needs in juvenile detention and there is now an emerging acknowledgement of the needs of young adults within the CJS (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; MoJ, 2017a) but this is not realised in practice. 'Insider' key stakeholders both confirmed and denied that transitions official guidance and policy statements (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015; 2018d) are undermined in practice. The construction of the transition process from the official guidance and perspectives of the 'insider' key stakeholders existed in parallel to the lived experiences of young people. The young adult estate poses significant problems for those held (see for example HMCIP, 2019b) and as it continues to be subsumed into the adult estate young

adults are fundamentally being forgotten and left to cope. In 2004 HMCIP (2004, p. 43) stated that “for young adults, there is nothing to compare with the joined-up, centrally funded training and resettlement for under-18s”. Fifteen years later the same concerns remain due to the blunt distinction between estates and support upon transition.

Academics have argued that the continued restructuring of both the juvenile secure estate (Goldson, 2015) and young adult/adult penal estate (Carlen, 2005) have failed to address the problems that exist within institutions and subsequently inflict harm on those held. Although there have been numerous statements of intent to support young people upon transition - predominantly through the new protocol (YJB, 2018d) - the issues raised here will not be effectively addressed until better provision is available and resource are invested in young adults. As discussed in Chapter Two, young adulthood provides an opportunity for identity exploration and development and can be a “transformative life phase” (Sawyer *et al.*, 2018, p. 227) but young prisoners are routinely denied appropriate support to enable them to achieve this. Incarceration is understood to be damaging (Crewe, 2014; Gooch, 2016) and the disruptive nature of the transition extends psychological harms (Hanham and Tracey, 2017) at a crucial period in the life course.

Children within the YJS have always been drawn from the most impoverished circumstances and historical research has shown how there has been little deviation from the controlled environment of institutions with a ‘mixed economy’ of stakeholders to which they were sent from 1850 (Godfrey *et al.*, 2017). It has been argued that the juvenile secure estate has failed to provide a stable and “effective model of care and control” (Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse, 2019, p. vii). The fundamental findings from this research conform with the view of McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark (2016, p. 2) that penal institutions fail to protect and improve future circumstances for young people, and they should be replaced with services that are: “more effective, more informed by evidence of what works, more likely to protect public safety, more developmentally appropriate, more humane, and more community based.” Academics and charities have continued to argue that places of incarceration for children should be a last resort or abolished (Goldson, 2005; Willow, 2015; Godfrey *et al.*, 2017; Article39.org.uk, 2018) and House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) have maintained that the young adult/adult estate should better meet the needs of young people. The final chapter considers such issues whilst addressing the third principal research objective and the policy implications associated with transitions.

Chapter Eight. Conclusion

This thesis has considered the pathways and transitions that young prisoners engage in when moving between juvenile YOIs and young adult/adult institutions. It has explored the views of young people before and after transition alongside contextual evidence drawn from key stakeholders; fieldwork observations; national qualitative and quantitative data from HMIP inspections and documentary and statistical data available within the public domain. This concluding chapter reflects on the findings of the thesis and its policy implications to fulfil the third principal research objective: *To identify policy and practice approaches that might mitigate what the Royal College of Psychiatrists (cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61) describe as the “frequently abrupt and inadequately planned” nature of such transitions at a time of major reform (of both welfare and justice systems).* Limitations of the research are discussed before considerations of future directions for the research are presented.

Contextualising the research

To set the context for this research Chapter Two introduced and critically analysed the literature concerning life course transitions from childhood, through youth and into adulthood. The chapter aligned with the literature which challenges arbitrary notions of adulthood being set at age 18 years by drawing on both social constructionist theorisation and evidence which demonstrates how developmental (neurological changes) (Prior *et al.*, 2011) and social (structural changes; employment, independent living and marriage) (Beck, 1992; Roberts, 2009) transitions occur later in life than was often the case for previous generations. Such transitions are often considered to be more difficult and less ‘successful’ for young people drawn from marginalised circumstances as they are expected to engage with artificially accelerated or ‘fast track’ transitions due to their particular social and economic circumstances (SEU, 2005) and loss of supportive services (Stein, 2008; Paulsen and Berg, 2016).

Chapter Three focused upon institutional transitions between the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate based on a range of literature including official documents, academic research, independent reviews and inspection reports. The official guidance in place for transitions between institutions was presented (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d) alongside reports which highlight pockets of best practice (see for example HMCIP, 2015c, 2016d, 2017b, 2017d, 2018c, 2018d, 2018e), however these examples were focused on pre-

rather than post-transition. Despite such guidance and practice, however, more detailed reporting has found that institutions fail to prepare (CJI, 2012) and support (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) young people through these penal transitions. Evidence from these reports, wider independent inspections (see for example HMCIP, 2017a, 2017e, 2017f, 2018a, 2018f) and reviews (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Newcomen, 2017a) demonstrate how the known vulnerabilities of young people held are compounded by inappropriate treatment and inadequate conditions across the respective estates (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Gooch, 2017). Building upon the lines of argument and analysis presented in Chapter Two, it was argued in Chapter Three that the arbitrary inscription of adulthood at age 18 years and the inevitable transfer into the young adult population within the young adult/adult estate triggers the deep-rooted existing vulnerabilities of young people held in penal institutions.

This research comes at a time when the population within the juvenile secure estate has reduced (YJB, 2016a), the structure of the juvenile secure estate is under review (Charlie Taylor, 2016; Argar, 2018; HM Government, 2018; MoJ, 2018a) and youth custody services have experienced reforms in management and responsibility (Truss, 2017a). There is also increased attention across media outlets, local authorities, independent reviews and committees about the harmful conditions within the juvenile secure estate (Panorama, 2016; Fenton, 2017; HMCIP, 2017a; Local Government Association, 2017; Wood, Bailey and Butler, 2017; End Child Imprisonment, 2019; Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse, 2019), the scale and functioning of the dedicated young adult estate (Nacro, 2001; Bateman, 2015; Harris, 2015; HMCIP, 2016a, 2017a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; 2018c; BBC News, 2018a), the crises within the adult estate (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2014) and the chaotic state of the Probation Services (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2015a, 2017a; Burke, 2016; CJI, 2016; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018b). Alongside such coverage, the specific needs of the young adult prison population is also gathering increasing levels of attention (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, 2018a; Lammy, 2017).

Prior to this research, the only literature specifically focusing upon the experiences of young people transitioning between the juvenile secure estate and the young adult/adult estate comprised independent inspection reports (CJI, 2012; HMCIP, 2014a, 2015a; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a) and evidence from independent reviews (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c, 2018b; NPM, 2018). Both inspections and

reviews highlight the urgent need for improved transition arrangements. This has also been acknowledged by the Government (MoJ, 2015b, 2017a) and has led to the publication of a revised protocol (YJB, 2018d). Limited academic research has considered the nature of transitions within institutions (Gooch, 2017) and the processes of adapting to the young adult/adult estate (Harvey, 2012). But this thesis research builds upon and extends the independent inspections and academic research and is unique in following young people through their transitions to advance understandings about how they comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the transfer between two quite different institutional worlds: from ‘childhood’ and the juvenile secure estate into ‘adulthood’ and the young adult/adult estate.

Aims and methods

The principal research method used for the collection of primary data was qualitative interviews with young people pre-transition and post-transition. The collaborative nature of the project with HMIP has also meant that a wealth of additional qualitative and quantitative data, some of which was previously not available within the public domain, has been collated and analysed to supplement the accounts of the young people and stakeholders.

The project has been underpinned by three core objectives:

- 1. To extend knowledge of the (seemingly compounding) vulnerabilities of child/young prisoners*
- 2. To advance understandings of the means by which young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between juvenile YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system*
- 3. To identify policy and practice approaches that might mitigate what the Royal College of Psychiatrists (cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee, 2013, p. 61) describe as the “frequently abrupt and inadequately planned” nature of such transitions at a time of major reform (of both welfare and justice systems)*

The methods and research design are set out in Chapter Four and the principal findings are presented and discussed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The research was designed to comprise an applied or ‘interventionist’ project and the thesis concludes by considering the principal implications for policy and practice, reflecting upon the limitations of the research and mapping a direction for future research and social science inquiry.

Principal policy and practice implications

Responses to children and young people

The introduction of the YJB (Home Office, 1998) sought to prevent offending and reoffending by young people and the make-up of the juvenile secure estate is ostensibly structured to meet the specific needs of the most serious offenders. In his review of the YJS Charlie Taylor (2016, p. 3) commented that: “it is right that children who break the law are dealt with differently than adults [...] children also have great strengths on which to build and are capable of rapid and extraordinary change”. Despite this, the juvenile secure estate has been found to be unsafe and failing to meet the needs of children (HMCIP, 2017a). This research has demonstrated that despite a growing acknowledgement of the continuing developmental needs of young adults (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; MoJ, 2017a) there remains an arbitrary split between services for ‘children’ and services for ‘adults’ which results in profound fragmentation and rupture and the substantial diminution of support as young people transition into young adult/adult institutions. The thesis argues that institutional transitions are taking place against a backdrop where services and penal institutions are ill-equipped to adequately support children and young people.

Following a protracted period when children were targeted with harsher sentencing from the New Labour era in 1997 onwards (Carlen, 2008; Goldson, 2006, 2010, 2015) the population of the juvenile secure estate has fallen dramatically (YJB, 2016a, 2018c) and those held are increasingly older, have more complex needs (Bateman, 2015) and are serving longer sentences (YJB, 2018b). Despite the decline in the juvenile secure estate population, proportionately more children who are held within juvenile YOIs are likely to transition and complete their sentence in the young adult/adult estate (see Chapter 3; MoJ, 2018g; YJB, 2019d). Independent reviews have shown that the institutional transitions have long been problematic (CJI, 2012; Harris, 2015; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016a; Newcomen, 2017a) and this research provides substantial evidence to that effect. Such young people require greater support, but in reality; the transition to the young adult/adult estate represents a further punitive sanction and the official guidance is not sufficiently realised in practice. Published data by the YJB (2019d) revealed that 40% of those transitioning into the young adult/adult estate from the juvenile secure estate in 2017-18 had a custodial episode of between one and 91 nights, an increase from 36% in 2014-15. As an element of discretion may be applied to hold young people within the juvenile secure

estate beyond their 18th birthday (NOMS, 2012) this practice may be more appropriate for those with short custodial episodes.

Garland (2001, p. 199-200) has argued that penal responses to manage the behaviour of marginalised populations are “immediate, easy to implement, and can claim to ‘work’ as a punitive end in themselves even when they fail in all other respects”. Wider academic commentators have supported this view that imprisonment moves the focus away from wider social and political issues that impact upon children young people (Katz, 2001; Goldson, 2010). The same children and young people see their status shift from ‘child’ to ‘offender’ (Crewe, 2011a; Gooch, 2015) upon entering the prison system. These labels dehumanize them (Katz, 2001; McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark, 2016) and, if anything, this is intensified within the young adult/adult estate.

Whilst an awareness of the specific needs of young people experiencing penal transitions has begun to increase, policy documents have either not kept up (Hamilton, Antonucci and Roberts, 2014) or are simply not translated into operational practices. The *National Standards for Youth Justice* (YJB, 2013) have been revised (YJB, 2018h, 2019c) but John Drew, former YJB chief executive, has stated that the draft standards lack detail which could lead to differing interpretations from professionals (Jozwiak, 2018). The new standards refer to the official guidance for transitions (YJB, 2018d), reiterate that transitions should be identified at the earliest stage and maintain that relevant agencies involved with the young person should minimise “any potential negative impact that any transition may have for a child” and be held to account “in the event of insufficient planning and delivery of the transition and or resettlement for a child” (YJB, 2019c, p. 17 and 14). The announcement that a secure school is to open on the site of Medway STC (Argar, 2018) drew further criticisms that it did not demonstrate that past lessons have been learnt (Wigzell, cited in Standing Committee for Youth Justice, 2018). Similarly, the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, the MoJ and London Councils (2018) memorandum has proposed that they will explore the opportunity to commission a secure school in London, despite the reported deterioration of HMYOI Feltham since 2015 (HMCIP, 2018e).

Goldson (2015) has outlined how the size and shape of child prisons has fluctuated over time and “the history of such institutions is characterised by a catalogue of failure, misery, scandal, human suffering, abuse and violence, repeatedly produced and reproduced through their regimes and standard operational practices” (Goldson, 2008, p. 89). He has argued that penal custody is harmful, violent (Goldson, 2008) and continues to be counter-productive, subject

to ‘penal politics’ rather than the incidence of youth crime (Goldson, 2015). Despite the juvenile secure estate being positioned as providing provision for vulnerable young people this research has demonstrated how institutions continue to fail to address the needs of children and young people as they progress into the young adult/adult estate. If official guidance (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d) was fulfilled it would only mitigate some of the issues experienced by those who make such transitions. Certain resources and provisions are available within the juvenile secure estate because there is an acknowledgement of the ‘vulnerability’ of children yet those aged 18 years and over are not covered by the same conventions (Goldson and Muncie, 2015), there is less sympathy and understanding of their needs and rights as ‘young adults’ and less investment in tailored support to address their needs. This research supports the view of the End Child Imprisonment (2019) campaign that institutions that hold young people must support and encourage their healthy development. Institutions that hold young people should be better resourced to meet their needs and the provision must extend to young people beyond age 18 years.

Transition support

Interviewees within this research were asked who was ultimately accountable for transition arrangements. The view of Inspector One highlights the problems associated with the governance of the transition process:

Inspector One: “No-one. [pauses] I mean it’s very difficult to point to even who has overall accountability for children so for transfers it’s not even, the governance arrangements are the classic case of moving around deck chairs on the Titanic, you know, lots of things going wrong in institutions and lots of fiddling around of who’s responsible for them.”

It is argued here that the fragmented and ruptured nature between services for ‘children’ and ‘adults’ means that there is no real overall responsibility taken for the transition process. This is a great concern given that substantial numbers of young people held within the juvenile secure estate – both with short and long custodial episodes – transition annually (nearly four in 10 – see Chapter Three). By virtue of moving between juvenile and young adult/adult institutions the accountability for young people entirely shifts with no consistency of care. There is a distinct lack of a ‘joined-up’ approaches to working with young people aged under 18 years and over 18 years (Neil, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017, p. 3, see also The Children’s Society, 2019). Although the governance of

overall youth custody services has moved to HMPPS, fundamentally the support mechanisms in place for young people within the juvenile secure estate ends upon transfer into the young adult/adult estate.

The Standing Committee for Youth Justice (cited in the Children's Society, 2019, p. 41) has argued that: "not enough has been done to address the 'cliff edge' in the approach taken to criminal justice before and after someone's 18th birthday" and this has been evidenced within this research. There is an array of stakeholders involved in transition processes, including, but not limited to; YOT, juvenile secure estate, young adult/adult estate, probation (NPS and CRC), mental health services, education, but unless they work together to achieve a truly individually tailored process for each young person, transitions will continue to be a damning reflection of the harms to which young people are exposed within penal institutions. It has been suggested that there will be a more cohesive service now that youth custody has moved under the governance of HMPPS and Hart (2017, p. 12) has stated that "there needs to be clear leadership and a shared sense of purpose". But wider critics have argued that it is a 'regressive' step moving children's services into an adult system that is said to be in 'crisis' (Neilson, 2017; Standing Committee for Youth Justice, 2017). Furthermore, there is a great difference between YOS and Probation Services and this rupture is further exacerbated by the fragmentation of the NPS and the intrusion of an uncoordinated collection of private sector agencies. Whilst the YJB (2018d) guidance appears to address some of the issues by outlining the roles of Probation Services and recommending the benefits of seconded probation officers within YOTs, the official guidance is not consistently applied in practice. There are numerous factors that need to must be addressed to facilitate a 'seamless' (NOMS, 2012, p. 3) transition.

The YJB (2018e) has identified 'transitions' between services as a priority, however, transfer to adult penal institutions is not specifically mentioned. The YJB states that it will: "work with the sector to explore how constructive resettlement principles can be applied beyond resettlement of children released from custody, in respect of broader transitions" (YJB, 2018g, p. 13). The young people within this study found transitions to be arbitrary and abrupt as they lost contact with key community-based support services by virtue of moving into the arena of adult services. For young people more emphasis needs to be placed on the experiences of transition as a coordinated process rather than a fixed event. This includes informing young people adequately in advance of their move and prioritising their needs rather than focusing upon the 'security' needs of the institution.

Poor post-transition support means that little is done to help young people cope with the move. The YJB (2018d) protocol sought to address this by suggesting that a post-transition meeting should take place. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2015b) recommended that young people receive a statutory period of support upon release from custody beyond their order. This provision, with more consistent support, would be appropriate for young people transitioning into the young adult/adult estate should they wish to engage with the service. Such approaches are similar to those taken with care leavers as there has been a growing recognition about their needs as "one of the most marginalized groups in society" (Barn, 2010, p. 832). Academics have suggested that there are considerable overlaps in the practical implications for working with young people in the care and youth justice systems (Paulsen and Berg, 2017; Paulsen and Thomas, 2017). Young people transitioning into the young adult/adult estate are similarly marginalised and require additional support.

Although many of the young people in this research initially expressed a desire to progress into the young adult/adult estate, they found upon transition that they were subject to more punitive sanctions, a restricted regime and deeper concerns about personal safety. Care leavers have recently been entitled to more 'interdependent' support (Paulsen and Berg, 2016) as they transition out of the care system (Department for Education, 2018; MoJ, 2018e) and a similarly inter-dependent approach is urgently needed for young people engaging with penal transitions.

Responses to young adults

The growing consensus that young people transitioning out of care require support until age 25 years has been acknowledged by the Conservative Government (Department for Education, 2018) but does not extend across wider policy (Home Office, 1933), international frameworks (UN, 1989; Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2016) and institutional transitions that affect young people (NOMS, 2012; YJB, 2015, 2018d). As discussed in Chapter Seven, Dr Phillip Lee, then the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the MoJ (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017, p. 6-7), agreed that setting an age limit is arbitrary but he claims that it is institutionally necessary. Equally, Rory Stewart, then the Minister of State for Justice, rejected calls to extend the definition of 'young adults' beyond age 21 years, potentially up to age 25 years, arguing that they do not: "wish to replicate a strict upper age limit to a distinct young adult approach, given that there may be individuals who have the same set of needs beyond their twenty-fifth year" (Stewart, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018a, p. 2). The entry and exit systems of the YJS are based on arbitrary

age-determined constructions (Goldson, 2009, 2013, 2019; Dünkel, 2015). This research has demonstrated how the transition between institutions and services serves to rupture support for young people and argues that provision available within the juvenile secure estate should be available to young people beyond the age of 18 years to mitigate the 'cliff-edge' of support (SEU, 2005; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2009; NAO, 2015; The Children's Society, 2019). The young people interviewed for this research felt particularly abandoned when they moved from YOT to probation services and greater consistency of care and support is particularly important during this transition.

Despite calls from independent inspectorates and organisations (Harris, 2015; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c; Transition to Adulthood Alliance, 2016; HMIP, 2017a) ongoing, developmentally appropriate provision for young adults in prison has been overlooked (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018c). This research maintains that given the substantial evidence about extended childhood-youth-adulthood transitions developing key principles for practice regardless of age is urgently required (Daniel, 2010). More generally, a more fluid and inclusive understanding of childhood-youth-adulthood transitions (Woodman and Wyn, 2013; Sawyer *et al.*, 2018) and young people involved in the YJS and CJS (Dünkel, 2015) would be more appropriate than the arbitrary split within institutional practices. This research supports the view of Howard League for Penal Reform (2014) and House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) that appropriate training for staff working with young adults should also be developed to ensure that responses to them take account of their specific needs.

The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the MoJ and London Councils (2018) have stated that the transition to the young adult/adult system and services is a period of particular vulnerability which requires a new approach. HMPPS (2018) and YJB (2018e) listed transitions as a priority area in 2018 and have begun publishing limited data about transfers to the young adult/adult estate (see YJB, 2019d). The Conservative Government has also announced, in response to the House of Commons Justice Committee's inquiry into the treatment of young adults in the CJS, that they have resourced additional support for the case management of young people transitioning from the juvenile secure estate to the young adult/adult estate and appointed a young adult lead within the prisons directorate of HMPPS (Stewart, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2018a), although it is unclear how precisely this will be achieved. As this research highlights there is a continued dissonance between the experiences of the young people and the official guidance and policies that are meant to

inform transition processes. Unless developmentally appropriate provision and resources are invested in the young adult/adult estate as a whole, good intentions will simply flounder.

Despite numerous reviews and academic literature which have highlighted the harmful impact of child/youth imprisonment (Goldson, 2002; Harris, 2015; Gooch, 2016, 2017; HMCIP, 2017a; House of Commons Justice Committee, 2016c) and the importance of engaging young people in ETE and activity (Coates, 2016; Meek, 2018), this research has demonstrated how too many young people continue to be held in institutions that fail to engage them in activity and promote their best interests. Such institutions are damaging (Goldson, 2002; McCarthy, Schiraldi and Shark, 2016; House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019) and painful (Crewe, 2014). The high number of self-inflicted deaths by young adults in penal institutions is an extreme marker of such failure (Harris, 2015) and those aged 18 to 20 years have been found to have the highest rate of self-harm incidents (MoJ, 2018g). On this basis, young adults can be considered one of the most vulnerable groups across the prison population and should be subject to the same level of independent scrutiny as the juvenile secure estate and inspected annually to report on the treatment and conditions for those held and drive improvements.

The House of Commons Justice Committee (2018c, p. 1) has reported that there is “overwhelming enthusiasm within the sector” for a change of the treatment of young adults within the CJS but suggested that the Government approach is narrow and negative. This is particularly poignant as HMCIP (2018h) has continually found there is no strategy for young adults. The young adult estate continues to merge within the adult estate with little recognisable support for those transitioning from juvenile institutions. But despite evidence to the contrary, ministers continue to claim that they are providing the best they can within the available resources. Michael Spurr, the previous CEO of HMPPS, for example, commented:

“I think that what we are doing at the moment, with the estate we have and the resources we have, is in the best interests of the young people. It reflects the fact that we have to provide a load of specialist services. If we had to replicate those for an under-25 population, it would be significantly more expensive for us to be able to do. We are trying to use the resources we have in the best way to meet the needs of individuals” (Spurr, cited in House of Commons Justice Committee, 2017, p. 5).

Support for young adults is ‘imagined’ (Carlen, 2008) but not actually delivered, therefore.

Wincup (2017, p. 57) has argued that prisons are in a state of ‘perpetual crisis’ which means that imprisonment ultimately does more ‘harm than good’. As concerns about the prison estate have continually been raised, Peter Clarke, HMCIP (cited in HMIP, 2017d, p. 3), has argued why it is important to continue to pay attention to such evidence:

“Some people may feel a sense of déjà vu or world-weariness when they hear repeated accounts of poor conditions in our prisons. I would urge readers not to assume this paper is simply another account of some dilapidated prisons, but to look at the details of what we describe, and then ask themselves whether it is acceptable for prisoners to be held in these conditions in the United Kingdom in 2017.”

This research poses serious questions regarding the ‘acceptability’ of treating young prisoners this way and has highlighted how the period of transition is one of heightened vulnerability and intensified neglect. The overwhelming evidence is that juvenile YOIs are harmful to the young people held (HMCIP, 2017a; Cunneen, Goldson and Russell, 2018; House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights, 2019) and this research has demonstrated how the transition extends the harms caused by youth imprisonment. It is argued here that institutions that hold young people must provide support for their specific needs at this crucial stage in their life course.

Limitations of the research

The mixed methods approach employed for this research ensured that standards of reliability, validity and reflexivity were maintained throughout. The primary qualitative data sources were 49 semi-structured interviews. This included two waves of interviews with a sample of 14 young people pre- and post-transition supplemented by interviews with key stakeholders drawn from juvenile YOIs, young adult/adult institutions, independent inspectorates, civil servants, academics and relevant charities and agencies. A thematic approach was employed to analyse the primary data which meant that the key themes emerged from the data and the perspectives of those interviewed. The continual process of reflecting upon the data and the emerging themes added to the validity of the analysis (Wong *et al.*, 2017). As this data was triangulated with secondary analyses of HMIP data, documentary and statistical analyses and fieldwork notes the findings were validated appropriately (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

Whilst this research highlights important issues for young people making transitions into the young adult/adult estate, as it was conducted within two out of the five juvenile YOIs the

findings of the research cannot necessarily be considered to be representative of the entire juvenile YOI population nor the wider juvenile secure estate. The scope of this research meant that a relatively small sample of the juvenile YOI population (YJB, 2019a) were interviewed. The experiences and perspectives of those transitioning from SCHs¹¹ and STCs - particularly females - was also excluded from this research despite efforts to mitigate this disparity by interviewing key stakeholders with experience and expertise of this estate. As discussed in Chapter Four, understanding the experience of girls transitioning subject to their gender-specific needs and constructions of risk (Gelsthorpe and Worrall, 2009; Sharpe and Gelsthorpe, 2015) is of vital importance. There is a small number of girls and young women within the juvenile secure estate who will make the 'particularly dramatic' transition (NPM, 2018) directly from SCHs or STCs into adult women's prisons as there are no juvenile YOIs nor distinct young adult YOIs for females. However, it was not possible to access this population within this research. A larger sample across institutions would also have been preferable to provide a more representative reflection of the population but neither was possible within the inevitable time and resource constraints of this research.

This research spoke to young people at two distinct points and the second wave of interviews post-transition were conducted as close as possible following transition to capture their recollections and experiences. Harvey (2012) identified that there are three stages of adaptation; liminality, acceptance and equilibrium and the young people may have moved across these stages during different periods of time whilst they were held. Further pre-transition interviews whilst the young person was held within the juvenile YOI and follow-up interviews held at the young adult/adult estate including post release would have provided a more rounded account of their transitional experience at each stage of their incarceration.

Directions for future research

Despite the inevitable limitations, this research is unique as it builds upon and substantially extends knowledge by way of the previous independent inspection report findings with tracked interviews with young people. It shines original light on advancing our understanding of the way in which young people comprehend, prepare for, negotiate and experience, the pathways and transitions between YOIs and the young adult/adult penal system. By offering an incisive perspective on this previously under-researched area this thesis has explored the

¹¹ Ofsted (2018d) reported that support and delivery of transition was a strength of SCHs although they did not specify whether such transitions were into other institutions within the juvenile secure estate, the young adult/adult estate or the community.

processes of transition alongside the young peoples' experiences of imprisonment within juvenile YOIs and young adult/adult institutions and movement between the juvenile secure and young adult/adult estates.

The different understandings of transitions identified has also highlighted tensions between 'insider' and 'outsider' accounts. 'Outsider' key stakeholders were aware of independent inspection reports, reviews and academic literature that provided analytical insights whereas 'insider' key stakeholders had little awareness and their 'knowledge' often derives from official guidance. Similarly, those outside of institutions were generally unsettled by the conditions across both penal estates, whereas those within them: 'insider' key stakeholders and young people, tend to become more institutionalised and inured. For relevant change to take place it is important that this research is shared beyond academic circles and taken back into penal institutions and government departments. It is vitally important to highlight the conditions in which young people are held, expected to mature and be rehabilitated in, to drive changes in policy and practice.

As Jewkes (2011, p. 69) has argued, prison research can be a "powerful stimulus in the formation of knowledge". Accessing prisons in which young people are held can be difficult but it extremely important, particularly for young people who may otherwise be rendered voiceless. Bateman, Hazel and Wright (2013, p. 25) believe that penal transitions are under-researched and have highlighted its key importance in understanding how subsequent transitions, such as resettlement and reintegration back into the community, are experienced. This research could be extended to take a longitudinal qualitative approach and follow a cohort of young people from juvenile YOIs to the young adult/adult penal estate and back into the community. This would provide an insight into the longer-term impacts of transitional experiences by offering the third level of transition: into the community by building on the two levels explored within this research. This is particularly important given the continuing reconfiguration of the Probation Service (MoJ, NPS and HMPPS, 2018, 2019).

Continuing and developing tracked interviews, further research could generate insights into individual life course trajectory (Farrell, 2016) and subsequently a stronger biographical narrative of the themes that affect young peoples' pathways during transitions (Thomson *et al.*, 2004; MacDonald, 2006). The thesis has opened doors into new knowledge and understanding. It has also opened doors into new lines of academic inquiry and social science research.

Bibliography

Abrams, L. Anderson-Nathe, B. and Aguilar, J. (2008) 'Constructing masculinities in juvenile corrections', *Men and Masculinities*, 11 (1), pp. 22–41. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X06291893.

Abrams, L. Jordan, S. P. and Montero, L. A. (2018) 'What is a juvenile? A cross-national comparison of youth justice systems', *Youth Justice*, 18 (2), pp. 111-130. DOI: 10.1177/1473225418779850.

Adler, J. Edwards, S., Scally, M., Gill, D., Puniskis, M., Gekosli, A. and Horvath, M. (2016) *What works in managing young people who offend? A summary of the international evidence*. London: Ministry of Justice Analytical Series. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/498493/what-works-in-managing-young-people-who-offend.pdf. (Accessed: 14th February 2018).

Allen, R. (2013) *Young adults in custody: the way forward*. Transition to adulthood alliance. Available at: http://www.barrowcadbury.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Young-Adults-in-Custody_V3.pdf. (Accessed: 18th November 2016).

Allen, K. (2016) Top girls navigating austere times: interrogating youth transitions since the 'crisis', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19 (6), pp. 805-820, DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2015.1112885.

Allen, R. (2016) *Meeting the needs of young adult women in custody*, February 2016. London: Transition to Adulthood Alliance. Available at: http://www.barrowcadbury.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Young-Adult-Women-in-Custody_LR2.pdf. (Accessed: 14th February 2018).

Allen, G. and Watson, C. (2017) *UK Prison Population Statistics: House of Commons Justice Committee Briefing Paper Number SN/SG/04334, 20th April 2017*. London: House of Commons. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN04334/SN04334.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th August 2017).

Argar, E. (2018) *Letter to Bob Neill MP, 2nd October, 2018*. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Justice/correspondence/Edward-Argar-secure-schools.pdf>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Ariès, P. (1962) *Centuries of childhood: a social history of family life* Translated by Roberts Baldick. New York: Vintage Books.

Arnett, J. (1997) 'Young people's conceptions of the transition to adulthood', *Youth and Society*, 29 (1), pp. 3-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X97029001001>.

Arnett, J. (2000) 'Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties', *American Psychologist*, 55 (5), pp. 469-480. DOI: 10.1037//003-066X.55.5.469.

Arnett, J. (2015) *Emerging adulthood: the winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. (2nd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Article39.org.uk (2016) *Medway secure training centre must close*. Available at: <https://article39.org.uk/2016/05/12/medway-secure-training-centre-must-close/>.

(Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Article39.org.uk (2018) *End child imprisonment*. Available at: <https://article39.org.uk/endchildimprisonment/>. (Accessed: 28th November, 2018).

Balaram, B. and Crowley, L. (2012) *Raising aspirations and smoothing transitions: The role of Careers Education and Careers Guidance in tackling youth unemployment*. Lancashire: The Work Foundation. Available at:

http://observgo.quebec.ca/observgo/fichiers/78979_Work-foundation.pdf. (Accessed: 15th April 2018).

Barn, R. (2010) 'Care leavers and social capital: understanding and negotiating racial and ethnic identity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (5), pp. 832-850, DOI: 10.1080/01419870903318896.

Barry, M. (2006) *Youth offending in transition: The search for social recognition*. Oxon: Routledge.

Bartollas, C. (1982) 'Survival problems of adolescent prisoners' in Johnson, R. and Toch, H. (ed.) *The pains of imprisonment*. London: Sage, pp. 165-180.

Bateman, T. (2015) *Resettlement of young people leaving custody: Lessons from the literature: Update March 2015*. Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Resettlement-of-young-people-leaving-custody-lessons-from-the-literature-March-2015.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st December 2015).

Bateman, T. (2016) *The state of youth custody*. National Association for Youth Justice. Available at: <http://thenayj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NAYJ-Briefing-State-of-Youth-Custody-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th October 2016).

Bateman, T. (2017) *The state of youth justice 2017 an overview of trends and developments*. National Association for Youth Justice. Available at: <http://thenayj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/State-of-Youth-Justice-report-for-web-Sep17.pdf>. (Accessed: 29th September 2017).

Bateman, T. Hazel. N. and Wright, S. (2013) *Resettlement of young people leaving custody: lessons from the literature*. Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Resettlement-of-Young-People-Leaving-Custody-Lessons-from-the-literature.pdf>. (Accessed 16th June 2016).

Bauwens, T., De Koster, K., Enhus, E. and Evenepoel, A. (2013) 'The pains and gains a social constructionist perspective on policy-supporting research', in Beyens, K. Christiaens, J. Claes, B. De Ridder, S. Tournel, H. and Tubex, H. (ed.) *The Pains of Doing Criminological Research*. Brussels: VubPress, pp. 39-57.

Bazeley, P. (2013) *Qualitative Data Analysis: Practical Strategies*. London: Sage.

BBC News (2017) 'Deerbolt YOI officer doctored footage of attack on inmate', *BBC News*, 9th October. Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-tees-41560850>. (Accessed: 10th October 2017).

BBC News (2018a) 'HMYOI Aylesbury: Prisoners 'trash wing' in riot', *BBC News*, 15th April. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-beds-bucks-herts-43775829>. (Accessed: 18th July 2018).

BBC News (2018b) 'G4S staff at Medway youth jail cleared of misconduct', *BBC News*, 26th March. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-kent-43542325>. (Accessed: 16th March 2018).

Beal, C. (2014) 'Insider accounts of the move to the outside: two young people talk about their transitions from secure institutions', *Youth Justice*, 14(1), pp. 63-76. DOI: 10.1177/147325413520362.

Beard, J. (2017) *Briefing paper: Prison safety in England and Wales 5th December 2017*. London: House of Commons Library. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7467/CBP-7467.pdf>. (Accessed: 18th July 2018).

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society*. London: Sage.

Becker, H. (1967) 'Whose side are we on', *Social Problems*, 14 (3), pp. 239-247. DOI: 10.2307/799147.

Becker, H. (1973) *Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Benson, J. and Elder, G. (2011) 'Young adult identities and their pathways: a developmental and life course model', *Developmental Psychology*, 47 (6), pp. 1646-1657. DOI: 10.1037/a0023822.

Bergman Blix, S. and Wettergren, A. (2015) 'The emotional labour of gaining and maintaining access to the field', *Qualitative research*, 15 (6), pp. 688-704. DOI: 10.1177/1468794114561348.

Bessant, J., Farthing, R. and Watts, R. (2017) *The precarious generation* Oxon: Routledge.

Beyens, K. Kennes, P. Snacken, S. and Tournel, H. (2015), 'The craft of doing qualitative research in prisons', *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 4 (1), pp. 66-78. DOI: 10.5204/ijcjsd.v4i1.207.

Biddle, L., Cooper, J., Owen-Smith, A., Klineberg, E., Bennewith, O., Hawton, K., Kapur, N., Donovan, J. and Gunnell, D. (2013) 'Qualitative interviewing with vulnerable populations: Individual' experiences of participating in suicide and self-harm based research', *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 145 (3), pp. 356-362. DOI 10.1016/j.jad.2012.08.024.

Blakemore, S. J. and Choudhury, S. (2006) 'Development of the adolescent brain: implications for executive function and social cognition', *Journal of child psychiatry and psychology*, 47 (3-4), pp. 296-312. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2006.01611.x.

Blatterer, H. (2007) 'Contemporary adulthood: reconceptualising an uncontested category' *Current sociology*, 55 (6), pp. 771-792. DOI: 10.1177/001139210781985.

Bosworth, M. Campbell, D., Demby, B., Ferranti, S. and Santos, M. (2005) 'Doing prison research: views from inside', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11 (2), pp. 249-264. DOI: 10.1177/1077800404273410.

Bosworth, M. and Kellezi, B. (2017) 'Doing research in immigration removal centres: Ethics, emotions and impact', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 17 (2), pp. 121-137. DOI: 10.1177/1748895816646151.

Bottrell, D. and Armstrong, D. (2007) 'Changes and exchanges in marginal youth transitions' *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (3), pp. 353-371. DOI: 10.1080/13676260701342616.

- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998) *Transforming Qualitative Information: thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oak, California: Sage.
- Brown, S. (2009), 'The changing landscape of youth and youth crime' in Barry, M and McNeil, F. (ed.) *Youth offending and Youth Justice*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 17-37.
- Brown, K. (2011) 'Vulnerability': handle with care', *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 5 (3), pp. 313-321. DOI: 10.1080/17496535.2011.597165.
- Brown, K., Ecclestone, K. and Emmel, N (2017) 'The Many Faces of Vulnerability', *Social Policy and Society*, 16 (3), pp. 497-510. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746416000610.
- Bryan-Hancock, C. and Casey, S. (2011) 'Young people and the Justice System: consideration of maturity in criminal justice responsibility', *Psychiatry, psychology and Law*, 18 (1), pp. 69-78. DOI: 1080/1321871103739086.
- Bryman, A. (2012) *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2016) *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bullock, K. and Bunce, A. (2018) 'The prison don't talk to you about getting out of prison': on why prisons in England and Wales fail to rehabilitate prisoners', *Criminology and criminal justice*, 0 (0), pp. 1-17. DOI: 10.1177/1748895818800743.
- Burke, L. (2016) 'Transforming rehabilitation: reflections two years on', *Probation Journal*, 63 (2), pp. 117-119. DOI: 10.1177/0264550516655710.
- Bynner, J. (2001) 'British Youth Transitions in Comparative Perspective', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 4 (1), pp. 5-23. DOI: 10.1080/13676260120028529.
- Bynner, J., Elias, P., McKnight, A., Pan, H. and Pierre, G. (2002) *Young people's changing routes to independence*. York: The Joseph Roundtree Foundation. Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/young-peoples-changing-routes-independence>. (Accessed: 6th April 2018).
- Byrne, B. (2004) 'Qualitative interviewing' in Searle, C. (ed.) *Researching society and culture* (2nd ed.) London: Sage, pp. 180-191.
- Carlen, P (2005) 'Imprisonment and the penal body politic: The cancer of disciplinary governance' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The Effects of Imprisonment*. Collompton: Willan Publishing, pp.421-441.

Carlen, P. (2008) 'Imaginary penalties and risk-crazed governance' in Carlen, P. (ed.) *Imaginary Penalties*. Devon: Willan, pp. 1-25.

Case, S. (2006) 'Young people 'at risk' of what? Challenging risk-focused early intervention as crime prevention', *Youth Justice*, 6 (3), pp. 171-179. DOI: 10.1177/1473225406069491.

Case, S. and Haines, K. (2015) 'Risk management and early intervention: a critical analysis' in Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (ed.) *Youth Crime and Justice* (2nd ed.). Sage: London, pp. 100-118.

Centre for Mental Health (2014) *Young adult (18-24) in transition, mental health and criminal justice* (The Bradley Commission No. 2). London: Centre for Mental Health. Available at: <https://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/bradley-briefing2>. (Accessed: 19th September 2016).

Children's Commissioner for England (2015) *Unlocking potential: a study of the isolation of children in custody in England*. London: Children's Commissioner. Available at: https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Unlocking%20Potential_0.pdf. (Accessed: 11th October 2016).

Children's Commissioner for England (2017) *Stability Index: Overview and initial findings*. London: Children's Commissioner for England. Available at: <http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Children%27s%20Commissioner%27s%20Stability%20Index%202017%20Overview%20Document%201.3.pdf>. (Accessed: 14th April 2017).

Children's Commissioner for England (2018) *A report on the use of segregation in youth custody in England*. London: Children's Commissioner for England. Available at: <https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Segregation-report-final.pdf>. (Accessed: 10th October 2018).

Christensen, P. and Prout, A. (2002) 'Working with ethical symmetry in social research with children', *Childhood*, 9 (4), pp. 477-497. DOI: 10.1177/0907568202009004007.

Claes, B., Lippens, V., Kennes, P. and Tournel, H. (2013) 'Gender and prison ethnography. Some fieldwork observations' in Beyens, K. Christiaens, J. Claes, B. De Ridder, S. Tournel, H. And Tubex, H. (ed.) *The Pains of Doing Criminological Research*. Brussels: VubPress, pp. 59-72.

CLINKS (2016) *The rehabilitative prison: what does 'good' look like?* London: CLINKS. Available at: http://www.clinks.org/sites/default/files/basic/files-downloads/clinks_rehabilitative-prison_final-web.pdf. (Accessed: 21st November 2016).

CLINKS (2017) *Clinks response to the Review of the Youth Justice System in England and Wales*. London: CLINKS. Available at: http://www.clinks.org/sites/default/files/basic/files-downloads/clinks_response_taylor-review_final-3.pdf. (Accessed: 17th February 2017).

Coates, S. (2016) *Unlocking potential: a review into education in prison*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524013/education-review-report.pdf (Accessed 18th May 2016).

Coffield, F. (1995) 'Always the trainee, never the employee? Increasingly protracted transition in the UK' in Cavalli A. and Galland, O. (ed.) *Youth in Europe*. London: Pinter, pp. 45-62.

Cohen, P. and Ainley, P. (2000) 'In the country of the blind: youth studies and cultural studies, *Britain Journal of Youth Studies*, 3 (1), pp. 79-96. DOI: 10.1080/136762600113059.

Cohen, S. and Taylor, L. (1977) 'Talking about Prison Blues' in Bell, C. and Newby, H. (ed.) *Doing sociological research*. London: George Allen and Unwin, pp. 67-86.

Colby, A. (1998) 'Foreword: Crafting life course studies' in Giele, J. and Elder, G. H., Jr. (ed.) *Methods of Life Course Research*. California: Sage, pp. vii-xii.

Cooper, C. (2012) 'Imagining 'radical' youth work possibilities – challenging the 'symbolic violence' within the mainstream tradition in contemporary state-led youth work practice in England', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15 (1), pp. 53-71. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2011.618489.

Committee on the Rights of the Child (2016) *Draft General Comment on the implementation of the rights of the child during adolescence*. CRC/C/GC/20 22nd April, 2016/. Geneva: United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Available at: http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC/C/GC/20&Lang=en. (Accessed: 13th June 2016).

Côté, J. and Bynner, J. (2008) 'Changes in the transition to adulthood in the UK and Canada: the role of structure and agency in emerging adulthood', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 11 (3), pp. 251-268. DOI: 10.1080/13676260801946464.

Coyle, B. (2019) 'What the f**k is maturity?': Young adulthood, subjective maturity and desistance from crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 0 (0), pp. 1-21. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azz010.

Crawley, E. (2004) *Doing prison work: the public and private lives of prison officers*. Devon: Willan.

Crewe, B. (2009) *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation and Social Life in an English Prison*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crewe, B. (2011a) 'Depth, weight, tightness: revisiting the pains of imprisonment', *Punishment and society*, 13 (5), pp. 509-529. DOI: 10.1177/1462474511422172.

Crewe, B. (2011b) 'Soft power in prison: implications for staff-prisoner relationship, liberty and legitimacy', *European Journal of Criminology*, 8 (6), pp. 455-468. DOI: 10.1177/1477370811413805.

Crewe, B. (2014) 'Not looking hard enough: masculinity, emotion and prison research', *Qualitative inquiry*, 20 (4), pp. 392-403. DOI: 10.1177/1077800413515829.

Crewe, B. Warr, J. Bennett, P. and Smith, A. (2014) 'The emotional geography of prison life', *Theoretical Criminology*, 18 (1), pp. 56-74. DOI: 10.1177/1362480613497778.

Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorates (2012) *Transitions, an inspection of the transition arrangements from youth to adult services in the criminal justice system: A Joint Inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, Care Quality Commission, Ofsted, Healthcare Inspectorate Wales and Estyn*. October, 2012. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation Available at: <http://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/cjji-transitions-thematic.pdf> (Accessed: 21st December 2015).

Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorates (2016) *An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Short-Term Prisoners A joint inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons* October 2016.. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2016/09/Through-the-Gate.pdf>. (Accessed: 4th October 2016).

Crook, F. (2016) 'The G4S-run Medway youth jail must be closed' *The Guardian* 12th January 2016. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jan/12/g4s-medway-youth-jail-must-be-closed>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Cunneen, C., Goldson, B. and Russell, S. (2018) 'Human rights and youth justice reform in England and Wales: a systemic analysis', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 18 (4), pp. 405-430. DOI: 10.1177/1748895817721957.

Cuervo, H., and Wyn, J. (2016) 'An unspoken crisis: the 'scaring effects' of the complex nexus between education and work on two generations of young Australians', *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 35 (2), pp. 122-135. DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2016.1164467.

Daniel, B. (2010) 'Concepts of Adversity, Risk, Vulnerability and Resilience: A Discussion in the Context of the 'Child Protection System'', *Social Policy & Society*, 9 (2), pp. 231-241. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746409990364.

Department for Education (2015a) *Children accommodated in secure children's homes at 31 March 2015: England and Wales*. June, 2014. London: Department for Education. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/431660/SFR15-2015_Text.pdf (Accessed: 8th April 2016).

Department for Education (2015b) *The Children Act 1989 guidance and regulations Volume 3: planning transition to adulthood for care leavers*. London: Department for Education. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/397649/CA1989_Transitions_guidance.pdf. (Accessed: 25th July 2016).

Department for Education (2016) *Children looked after in England (including adoption) year ending 31 March 2016*. London: Department for Education. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/556331/SFR41_2016_Text.pdf. (Accessed: 15th February 2017).

Department for Education (2018) *Extending Personal Adviser support to all care leavers to age 25 statutory guidance for local authorities*. London: Department for Education. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/683701/Extending_Personal_Adviser_support_to_all_care_leavers_to_age_25.pdf. (Accessed: 14th May 2018).

Department for Education and Skills (2005) *Youth Matters CM 6629*. London: The Stationery Office. Available at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130320215757/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Cm6629.pdf>. (Accessed: 10th May 2018).

Department of Work and Pensions (2017) *Statutory instruments 2017 No. 252 Social Security The Universal Credit (Housing Costs Element for claimants age 18 to 21) (Amendment) Regulations 2017*. London: Department for Work and Pensions. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/252/pdfs/uksi_20170252_en.pdf. (Accessed: 9th March 2017).

Department for Work and Pensions (2018) *Housing support for young people* [Press Release]. 29th March. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/housing-support-for-young-people>. (Accessed: 3rd April 2018).

De Viggiani, N. (2012) 'Trying to be something you are not: Masculine performances within a prison settings', *Men and Masculinities*, 15(3), pp. 271-291. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X12448464.

De Viggiani, N. (2018) "'Don't mess with me!'" Enacting masculinities under a compulsory prison regime' in Maycock, M. and Hunt, K. (ed.), *New perspectives on prison masculinities*. Palgrave studies in prisons and penology: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 91-121.

Dünkel, F. (2015) 'Juvenile justice and crime policy in Europe' in Zimring, F., Langer, M. and Tannenhaus, D. D. (ed.). *Juvenile Justice in Global perspective*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 9. 62.

Dwyer, P and Wyn, J. (2001) *Youth, education and risk: facing the future*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Eder, D. and Fingerson, L. (2001) 'Interviewing children and adolescents' in Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Interview research*. California: Sage, pp. 181-199.

Edgar, K. and Tsintsadeze, K. (2017) *Tackling discrimination in prison: still not a fair response*. London: Prison Reform Trust and Zahid Mubarek Trust. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Tackling%20discrimination.pdf> (Accessed: 3rd April 2017).

Edwards, T. (2009) 'Capacity and the Adolescent Brain', *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 16 (3), pp. 427-434. DOI: 10.1080/13218710902930333.

Ellis, K. (2018) 'Contested vulnerability: a case study of girls in secure care', *Children and youth services review*, 88, pp. 156-163. DOI: [10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.02.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.02.047).

End Child Imprisonment (2019) *Principles and minimum expectations for children deprived of their liberty*. End Child Imprisonment. Available at: <https://article39.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ECI-Principles-and-Minimum-Expectations-FINAL-pub-18-April-2019.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th April 2019).

European Group for Integrated Social Research (2001) 'Misleading trajectories: transition dilemmas of young adults in Europe', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 4 (1), pp. 101-118. DOI: 10.1080/13676260120028574.

Evans, K. (2002) 'Taking Control of their Lives? Agency in Young Adult Transitions in England and the New Germany', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 5 (3), pp. 245-269, DOI: 10.1080/1367626022000005965.

Farmer, M. (2017) *The Importance of Strengthening Prisoners' Family Ties to Prevent Reoffending and Reduce Intergenerational Crime*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/636619/farmer-review-report.pdf. (Accessed: 10th August 2017).

Farrall, S., Hunter, B., Sharpe, G. and Calverley, A. (2016) 'What 'works' when retracing sample members in a qualitative longitudinal study?', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 19 (3), pp. 287-300, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2014.993839.

Fenton, S. (2017) 'UK prisons 'holding child inmates in solitary confinement against UN torture rules'', *Independent*, 22nd February. Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/uk-prisons-child-inmates-solitary-confinement-un-torture-rules-young-offenders-institutes-break-jail-a7591781.html>. (Accessed: 22nd February 2017).

Fitzgibbon, D. (2008) 'Fit for purpose? OASys assessments and parole decisions', *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 55 (1), pp. 55-69. DOI: 10.1177/0264550507085677.

Fitzpatrick, C. and Williams, P. (2017) 'The neglected needs of care leavers in the criminal justice system: Practitioners' perspectives and the persistence of problem (corporate) parenting', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 17 (2), pp. 175-191. DOI: 10.1177/1748895816659324.

- Foster, M. Flanagan, C. Osgood, W. and Ruth, G. (2008) 'The transition to adulthood for vulnerable youth and families: common themes and future directions' in Osgood, W. Foster, M. Flanagan, C. and Gretchen, R. (ed.) *On your own without a net: the transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 375-390.
- Furlong, A. (2009) 'Reconceptualising youth and young adulthood' in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of youth and young adulthood*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 1-2.
- Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (1997) *Young people and social change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Furlong, A. Woodman, D. and Wyn, J. (2011) 'Changing times, changing perspectives: reconciling 'transition' and 'cultural' perspectives on youth and young adulthood', *Journal of Sociology*, 47 (4), pp. 355-370. DOI: 10.1177/1440783311420787.
- Gadsby, B. (2019) *Research briefing 1: establishing the employment gap*. Impetus, Centre for Vocational Education Research and National Institute of Economic and Social Research. Available at: <https://impetus.org.uk/assets/publications/Report/Youth-Jobs-Gap-Establishing-the-Employment-Gap-report.pdf>. (Accessed: 26th April 2019).
- Galland, O. (1995) 'Introduction: What is youth?' in Cavalli A. and Galland, O. (ed.) *Youth in Europe*. London: Pinter, pp. 1-6.
- Garland, D. (1997) "'Governmentality' and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology", *Theoretical criminology*, 1 (2), pp. 173-214. DOI: 10.1177/1362480697001002002.
- Garland, D. (2001) *The culture of control: crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gelsthorpe, L. and Worrall, A. (2009) 'Looking for trouble: a recent history of girls, young women and youth justice', *Youth justice* 9 (3) pp. 209-223. DOI: 10.1177/1473225409345100.
- Gibbs, J. (1982) 'Disruption and distress: going from the street to jail' in Parisi, N. (ed.) *Coping with imprisonment*. London: Sage, pp. 29-45.
- Gibbs, G. (2012) 'Grounded theory, coding and computer assisted analysis' in Becker, S., Bryman, A. and Ferguson, H. (ed.) *Understanding research for social policy and social work: themes, methods and approaches*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 337-342.
- Gillen, J. (2006) 'The age of criminal responsibility: "the frontier between care and justice"', *Child care in practice*, 12 (2), pp. 129-139. DOI: 10.1080/13575270600618414.

- Girling, E. (2017) 'Ethical challenges: doing research with children' in Cowburn, M., Gelsthorpe, L. and Wahidin, A. (ed.) *Research ethics in criminology: dilemmas, issues and solutions*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 37-54.
- Godfrey, B., Cox, P., Shore, H. and Alker, Z. (2017) *Young criminal lives: life courses and life changes from 1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. London: Penguin.
- Goldson, B. (1997a) 'Childhood' An Introduction to historical and theoretical analyses' in Scraton, P. (ed.) *Childhood in crisis*. London: UCL Press, pp. 1-28.
- Goldson, B. (1997b) 'Children in trouble: state responses to juvenile crime', in Scraton, P. (ed.) *Childhood in crisis*. London: UCL Press, pp. 127-148.
- Goldson, B. (2002) *Vulnerable inside: children in secure and penal settings*. London: The Children's Society.
- Goldson, B. (2005) 'Child imprisonment: a case for abolition', *Youth Justice*, 5 (2), pp. 77-90. DOI: 10.1177/147322540500500202.
- Goldson, B. (2006) 'Damage, harm and death in child prisons in England and Wales: questions of abuse and accountability' *The Howard Journal* 45 (5) pp. 449-467. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2006.00437.x.
- Goldson, B. (2008) 'Child incarceration: institutional abuse, the violent state and the politics of impunity' in Scraton, P. and McCulloch, J. (ed.) *The violence of incarceration*. New York: Routledge, pp. 86-106.
- Goldson, B. (2009) 'Counterblast: 'Difficult to understand or defend': a reasoned case for raising the criminal age of responsibility', *The Howard Journal*, 48 (5), pp. 514-521. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2009.00592.x.
- Goldson, B. (2010) 'The sleep of (criminological) reason: knowledge-policy rupture and New Labour's youth justice legacy', *Criminology and criminal justice*, 10 (1), pp. 155-178. DOI: 10.1177/1748895809360964.
- Goldson, B. (2013) 'Unsafe, unjust and harmful to wider society': grounds for raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility in England and Wales', *Youth Justice*, 13 (2), pp. 111-130. DOI: 10.1177/1473225413492054.

Goldson, B. (2015) 'The circular motions of penal politics and the pervasive irrationalities of child imprisonment', in Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (ed.) *Youth crime and justice* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 170-190.

Goldson, B. (2019) 'Reading the present and mapping the future(s) of juvenile justice in Europe: complexities and challenges' in Goldson, B. (ed.). *Juvenile Justice in Europe: Past, Present and Future*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 209-253.

Goldson, B. and Coles, D. (2005) *In care of the state? Child deaths in penal custody in England and Wales*. London: Inquest.

Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (2015) 'Children's human rights and youth justice with integrity', in Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (ed.) *Youth crime and justice* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 227-257.

Gooch, K. (2015) 'Who needs restraining? Re-examining the use of physical restraint in an English young offender institution', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 37 (1), pp. 3-20. DOI: 10.1080/09649069.2015.997999.

Gooch, K. (2016) 'A childhood cut short: child deaths in penal custody and the pains of child imprisonment', *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 55 (3), pp. 278-294. DOI: 10.1111/hojo.12170.

Gooch, K. (2017) 'Kidulthood': Ethnography, juvenile prison violence and the transition from 'boys' to 'men'', *Criminology and criminal justice*, 19 (1) pp. 80-97. DOI: 10.1177/1748895817741519.

Gooch K and Treadwell J (2015) *Prison bullying and victimisation*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham. Available at: <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/law/Prison-Bullying-and-Victimisation.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th December 2017).

Goodfellow, P. and Liddle, M. (2017) *Lessons from Youth in focus*. London: Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Lessons-from-Youth-in-Focus.pdf>. (Accessed: 6th April 2017).

Gov.UK (2015) *Written statement to Parliament: Youth justice*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/youth-justice>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Gov.UK (2016) *Working for HMPS*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-prison-service/about/recruitment>. (Accessed: 7th November 2016).

Gov.UK. (2017) *Prisons and courts bill: what it means for you*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/prisons-and-courts-bill-what-it-means-for-you>.

(Accessed: 15th August 2018).

Gov.UK (2018a) *Young people in custody*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/young-people-in-custody/arriving-at-custody>. (Accessed: 21st May 2018).

Gov.UK (2018b) *Prison life*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/life-in-prison>. (Accessed: 21st May 2018).

Gov.UK (2018c) *National Minimum Wage and National Living Wage rates*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/national-minimum-wage-rates>. (Accessed: 4th April 2018).

Green, L. (2019) *Children in custody 2017-18: an analysis of 12-18 year olds' perceptions of their experience in secure training centers and young offender institutions*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectores.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/01/6.5164_HMI_Children-in-Custody-2017-18_A4_v10_web.pdf. (Accessed: 29th January 2019).

Greenwood, G. (2017) Early deaths amongst care leavers revealed *BBC News* 15th February 2017. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-38961818>. (Accessed: 15th February 2017).

Griffin, C. (2013) *Representations of youth: the study of youth adolescence in Britain and America*. Cambridge: Policy Press. Available at: [http://reader.ebib.com/\(S\(jblxvasacsnt21fj45a0b51v\)\)/Reader.aspx?p=1295008&o=1083&u=50hN9nkvn%2b7yMu3evebcAr3QoFU%3d&t=1472122113&h=0C0B4496E0AA9B6DAADF94984157CF472D0CD55B&s=47501274&ut=3544&pg=1&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=2#](http://reader.ebib.com/(S(jblxvasacsnt21fj45a0b51v))/Reader.aspx?p=1295008&o=1083&u=50hN9nkvn%2b7yMu3evebcAr3QoFU%3d&t=1472122113&h=0C0B4496E0AA9B6DAADF94984157CF472D0CD55B&s=47501274&ut=3544&pg=1&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=2#). (Accessed: 25th August 2016).

Griffiths, P. (1996) *Youth and Authority*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198204756.001.0001/acprof-9780198204756-chapter-1>. (Accessed: 11th April 2018).

Guba, E. (1981) 'Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries', *Educational communication*, 29 (2), pp. 75-91. DOI: 10.1007/BF02766777.

Guillemin, M. and Gillam, L. (2004) 'Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10 (2), pp. 261-280. DOI: 10.1177800403262360.

Haines, K. and Case, S. (2018) 'The future of youth justice', *Youth Justice* 18 (2) pp.131-148. DOI: 10.1177/1473225418791416.

Halsey, M. (2007) 'On confinement: Resident and inmate perspectives of secure care and imprisonment', *Probation Journal: The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 54 (4), pp. 338-367. DOI: 10.1177/0264550507083535.

Halsey, M. (2008) 'Risking desistance: respect and responsibility in custodial and post-release contexts' in Carlen, P. (ed.) *Imaginary Penalties*. Devon: Willan, pp. 218-251.

Hammersley, M (2003) 'Recent Radical Criticism of Interview Studies: Any implications for the sociology of education?', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24 (1), pp. 119-126. DOI: 10.1080/01425690301906.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: principles in practice* (3rd ed.). Great Britain: The Cromwell Press.

Hammersley, M. and Traianou, A. (2012) *Ethics in qualitative research: controversies and context*. London: Sage.

Hamilton, M. Antonucci, L. and Roberts, S. (2014) 'Introduction: Young People and Social Policy in Europe Past and Present' in Hamilton, M. Antonucci, L. and Roberts, S. (ed.) *Young People and Social Policy in Europe Dealing with Risk, Inequality and Precarity in Times of Crisis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-12.

Hamilton, C. Fitzgibbon, W. and Carr, N. (2016) 'Punishment, youth justice and cultural contingency Towards a balanced approach', *Youth Justice*, 16 (3) pp. 226-245. DOI: 10.1177/1473225415619500.

Hanham, J. and Tracey, D. (2017) 'Evolution of mentoring relationships involving young male offenders transitioning from a juvenile justice centre to the community', *Youth Justice*, 17 (2), pp. 116-133. DOI: 10.1177/1473225417699169.

Hannah-Moffat, K. (2005) 'Criminogenic needs and the transformative risk subject: hybridizations of risk/need in penalty', *Punishment and Society*, 7 (29), pp. 29-51. DOI: 1177/146247505048132.

Hannah-Moffat, K. (2010) 'Criminological cliques: Narrowing dialogues institutional protectionism and the next generation' in Bosworth, M. and Hoyle, C. (ed.) *What is criminology?*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 440-455.

Harris, T. (2015) *Changing prisons, saving lives: Report of the independent review into self-inflicted deaths in custody of 18-24 year olds*, (Cm 9087) July, 2015. London: Home Office. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/439859/moj-harris-review-web-accessible.pdf (Accessed: 26th February 2016).

Hart, D. (2017) *The 'transformation' of youth custody: a discussion paper* National Association for Youth Justice May 2017. Available at: <http://thenayj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/NAYJ-Briefing-Transformation-of-Youth-Custody-May17.pdf>.

(Accessed: 29th September 2017).

Harvey, J. (2005) 'Crossing the boundary: the transition of young adults into prison', in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The effects of imprisonment*. Devon: Willan, pp. 232-254.

Harvey, J. (2012) *Young men in prison: surviving and adapting to life inside*. Oxon: Routledge.

Heath, S., Brooks, R., Cleaver, E. and Ireland, E. (2009) *Researching young people's lives*. London: Sage.

Heinz, W. (1995) 'Access to working life in Germany and Britain' in Cavalli A. and Galland, O. (ed.) *Youth in Europe*. London: Pinter, pp. 63-78.

Heinz, W. (2009) 'Youth transitions in an age of uncertainty' in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of youth and young adulthood*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 3-13.

Heinz, W. and Krüger, H. (2001) 'Life course: innovations and challenges for social research', *Current sociology*, 49 (2), pp. 29-45. DOI: 10.1177/0011392101049002004.

Hendrick, H. (1997) 'Constructions and reconstructions of British childhood: An interpretative survey 1800 to the present' in James, A. and Prout, A. (ed.) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociology study of childhood* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press, pp. 33-60.

Heptinstall, E. (2000) 'Research note: Gaining access to looked after children for research purposes: lessons learned', *British Journal of Social Work*, 30 (6), pp. 867-872. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/30.6.867>.

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (1997) *Young Prisoners: A thematic review*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/young-prisoners-a->

[thematic-review-by-hm-chief-inspector-of-prisons-for-england-and-wales/](#) (Accessed: 15th January 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2004) *Annual report of HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales 2002-2003*. London: The Stationary Office.

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2008) *HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales Annual report 2007-08*. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/09/HMIP-AR_08.pdf. (Accessed: 13th November, 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2010) *Report on an announced inspection of HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall 3 – 6 May 2011*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/prisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/03/2008_swinfen_hall_final-rps.pdf (Accessed: 16th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2011) *Report on an unannounced short follow-up inspection of HMYOI Aylesbury 3 – 6 May 2011*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/prisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/03/aylesbury-2011.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st April 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2013) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Aylesbury 2 – 12 April 2013*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/prisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/03/aylesbury-2013.pdf>. (Accessed: 16th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2014a) *Submission to the Harris Review: Independent Review into Self-inflicted Deaths in NOMS Custody of 18-24 Year Olds*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/02/HMIP-submission-to-the-Harris-Review-240714.pdf>. (Accessed: 18th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2014b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Hindley 3 – 14 March 2014*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/08/Hindley-Web-2014.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st April 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2014c) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Swinfen Hall 23 June – 3 July 2014*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/11/Swinfen-Hall-final-report-web-2014.pdf> (Accessed: 16th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2015a) *Written evidence from Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons House of Commons Justice Committee Inquiry into Young Adult Offenders* London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/the-treatment-of-young-adults-in-the-criminal-justice-system/written/22172.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2015b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMIP Wandsworth 23 February – 6 March 2015*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/07/Wandsworth-web-2015.pdf>. (Accessed 1st June 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2015c) *Report on an announced inspection of HMP Belmarsh 2 – 6 February 2015*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/05/Belmarsh-2015-web.pdf>. (Accessed 1st June 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2015d) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Cookham Wood by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 5 – 15 May 2015*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/09/Cookham-Wood-Web-2015.pdf>. (Accessed 17th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2016a) *Annual report 2015-16* (HC 471) London: Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/07/HMIP-AR_2015-16_web.pdf. (Accessed 2nd August 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2016b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Hindley by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 4 – 15 July 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at:

<https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/11/Hindley-Web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 29th November 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2016c) *Report on an announced inspection of Juvenile unit at HMYOI Parc by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 11–22 January 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/06/Parc-CYP-unit-web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed 13th June 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2016d) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Werrington by Her Majesty's Inspector of Prisons, 12 – 23 October 2015*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/03/Werrington-Web-2016.pdf> (Accessed: 16th March 2016).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017a) *Annual report 2016-17* (HC 208) London: Her Majesty's Chief Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/07/HMIP-AR_2016-17_CONTENT_11-07-17-WEB.pdf. (Accessed 18th July 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Aylesbury 4-5, 24-28 April 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/08/Aylesbury-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th August 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017c) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Exeter 15 - 26 August 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/01/Exeter-Web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 1st February 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017d) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall 24 October – 4 November 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/03/Swinfen-Hall-Web-2016-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017e) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP/YOI Norwich 12 -23 September 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons

Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/02/Norwich-Web-2016-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th February 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017f) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Swansea 7, 8, 14-17 August 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons.

Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/01/Swansea-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 12th February 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017g) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Cookham Wood 12 - 23 September 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons

Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/01/Cookham-Wood-Web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th January 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017h) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Preston 6 – 17 March 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/07/Preston-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th July 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017i) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Holme House 3–4, 10 – 13 July 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/12/Holme-House-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 5th December 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017j) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Wormwood Scrubs 31 July – 11 August 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons.

Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/12/HMP-Wormwood-Scrubs-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th December 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017k) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Durham 3 - 14 October 2016*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/03/Durham-Web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 7th March 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017l) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Wetherby and Keppel 13-24 March 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons.

Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp->

[content/uploads/sites/4/2017/09/Wetherby-Keppel-Web-2017.pdf](https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/09/Wetherby-Keppel-Web-2017.pdf). (Accessed: 20th September 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017m) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HM/YOI Portland 15-19 May*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/09/Portland-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th September 2017).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018a) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Deerbolt 16 - 27 April 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/09/Deerbolt-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 14th September 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP & YOI Parc by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 16 – 26 October 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/02/Young-persons-unit-at-HMP-YOI-Parc-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st February 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018c) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Wetherby and Keppel 5 -15 March 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/07/Wetherby-and-Keppel-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018d) *Report on an unannounced Inspection of HMYOI Werrington 15 - 25 January 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/06/Werrington-Web-2018-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th June 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018e) *Report on unannounced Inspection of HMYOI Feltham (Feltham A – children and young people) 20–21 December 2017, 8–12 January 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/05/Feltham-A-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th May 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018f) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMPYOI Brinsford by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 6 – 17 November 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/03/Brinsford-Web-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th March 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018g) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP & YOI Rochester by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons 23 October – 3 November 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/03/HMP-YOI-Rochester-Web-2017-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 15th March 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018h) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Hull 26 March – 12 April 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/08/Hull-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th August 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018i) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Wandsworth 26 February – 9 March 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/07/Wandsworth-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 18th July 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2018j) *Annual report 2017-18*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/07/6.4472_HMI-Prisons_AR-2017-18_Content_A4_Final_WEB.pdf. (Accessed: 11th July 2018).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2019a) *Report on an unannounced inspection of young person's unit at HMP & YOI Parc 15 – 25 October 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Young-Persons-Unit-at-Parc-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th February 2019).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2019b) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Isis 23 July – 2 August 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available

at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/12/HMP-YOI-Isis-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th January, 2019).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2019c) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Swinfen Hall 6-7, 20-23 August 2018*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/01/Swinfen-Hall-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th January, 2019).

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (2019d) *Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Cookham Wood 10 – 20 December 2018*. London. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/Cookham-Wood-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th April 2019).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (1999) *Suicide is everyone's concern: A thematic review by HM Chief Inspectorate of Prisons for England and Wales* (HC 680) October 2014. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/07/suicide-is-everyones-concern-1999-rps.pdf>. (Accessed: 12th February 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2011) *The care of looked after children in custody: a short thematic review*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/08/Looked-after-children-print.pdf> (Accessed: 8th April 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2012) *Expectations: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*, [Version 4]. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/prisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/02/adult-expectations-2012.pdf>. (Accessed: 29th September 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2014) *What we do*. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-hmi-prisons/>. (Accessed: 18th March, 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2015a) *Life in Prison: The first 24 hours in prison: A findings paper*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/11/HMIP-First-24-hours-findings-paper-web-2015.pdf> (Accessed: 16th January 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2015b) *Ethical principles for research activities*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/02/5.-ETHICAL-PRINCIPLES-FOR-RESEARCH-ACTIVITIES-July-2015-01.pdf>. (Accessed: 2nd November 2017).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2016a) *The impact of distance from home on children in custody*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/09/The-impact-of-distance-from-home-on-children-in-custody-Web-2016.pdf>. (Accessed: 28th September 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2016b) *Life in prison: peer support*. London: HMIP. Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/01/Peer-support-findings-paper-final-draft.pdf>. (Accessed: 29th January 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2017a) *Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons* [Version 5]. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/07/Expectations-for-publication-FINAL.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th July 2017).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2017b) *HM Chief Inspector of Prisons welcomes new 'Urgent Notification' agreement with potential to strengthen the impact of inspections in failing jails* November 2017. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/media/press-releases/2017/11/hm-chief-inspector-of-prisons-welcomes-new-urgent-notification-agreement-with-potential-to-strengthen-the-impact-of-inspections-in-failing-jails/>. (Accessed: 15th August 2018).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2017c) *Children in custody 2016/17 appendices*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/11/Children-in-Custody-2016-17-Appendices.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th May 2018).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2017d) *Life in prison: Living conditions A findings paper*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/10/Findings-paper-Living-conditions-FINAL-.pdf>. (Accessed: 10th October 2017).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2018) *Incentivising and promoting good behaviour: a thematic review*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/03/Incentivising-and-promoting-good-behaviour-Web-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 21st March 2018).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, Care Quality Commission and Ofsted (2019) *Joint Inspection Framework: secure training centres*. Manchester: Ofsted. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/785459/STC_framework_120319.pdf. (Accessed: 15th March 2019).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2015a) *Transforming Rehabilitation, Early Implementation 3, 'An independent inspection of the arrangements for Offender supervision*. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2015/11/TransformingRehabilitation3.pdf> (Accessed: 21st December 2015).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2015b) *Joint thematic inspection of resettlement services to children by Youth Offending Teams and partner agencies*. Manchester, England: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. Available at: https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/20150311_youth_resettlement_report.pdf. (Accessed: 17th August 2018).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016a) *Transitions arrangements: a follow-up inspection* January, 2016. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation Available at:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/01/Transitions-arrangements-follow-up-report.pdf>

(Accessed: 20th January 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016b) *Desistance and young people* May 2016. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation Available at: http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/05/Desistance_and_young_people.pdf. (Accessed: 26th May 2016).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2016c). *Accommodation of homeless 16 and 17 year old children working with youth offending teams*. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation and Criminal Justice Joint Inspection. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/09/Thematic-Report-Accommodation-of-Homeless-16-and-17-Year-Old-Children.pdf>. (Accessed: 14th February 2018).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2017a) *2017 Annual Report: HM Inspectorate of Probation for England and Wales*. Manchester: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/12/HMI-Probation-Annual-Report-2017lowres-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 15th December 2017).

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (2018) *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service annual report and accounts 2017-18* (HC 1175). Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720863/HMPPS_ARA_2017-18_web.pdf. (Accessed: 10th July 2018).

Hill, M. (1999) 'What's the problem? Who can help? The perspectives of children and young people on their well-being and on helping professionals', *Journal of social work and practice*, 13 (2) pp. 135-145. DOI: 10.1080/026505399103368.

HM Government (2006) *Safeguarding Vulnerable groups Act 2006 Chapter 47*. London: HM Government. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/47/pdfs/ukpga_20060047_en.pdf. (Accessed: 13th March 2019).

HM Government (2012) *Protections of Freedom Act Chapter 9*. London: HM Government. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/9/pdfs/ukpga_20120009_en.pdf. (Accessed: 13th March 2019).

HM Government (2013) *Care Leaver Strategy: A cross-developmental strategy for young people leaving care*. London: HM Government. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/266484/Care_Leaver_Strategy.pdf. (Accessed: 25th July 2016).

HM Government (2014) *Care Leaver Strategy: One year on progress update*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/368235/Care_Leavers_Strategy_update.pdf. (Accessed: 25th July 2016).

HM Government (2016) *Keep on caring: supporting young people from care to independence*. London: HM Government. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/535899/Care-Leaver-Strategy.pdf. (Accessed 22nd July 2016).

HM Government (2017) *Children and Social Work Act Chapter 16*. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/16/pdfs/ukpga_20170016_en.pdf. (Accessed: 10th January 2018).

HM Government (2018) *Secure schools: how to apply guide. Draft for comment*. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/712978/secure-schools-how-to-apply-guide-print.pdf. (Accessed: 7th June 2018).

HMPPS Briefing and Correspondence (2019) Freedom of Information request – 190405020 [email] Price, J. prisoncasework@justice.gov.uk. 8th May 2019.

Home Office (1933) *Children and Young Persons Act*. London: Home Office Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/23-24/12> (Accessed: 15th December 2015).

Home Office (1988) *Criminal Justice Act*. London: Home Office. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/33/part/IX/enacted>. (Accessed: 30th May, 2019).

Home Office (1998) *Crime and Disorder Act*. London: Home Office. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/37/part/III>. (Accessed: 26th September 2017).

Home Office (2000a) *Criminal justice and court services act 2000*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/43/notes/division/4/3/6>. (Accessed: 21st May 2018).

Home Office (2000b) *The young offender institution rules 2000*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2000/3371/made>. (Accessed: 21st May 2018).

Home Office (2004) *Reducing reoffending National Action Plan*. London: Home Office. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/272221/6717.pdf. (Accessed: 16th May 2018).

Hoolachan, J., McKee, K., Moore, T. and Mihaela Soaita, A. (2017) ‘Generation rent’ and the ability to ‘settle down’: economic and geographical variation in young people’s housing transitions’, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 20 (1), pp. 63-78, DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2016.1184241.

Horowitz, A. and Bromnick, R. (2007) ‘“Contestable adulthood” variability and disparity in the markers for negotiating the transition to adulthood’, *Youth and Society*, 39 (2), pp. 209-231. DOI: 10.1177/0044118X06296692.

House of Commons Education and Health and Social Care Committees (2018) *The Government’s Green Paper on mental health: failing a generation* (HC 642). London: House of Commons Education and Health and Social Care Committees. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmhealth/642/642.pdf>. (Accessed: 10th May 2018).

House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights (2019) *Youth detention: solitary confinement and restraint. Nineteenth report of session 2017-19* (HC 994, HL Paper 343). London: House of Commons House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt201719/jtselect/jtrights/994/994.pdf>. (Accessed: 18th April 2019).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2009) *Role of the Prison officer. Seven Report of Session 2008-09* (HC 361). London: The Stationary Office Available at <https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmjust/361/361.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th November 2016).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2013) *Youth Justice. Seventh Report of Session 2012-13* (HC 339). London: The Stationary Office Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmjust/339/339.pdf> (Accessed: 19th February 2016).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2016a) *Oral Evidence: Young Adult Offenders* (HC 397). London: House of Commons. Available at: <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/the-treatment-of-young-adults-in-the-criminal-justice-system/oral/27782.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th January 2016).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2016b) *Oral evidence, Young Adult Offenders* (HC 397). London: House of Commons. Available at: <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/young-adult-offenders/oral/28364.pdf> (Accessed: 9th February 2016).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2016c) *The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system. Seventh Report of Session 2016–17* (HC 169). London: The Stationary Office Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmjust/169/169.pdf>. (Accessed: 26th October 2016).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2017) *Oral evidence: young adults in the criminal justice system and youth custodial estate* (HC 419). London: House of Commons. Available at: <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/young-adults-in-the-criminal-justice-system/oral/73285.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th November 2017).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2018a) *Young adults in the criminal justice system: Government response to the Committee's eighth report of session 2017-19. Fifth report of session 2017-19* (HC 1530). London: House of Commons Justice Committee. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/1530/1530.pdf>. (Accessed: 7th September 2018).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2018b) *Transforming rehabilitation. Ninth report of session 2017-19* (HC 482). London: House of Commons Justice Committee. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/482/482.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2018c) *Young adults in the criminal justice system: eighth report of session* (HC 419). London: House of Commons Justice Committee. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/419/419.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th June 2018).

House of Commons Justice Committee (2019) *Prison population for 2022: planning for the future. Sixteenth report of session 2017-19*. (HC 483). London: House of Commons Justice Committee. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/483/483.pdf>. (Accessed: 15th April 2019).

House of Lords Select Committee on Intergenerational Fairness and Provision (2019) *Tackling intergenerational unfairness. Report of session 2017-19*. (HL Paper 329). Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldintfair/329/329.pdf>. (Accessed: 25th April 2019).

Howard League for Penal Reform (2014) *Public sector prison-officer numbers cut by 41 per cent*. London: Howard league for Penal Reform, 20th October 2014. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/news/prisonofficernumberscut/>. (Accessed: 7th November 2016).

Howard League for Penal Reform (2016a) *A million days: the world of prison discipline*. London: Howard league for Penal Reform. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/A-Million-Days.pdf>. (Accessed: 18th November 2016).

Howard League for Penal Reform (2016b) *The Carlile Inquiry 10 years on: The use of restraint, solitary confinement and strip-searching on children*. London: Howard League for Penal Reform. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Carlile-Inquiry-10-years-on.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th June 2016).

Howard League for Penal Reform (2017) *The role of the prison officer: research briefing*. London: Howard League for Penal Reform. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/The-role-of-the-prison-officer.pdf>. (Accessed: 15th November 2017).

Howard League for Penal Reform and Transition to Adulthood Alliance (2018) *Sentencing young adults: making the case for sentencing principles for young adults*. London: Howard League for Penal Reform, Transition to Adulthood Alliance and Barrow Cadbury Trust. Available at: <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Sentencing-Young-Adults.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th May 2019).

Hughes, N. and Strong, G. (2016) 'Implementing the evidence on young adult neuromaturation: the development of a specialist approach in probation services', *Probation Journal*, 63 (4), pp. 452-459. DOI: 10.1177/0264550516648398.

Hulley, S., Crewe, B. and Wright, S. (2016) 'Re-examining the problems of long-term imprisonment', *British Journal of Criminology*, 56 (4), pp. 769-792. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv077>.

Hurrelmann, K. & Quenzel, G. (2015) 'Lost in transition: status insecurity and inconsistency as hallmarks of modern adolescence', *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20 (3), pp. 261-270. DOI: 10.1080/02673843.2013.785440.

Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse (2019) *Sexual abuse of children in custodial institutions 2009-2017 Investigation report February 2019*. Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse. Available at: <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/reports/cici>. (Accessed: 13th March 2019).

Independent Monitoring Board (2016a) *HMYOI Werrington Independent Monitoring Board Annual Report 1 June 2015 – 31 May 2016*. Independent Monitoring Board. Available at: <http://www.imb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Werrington-2015-16.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th October 2016).

Independent Monitoring Board (2016b) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board 1 October 2015 – 30 September 2016 HMYOI Deerbolt*. Independent Monitoring Board. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2017/01/Deerbolt-2015-16.pdf>. (Accessed: 6th August 2018).

Independent Monitoring Board (2017a) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall for reporting Year 1 May 2016 to 30 April 2017*. Independent Monitoring Board and National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2017/09/Swinfen-Hall-2016-17.pdf>. (Accessed: 6th August 2018).

Independent Monitoring Board (2017b) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMYOI Wetherby June 2016 to May 2017*. Independent Monitoring Board and National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2017/09/Wetherby-2016-17.pdf>. (Accessed: 6th August 2018).

Independent Monitoring Board (2017c) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HM YOI Aylesbury for reporting Year 1st July 2016 to 30th June 2017*. Independent Monitoring Board and National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2017/11/Aylesbury-2016-17-2.pdf>. (Accessed: 4th August 2018).

Independent Monitoring Board (2018a) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMYOI Feltham for reporting year (1st November 2016 to 31st October 2017)*. Independent Monitoring Board and National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2018/04/Feltham-2016-17-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 14th May 2018).

Independent Monitoring Board (2018b) *Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMYOI Deerbolt for reporting Year 1 October 2016 to 30 September 2017*. Independent Monitoring Board and National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/imb-prod-storage-1ocod6bqky0vo/uploads/2018/01/Deerbolt-2016-17-AR.pdf>. (Accessed: 6th August 2018).

Innovation Unit (2019) *Falling through the gaps: fragmented and underfunded systems are failing care leavers who serve prison sentences, in custody and in the community*. Available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1j6lC39SloulsBZnXTfppWlejWRE5j_l4/view. (Accessed: 15th March 2019).

Inquest and Transition to Adulthood (2015) *Stolen lives and missed opportunities: the deaths of young adults and children in prison*. London: Inquest. Available at: https://www.barrowcadbury.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Inquest-Report_finalversion_Online.pdf. (Accessed: 16th April 2017).

Irwin, J. and Owen, B. (2005) 'Harm and the contemporary prison' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The effects of imprisonment*. Devon: Willan, pp. 94-117.

Israel, M. and Gelsthorpe, L. (2017) 'Ethics in criminological research: a powerful force or a force for the powerful' in Cowburn, M., Gelsthorpe, L. and Wahidin, A. (ed.) *Research ethics in criminology: dilemmas, issues and solutions*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 185-203.

Jacobson, J. and Talbot, J. (2009) *Vulnerable Defendants in the Criminal Courts: a review of provision for adults and children*. London: Prison Reform Trust. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/vulnerable%20defendants%20in%20the%20criminal%20courts.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th April 2017).

James, A and James, A. (2004) *Constructing childhood: theory, policy and social research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

James, A. Jenks, C. Prout, A. (1998) *Theorizing Childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jaspers, Y. Nuytiens, A., Christiaens, J. and Dumortier, E. (2017) 'Pathways of transferred youth offenders into adulthood', *Youth Justice*, 17 (2), pp. 153-170. DOI: 10.1177/1473225417700324.

Jeffrey, C. and McDowell, L. (2004) 'Youth in a comparative perspective', *Youth and Society*, 36 (2), pp. 131-142. DOI: 10.11770044118X04268375.

Jeffer, T. and Smith, M. (1998) 'The problem of "youth" for youth work', *Youth and Policy*, 62, pp. 45-66.

Jewkes, Y. (2005a) 'Loss, liminality and the life sentence: managing identity through a disrupted life course' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The effects of imprisonment*. Devon: Willan, pp. 366-390.

Jewkes, Y. (2005b) 'Men behind bars: "doing" masculinity as an adaptation to imprisonment', *Men and masculinities*, 8 (1), pp. 44-63. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X03257452.

Jewkes, Y. (2011) 'Autoethnography and emotion as intellectual resources: doing prison research differently', *Qualitative enquiry*, 18 (1), pp. 63-75. DOI: 10.1177/1077800411428942.

Jones, G. (2002) *The youth divide: diverging paths to adulthood*. York: The Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/youth-divide-diverging-paths-adulthood>. (Accessed: 13th April 2018).

Jones, G. and Bell, R. (2000) *Balancing acts: youth, parenting and public policy*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/balancing-acts-youth-parenting-and-public-policy>. (Accessed: 25th September 2016).

Jozwiak, G. (2018) Revised youth justice guidelines 'risk poorer outcomes' *Children and Young People Now*, 16th November 2018. Available at: https://www.cypnow.co.uk/cyp/news/2006046/revised-youth-justice-guidelines-risk-poorer-outcomes?utm_content=&utm_campaign=191118_Update&utm_source=Children. (Accessed: 20th November 2018).

Justice (2017) *Swinfen Hall Prison Information*. Available at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/contacts/prison-finder/swinfen-hall>. (Accessed: 18th January 2018).

Justice Studio (2014) *'They helped me, they supported me' Achieving outcomes and value for money in secure children's homes*. London: Justice Studio. Available at: http://www.justicestudio.org/reports/sch_outcomes_and_vfm_final_april_2014.pdf. (Accessed: 10th October 2016).

Katz, J. (2001) 'Boys are not men: notes on working with adolescent males in juvenile detention' in Sabo, D., Kupers, T. A., and James, W. (ed.) *Prison Masculinities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 207-217.

King, R. and Liebling, A. (2008) 'Doing research in prisons' in King, R. and Wincup, E. (ed.) *Doing research on crime and justice* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 431-454.

Lammy, D. (2017) *The Lammy Review An independent review into the treatment of, and outcomes for, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in the Criminal Justice System*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf. (Accessed: 8th September 2017).

Lanskey, C. (2016) 'Formal and informal learning in custody settings for young people', *Prison Service Journal*, 226, pp. 3-7. Available at: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/PSJ%20226%20July%202016.pdf>. (Accessed: 1st August 2016).

Laws, B. (2018) 'The return of the suppressed: exploring how emotional suppression reappears as violence and pain among male and female prisoners', *Punishment and society*, 0 (0) pp. 1-18. DOI: 10.1177/1462474518805071.

Laws, B. and Crewe, B. (2016) 'Emotion regulation among male prisoners', *Theoretical criminology*, 20 (4), pp. 529-547. DOI: 10.1177/1362480615622532.

Lee, P. (2018) *Letter to Bob Neill MP, 27th February 2018*. Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Justice/correspondence/Dr-Lee-Young-adults-youth-custodial-estate.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th March 2018).

Lepper, J. (2015) YOT leaders unconvinced by youth justice transition protocol *Children and Young People Now*, 11th December 2015. Available at:

<http://www.cypnow.co.uk/cyp/news/1155152/yot-leaders-unconvinced-by-youth-justice-transition-protocol> (Accessed: 16th December 2015).

Liddle, M., Boswell, G., Wright, S. and Francis, V. (2016) *Trauma and young offenders: A review of the research and practice literature*. London: Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Trauma-and-young-offenders-a-review-of-the-research-and-practice-literature.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th December 2016).

Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., Ikeda, J. (2015) 'Neo-liberalism and responsibilisation in the discourse of social service workers', *British Journal of Social Work*, 45 (3), pp. 1006-1021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bct172>.

Liebling, A. (1999) 'Doing research in prison: breaking the silence?', *Theoretical Criminology*, 3(2), pp. 147-173. DOI: 10.1177/1362480699003002002.

Liebling, A. (2000) 'Prison Officers, Policing and the Use of Discretion', *Theoretical Criminology*, 4 (3), pp. 333 – 357. DOI: [10.1177/136248060004003005](https://doi.org/10.1177/136248060004003005).

Liebling, A. (2001) 'Whose side are we on? Theory, practice and allegiances in prisons research', *British Journal of Criminology*, 41 (3), pp. 472-484. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/41.3.472>.

Liebling, A. (2008) 'Incentives and earned privileges revisited: fairness, discretion, and the quality of prison life', *Journal of Scandinavian studies in criminology and crime prevention*, 9 (S1), pp. 25-41. DOI: 10.1080/14043850802450773.

Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (2005) 'The effects of imprisonment revisited' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The effects of imprisonment*. Devon: Willan, pp. 1-32.

Liebling, A., Durie, L., Stiles, A. and Tait, S. (2005) 'Revisiting prison suicide: the role of fairness and distress' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (ed.) *The effects of imprisonment*. Devon: Willan, pp. 209-231.

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

Livingstone, I, Amad, S. and Clark, L. (2015) *Effective approaches to working with young adults: a guide for probation services*. London: Transition to Adulthood. Available at: http://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Probation-guide_Web-Ver4.pdf (Accessed: 11th January 2016).

Local Government Association (2017) *Councils call for urgent action to improve safety in youth offending institutions* Local Government Association 22nd September 2017. Available at: <https://www.local.gov.uk/about/news/councils-call-urgent-action-improve-safety-youth-offending-institutions>. (Accessed: 29th September 2017).

Longfield, A. and Casey, L. (2018) *Voices from the inside: the experiences of girls in Secure Training Centres*. London: Children's Commissioner for England. Available at: <https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CCO-Voices-from-the-Inside-MARCH-2018-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th March 2018).

MacDonald, R. (2006) 'Social exclusion, youth transitions and criminal careers: five critical reflections on 'risk'', *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 39 (3), pp. 371-383. DOI: 10.1375/acri.39.3.371.

MacDonald, R. (2011) 'Youth transitions, unemployment and underemployment: Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose?', *Journal of Sociology*, 47 (4), pp. 427-444. DOI: 10.1177/1440783311420794.

MacDonald, R. and Shildrick, T. (2007) 'Street corner society: leisure careers, youth (sub)culture and social exclusion', *Leisure Studies*, 26 (3), pp. 339-355. DOI: 10.1080/02614360600834826.

MacDonald, R. Shildrick, T. Webster, C and Simpson, D. (2005) 'Growing up in poor neighborhoods: the significance of class and place in the extended transitions of 'social excluded' young adults', *Sociology*, 39 (5), pp. 873-891. DOI: 10.1177/0038038505058370.

Mackie, A. (2019) 'The young unemployed and a 'perfect storm' of stigmatisation'', *Concept*, 10 (1) pp. 1-6. Available at: <http://concept.lib.ed.ac.uk/article/view/2999> (Accessed: 25 April 2019).

Maguire, M. and Raynor, R. (2017) 'Offender management in and after prison: the end of 'end to end'?' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 17 (2), pp. 138-157. DOI: 10.1177/1748895816665435.

Margaret Thatcher Foundation (2018) *Conservative Party Manifesto 1979*. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/110858>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Maruna, S., Coyle, B. and Marsh, B. (2015) 'Desistance from crime in the transition to adulthood', in Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (ed.) *Youth crime and justice* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 157-169.

Mary, A. (2014) 'Re-evaluating the concept of adulthood and the framework of transition', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17 (3), pp. 415-429. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2013.853872.

Masson, J. (2000) 'Researching children's perspectives: legal issues' in Lewis, A. and Lindsay, G. (ed.) *Researching children's lives*. Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 34-45.

Maurutto, P. and Hannah-Moffat, K. (2006) 'Assembling risk and the restructuring of penal control' *British Journal of Criminology*, 46 (3), pp. 438-454. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azi073.

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the Ministry of Justice and London Councils (2018) *Working towards Justice Devolution to London: Memorandum of Understanding between the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the Ministry of Justice and London Councils*. London: Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the Ministry of Justice and London Councils. Available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_justice_mou_final.pdf. (Accessed: 26th March 2018).

McCarthy, D. and Adams, M. (2017) 'Prison visitation as human 'right' or earned 'privilege'? The differing tales of England/Wales, and Scotland', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 39 (2), pp. 403-416. DOI: 10.1080/09649069.2017.1390292.

McCarthy, P., Schiraldi, V. and Shark, M. (2016) *The future of youth justice: A community-based alternative to the youth prison model*. Laurel: National Institute of Justice and Harvard Kennedy School. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/250142.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th October 2017).

Medlicott, D. (2008) 'Preventing torture and casual cruelty in prisons through independent monitoring' in Scraton, P. and McCulloch, J. (ed.) *The violence of incarceration*. New York: Routledge, pp. 244-260.

Meek, R. (2018) *A sporting chance: an independent review of sport in youth and adult prisons*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/733184/a-sporting-chance-an-independent-review-sport-in-justice.pdf. (Accessed: 3rd September 2018).

Mehay, A., Meek, R. and Ogden, J. (2019) "'I try and make my cell a positive place": tactics for mitigating risks to health and wellbeing in a young offender institution', *Health and place*, 57, pp. 54-60. DOI: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.03.012.

Mid and West Wales Safeguarding Children's Board (2018) *Extended child practice review report in respect of Child A*. Available at: <http://cysur.wales/media/124632/CYSUR-4-2017-ECPR-FINAL-Report.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th February 2018).

Miller, T. A. (2000) 'Surveillance: Gender, privacy and the sexualization of power in prison' *George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal*, 291, pp. 1–39.

Ministry of Justice (2012) *PSI 08/2012 Care and management of young people*. London: National Offender Management Service.

Ministry of Justice (2013a) *Transforming Management of Young Adults in Custody* (CM 8733). London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/young-adults/user_uploads/transforming-management-of-young-adults-in-custody.pdf (Accessed: 12th February 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2013b) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform* (CM 8619). London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228744/8619.pdf (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2013c) *PSI 64/2011 (9th September 2013 F&S Revised) Management of prisoners at risk of harm to self, others and from others (Safer Custody)*. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/psis/prison-service-instructions-2011>. (Accessed: 14th February 2019).

Ministry of Justice (2014) *Transforming youth custody: government response to the consultation*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/273402/transforming-youth-custody-consultation-response.pdf (Accessed: 18th April 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2015a) *Women Prisoners*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/types-of-offender/women>. (Accessed: 18th April 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2015b) *Government response to the Harris Review into self-inflicted deaths in National Offender Management Service custody of 18-24 year olds*. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/486564/gov-response-harris-review.pdf. (Accessed: 12th September 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2016a) *Costs per place and costs per prisoner National Offender Management Service Annual Report and Accounts 2015-16 Management Information Addendum Ministry of Justice*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/563326/costs-per-place-cost-per-prisoner-2015-16.pdf. (Accessed: 9th August 2017).

Ministry of Justice (2016b) *The government's response to Charlie Taylor's review of the Youth Justice System*. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/576553/youth-justice-review-government-response.pdf. (Accessed: 15th December 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2016c) *Prison Safety and reform*. London: The Stationary Office Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/565014/cm-9350-prison-safety-and-reform-web.pdf. (Accessed: 4th November 2016).

Ministry of Justice (2017a) *Government Response to the Justice Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2016-17: The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system*. London: Ministry of Justice Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Justice/treatment-of-young-adults-govt-response.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th February 2017).

Ministry of Justice (2017b) *National Offender Management Service Annual Offender Equalities Report 2016/17 Statistics Bulletin*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/663390/noms-offender-equalities-annual-report-2016-2017.pdf. (Accessed: 8th December 2017).

Ministry of Justice (2018a) *Our Secure Schools Vision*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/712904/secure-schools-vision.pdf. (Accessed: 8th June 2018).

Ministry of Justice (2018b) *Government hits target of 2,500 new prison officers 7 months ahead of schedule* [Press release]. 22nd April. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-hits-target-of-2500-new-prison-officers-7-months-ahead-of-schedule>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

Ministry of Justice (2018c) *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) workforce statistics bulletin, as at 30 June 2018*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/734018/hmpps-workforce-statistics-bulletin-30-june-2018.pdf. (Accessed: 3rd September 2018).

Ministry of Justice (2018d) *Costs per place and cost per prisoner by individual prison establishment 2017 to 2018 tables* [Microsoft excel spreadsheet]. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-performance-statistics-2017-to-2018>. (Accessed: 26th October 2018).

Ministry of Justice (2018e) *Ministry of Justice: Care leaver covenant offer*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ministry-of-justice-care-leaver-covenant-offer?utm_source=c7362285-0af1-4259-b769-806e2b78a630&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=govuk-notifications&utm_content=immediate. (Accessed: 13th November 2018).

Ministry of Justice (2018f) *Annual prison population: 2018* [Microsoft excel spreadsheet]. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/offender-management-statistics-quarterly-january-to-march-2018>. (Accessed: 3rd February 2019).

Ministry of Justice (2018g) *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service Offender Equalities Annual Report 2017/18*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/760093/hmpps-offender-equalities-2017-18.pdf. (Accessed: 5th December 2018).

Ministry of Justice, National Probation Service and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (2018) *Justice Secretary outlines future vision for probation* [Press release]. 27th July. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/justice-secretary-outlines-future-vision-for-probation>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

Ministry of Justice, National Probation Service and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (2019) *Justice Secretary outlines new model for probation* [Press release]. 16th May. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/justice-secretary-outlines-future-vision-for-probation>. (Accessed: 16th May 2019).

Misztal, P. (2011) *The challenges of vulnerability: in search of strategies for a less vulnerable social life*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mitchell, M. Jones, T. and Renema, S. (2015) 'Will I make it on my own? Voices and visions of a 17-year old youth in transition', *The Journal of Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 32, pp. 291-300. DOI: 10.1007/s10560-014-0364-2.

Molgat, M. (2007) 'Do Transitions and Social Structures Matter? How 'Emerging Adults' Define Themselves as Adults', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (5), pp. 495-516, DOI: 10.1080/13676260701580769.

Mook, A. (2017) 'Why don't we just... help foster carers reduce homelessness?', *Big Issue North*, 4th April. Available at: <http://www.bigissuenorth.com/comment/2017/04/dont-just-help-foster-carers-reduce-homelessness/>. (Accessed: 1st May 2017).

Moore, L. and Wahidin, A. (2017) 'The role of ethics in prisoner research' in Cowburn, M., Gelsthorpe, L. and Wahidin, A. (ed.) *Research ethics in criminology: dilemmas, issues and solutions*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 55-76.

Morse, J., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olsen, J. and Spires, J. (2002) 'Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research', *The International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1 (2), pp. 13-22. DOI: 10.1177/160940690200100202.

Mukassa, M. (2019) 2019 05 01 – Jayne Price FOI 190409009 [email]. Price, J. martin.mukassa@noms.gsi.gov.uk. 9th May 2019.

Muncie, J. (2005), 'The globalisation of crime control – the case of youth and juvenile justice: neo-liberalism, policy convergence and international conventions', *Theoretical Criminology*, 9 (1) pp. 35-64. DOI: 10.1177/1362480605048942.

Muncie, J. (2008) 'The 'punitive' turn in juvenile justice: Cultures of control and rights compliance in Western Europe and the USA', *Youth Justice*, 8 (2), pp. 107-121. DOI: 10.1177/1473225408091372.

Nacro (2000) *Youth Crime Briefing*. London: Nacro.

Nacro (2001) *Young adult offenders: a period of transition*. London: Nacro.

Nacro and Centrepoint (2018) 'Have you got anybody you can stay with?' *Housing options for young people leaving custody*. London: Nacro and Centrepoint. Available at: <https://www.nacro.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Nacro-Centrepoint-Report-Have-you-got-anybody-you-can-stay-with-June-2018.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th June 2018).

Narey, M. (2016) *Residential care in England: Report of Sir Martin Narey's independent review of residential children's care*. London: HM Government Department of Education. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/534560/Residential-Care-in-England-Sir-Martin-Narey-July-2016.pdf. (Accessed 22nd July 2016).

National Audit Office (2015) *Care leavers' transition to adulthood*. London: Department for Education. Available at: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Care-leavers-transition-to-adulthood.pdf>. (Accessed: 25th July 2016).

National Audit Office (2017) *Mental Health in Prisons (HC 247) Session 2016-2017 29 June 2017*. London: Her Majesty's Prison & Probation Service, NHS England and Public Health England. Available at: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Mental-health-in-prisons.pdf>. (Accessed: 30th June 2017).

National Offender Management Service (2012) *The transition process: guidance on transfers from under 18 young offender institutions to young adult Young Offender Institutions*. London: Ministry of Justice and National Offender Management Service. Available at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140715125218/https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/youth-justice/youth-adult-transitions/guidance-transfers-from-under18-yoi-to-adult-yoi.pdf>. Accessed: 3rd April 2018).

National Offender Management Service (2014) *Research applications*. London: National Offender Management Service.

National Offender Management Service (2015a) *Better outcomes for young adult men: evidence based commissioning principles*. London: NOMS. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/462169/Better_Outcomes_for_Young_Adult_Men_P1_1_.pdf (Accessed on: 9th February 2016).

National Offender Management Service (2015b) *Early days in custody – reception in custody, and induction to custody* PSI 07/2015. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/offenders/psipso/psi-2015/psi-07-2015-pi-06-2015-early-days-in-custody.pdf>. (Accessed: 22nd January 2018).

National Offender Management Service (2015c) *Sentence planning* PSI 19/2014. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/offenders/psipso/psi-2014/psi-19-2014-ai-14-2014-pi-13-2014-sentence-planning.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th May 2018).

National Offender Management Service (2015d) *National Security Framework Control and Order Function Amendments to Use of Force Policy PSI 30/2015*. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/psis/prison-service-instructions-2015>. (Accessed: 13th February 2019).

National Offender Management Service (2016) *National Security Framework 3.1 Searching of the Person PSI 07/2016*. London: National Offender Management Service. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/psis/prison-service-instructions-2016>. (Accessed: 13th February 2019).

National Offender Management Service (2017) *National Offender Management Service Annual reports and accounts 2017-2017*. London: National Offender Management Service. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/630533/6.3329_NOMS_AR_180717_19_July_web.pdf. (Accessed: 9th August 2017).

National Preventative Mechanism (2017) *Guidance: Isolation in detention*. London: National Preventative Mechanism. Available at: <http://www.nationalpreventivemechanism.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/NPM-Isolation-Guidance-FINAL.pdf>. (Accessed: 22nd February 2017).

National Preventative Mechanism (2018) *Monitoring places of detention: eighth annual report of the United Kingdom's National Preventative Mechanism 1 April 2016-31 March 2017* CM9563. Available at: https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/npm-prod-storage-19n0nag2nk8xk/uploads/2018/02/6.4122_NPM_AR2016-17_v4_web.pdf. (Accessed: 29th January, 2018).

Neale, B. (2013) 'Adding time into the mix: stakeholder ethics in qualitative longitudinal research', *Methodological innovations online*, 8 (2), pp. 6-20. DOI: 10.4256/mio.2013.010.

Neilson, A. (2017) *Howard League responds to Youth Justice Board announcement* [Press Release]. 24th February. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/news/howard-league-responds-to-youth-justice-board-announcement/>. (Accessed: 27th February 2017).

Newcomen, N. (2015a) *Investigation into the death of a man at HMP Humber in January 2014*. London. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ppo-prod-storage-1g9rkjhkjmngw/uploads/2015/07/J196-14-Death-of-a-male-Everthorpe-10-01-2014-SID-18-21.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th January 2018).

Newcomen, N. (2015b) *Investigation into the death of a man at June 2014 at HMYOI Glen Parva*. London. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ppo-prod-storage-1g9rkjhkjmkgw/uploads/2015/11/K048-14-Death-of-a-male-prisoner-Glen-Parva-11-06-2014-SID-18-21.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th January 2018).

Newcomen, N. (2016) *Investigation into the death of a man at HMP Wandsworth in June 2014*. London. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ppo-prod-storage-1g9rkjhkjmkgw/uploads/2016/02/K050-14-Death-of-a-male-prisoner-in-hospital-Wandsworth-12-06-2014-SID-18-21.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th January 2018).

Newcomen, N. (2017a) *Independent investigation into the death of Mr Joshua Collinson a prisoner at HMP Swinfen Hall on 3 September 2015*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ppo-prod-storage-1g9rkjhkjmkgw/uploads/2017/01/L137-15-Death-of-Mr-Joshua-Collinson-Swinfen-Hall-03-09-2015-SID-18-21-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 17th January 2018).

Newcomen, N. (2017b) *Independent investigation into the death of Daniel Adewole, at HMYOI Cookham Wood, on 4 July 2015*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/ppo-prod-storage-1g9rkjhkjmkgw/uploads/2017/04/L080-15-Death-of-Mr-Daniel-Adewole-Cookham-Wood-04-07-2015-Nat-14-17.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th May 2017).

Newman, D. (1958) 'Research interviewing in prison', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 49 (2), pp. 127-132. DOI: 10.2307/1140922.

Ng. I., Sarri, R., Shook, J. and Stoffregen, E. (2012) 'Comparison of correctional services for youth incarcerated in adult and juvenile facilities in Michigan', *The Prison Journal*, 92 (4), pp. 460-483. DOI: 10.1177/0032885512457547.

Nowell, L., Norris, J., White, D. and Moules, N. (2017) 'Thematic analysis: striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria', *International journal of qualitative methods*, 16 (1), pp. 1-13. DOI: 10.1177/1609406917733847.

Nurmi, J. (1998) 'Growing up in contemporary Europe', in Nurmi, J. (ed.) *Adolescents, cultures and conflicts*. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., pp. 3-18.

Ofsted (2010) *Transition through detention and custody: arrangements for learning and skills for young people in custodial or secure settings*. Manchester: Ofsted. Available at:

<http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1119/1/Transition%20through%20detention%20and%20custody.pdf>.

(Accessed: 11th October 2016).

Ofsted (2016) *Inspection of Medway Secure Training Centre*. Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted. Available at: <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50000025>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Ofsted (2017) *Inspection of Medway Secure Training Centre*. Manchester: Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted. Available at: <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50000127>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Ofsted (2018a) *Inspection of Medway Secure Training Centre*. Manchester: Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted. Available at: <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50004467>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Ofsted (2018b) *Inspection of Oakhill Secure Training Centre*. Manchester: Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted. Available at: <https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/secure-training-centre-reports/oakhill/Oakhill%20STC%20June%202018%20report.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th August 2018).

Ofsted (2019) *Inspection of Rainsbrook Secure Training Centre*. Manchester: Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted. Available at: <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50040904>. (Accessed: 8th January, 2019).

Office of High Commissioner Human Rights (2015) *View the ratification status by country or by treaty*. United Nations. Available at: http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx. (Accessed: 21st December 2015).

Onyejeli, M. (2018) FOI response – data on transitions [email] Price, J. Maureen.onyejeli@noms.gsi.gov.uk. 15th June 2018.

Osgood, W. Foster, M. Flanagan, C. and Gretchen, R. (2008) 'Introduction: why focus on the transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations' in Osgood, W. Foster, M. Flanagan, C. and Gretchen, R. (ed.) *On your own without a net: the transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press pp. 1-26.

Panorama (2016) *Teenage prison abuse exposed* [TV] BBC Monday 11th January 2016. 20:30.

Parliament, House of Commons (2017) *Prisons and Court Bill 170 56/2*. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/2016-2017/0170/17170.pdf>. (Accessed: 15th August 2018).

Parliament.UK (2018) *Young adults in the criminal justice system: distinct approach needed*. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/justice-committee/news-parliament-2017/young-adults-criminal-justice-system-report-published-17-19/>. (Accessed: 21st November 2018).

Parry, J. (2006) 'The transitions to adulthood of young people with multiple disadvantages' in Leccardi, C. and Ruspini, E. (ed.) *A new youth? Young people, generations and family life*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, pp. 276-297.

Paulsen, V. and Berg. B. (2016) 'Social support and interdependency in transition to adulthood from child welfare services', *Children and Youth Services Review*, 68 pp. 125-131. DOI: 10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.07.006.

Paulsen, V. and Thomas, N. (2017) 'The transition to adulthood from care as a struggle of recognition', *Child and family social work*, 23 (2) pp. 163-170. DOI: 10.1111/cfs.12395.

Phelan, S. and Kinsella, E. (2013) 'Picture this ... safety, dignity, and voice – ethical research with children: practical considerations for the reflexive researcher', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19 (2), pp. 81-90. DOI: 10.1177/1077800412462987.

Phillips, C. (2012) *The multicultural prison: ethnicity, masculinity, and social relations among prisoners*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Phoenix, J. (2016) 'Against youth justice and youth governance, for youth penalty', *British Journal of Criminology*, 56 (1), pp. 123-140. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azv031.

Pierce, R. (2008) *Research methods in politics*. London: Sage.

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (2014) *Learning lessons bulletin Fatal Incidents Investigations Issue 6: young adult prisoners*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: http://www.ppo.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/LLB-FII-06_Young-adults-.pdf. (Accessed: 10th November 2016).

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (2015) *Learning from PPO Investigations: Why do women and young people in custody not make formal complaints?* London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: <http://www.ppo.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Why-do->

[women-and-young-people-in-custody-not-make-formal-complaints_final.pdf](#). (Accessed: 21st February 2017).

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (2016a) *Annual report 2015-16*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: http://www.ppo.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/PPO_Annual-Report-201516_WEB_Final.pdf. (Accessed: 9th September 2016).

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (2016b) *Learning lessons bulletin: Fatal Incidents Investigations Issue 10: Early days and weeks in custody*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: http://www.ppo.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/PPO-LearningLessons-Bulletin-Fatal-incidents-issue-10-early-days-and-weeks-in-custody_Final_digital.pdf. (Accessed: 10th November 2016).

Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (2017) *Learning lessons bulletin: Complaints from young people in custody*. London: Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Available at: http://www.ppo.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/PPO-Learning-Lessons-Bulletin_Young_people_in_custody_Feb17_Final.pdf. (Accessed: 21st February 2017).

Prison Reform Trust (2004) *A lost generation: the experiences of young people in prison*. London: Prison Reform Trust. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Lost%20Generation.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th September 2016).

Prison Reform Trust and Inquest (2012) *Fatally flawed: Has the State learned lessons from the deaths of children and young people in prison?* London: Prison Reform Trust. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/portals/0/documents/fatally%20flawed.pdf>. (Accessed: 2nd May 2017).

Prior, D., Farrow, K. Hughes, N., Kelly, G., Manders, G. White, S. and Wilkinson, B. (2011) *Maturity, young adults and the criminal justice system: a literature review*. University of Birmingham and Barrow Cadbury Trust for the Transition to Adulthood Alliance. Available at: <http://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Birmingham-University-Maturity-final-literature-review-report.pdf>. (Accessed 25th August 2016).

Propp, J., Ortega, D. and NewHeart, F. (2003) 'Independence or interdependence: rethinking the transition from "ward of court" to adulthood' *Families in Society*, 84 (2), pp. 259-266. DOI: 10.1606/1044-3894.102.

Prout, A. and James, A. (1997) 'A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Provenance, promise and problems' in James, A. and Prout, A. (ed.) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociology study of childhood* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press, pp. 6-28.

Ramsbotham, D. (2005) *Prisongate: The shocking state of Britain's prisons and the need for visionary change* (new ed.). London: The Free Press.

Redmond, A. (2015) *Children in custody 2014-2015: an analysis of 12-18 year olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centers and young offender institutions*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/12/HMIP_CP_-_Children-in-custody-2014-15-FINAL-web-AW.pdf. (Accessed: 18th January 2016).

Ricciardelli, R., Maier, K. and Hannah-Moffat, K. (2015) 'Strategic masculinities: Vulnerabilities, risk and the production of prison masculinities', *Theoretical Criminology*, 19 (4), pp. 491–513. DOI: 10.1177/1362480614565849.

Ridge, T. (2013) 'We are all in this together?' The hidden costs of poverty, recession and austerity policies on Britain's poorest children', *Children and Society*, 27 (5) pp. 406-417. DOI: 10.1111/chso.12055.

Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (1994) 'Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research' in Bryman, A. and Burgess, B. (ed.) *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Routledge, pp. 173-194.

Robb, M., Featherstone, B., Ruxton, S. and Ward, M. (2015) *Beyond male role models: gender identities and work with young men*. Milton Keynes: Action for Children and the Open University. Available at: http://www.open.ac.uk/health-and-social-care/research/beyond-male-role-models/sites/www.open.ac.uk.health-and-social-care.research.beyond-male-role-models/files/files/BMRM_report.pdf. (Accessed: 28th March 2017).

Roberts, K. (1997), 'Is there an emerging British 'underclass'?: The evidence from the research', in MacDonald R. (ed.) *Youth, the 'underclass' and social exclusion*. London: Routledge, pp. 39-54.

Roberts, K. (2009) *Youth in transition: Eastern Europe and the West*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, S. (2011) 'Beyond 'NEET' and 'tidy' pathways: considering the 'missing middle' of youth transition studies', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14 (1), pp. 21-39. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2010.489604.

Rolfe, M. and Gillan, S. (2016a) *Unacceptable levels of violence – immediate response to decreasing safety. POA Circulars 97 28th October 2016*. POA: The Professional Trades Union for Prison, Correctional and Secure Psychiatric Workers. Available at: http://www.poauk.org.uk/index.php?circulares-2016&newsdetail=20161028-141_unacceptable-levels-of-violence-immediate-response-to-decreasing-safety. (Accessed 7th November 2016).

Rose, J. (2008) 'Types of secure establishment' In Blyth, M. Newman, R. and Wright, C. (ed.) *Children and young people in custody: managing the risk*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 23-34.

Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, Royal College of Psychiatrists and British Medical Association (2018) *Joint position statement on solitary confinement of children and young people*. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, Royal College of Psychiatrists and British Medical Association. Available at: [https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/20180061%20Solitary%20confinement%20document%20position%20statement%20v2%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/20180061%20Solitary%20confinement%20document%20position%20statement%20v2%20(1).pdf). (Accessed: 19th April 2018).

Ryan, G. and Bernard, H. (2003) 'Techniques to identify themes', *Field Methods*, 15 (1), pp. 85-109. DOI: 10.1177/1525822X02239569.

Sanders, J., Munford, R., Liebenberg, L. and Henaghan, M. (2014) 'Show some emotion? Emotional dilemmas in undertaking research with vulnerable youth', *Field Methods*, 26 (3) pp. 239-251. DOI: 10.1177/1525822X13516842.

Sawyer, S. Azzopardi, P., Wickremarathne, D. and Patton, G. (2018) 'The age of adolescence', *The Lancet: Child and Adolescent Health*, 2 (3), pp. 223-228. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30022-1.

Schinkel, M. (2015) 'Adaptation, the meaning of imprisonment and outcomes after release – the impact of the prison regime', *Prison Service Journal*, 219, pp. 24-29. Available at: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/PSJ%20219%20May%202015.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th October 2018).

- Schlosser, J. (2008) 'Issues in interviewing inmates: navigating the methodological landmines of prison research', *Qualitative inquiry*, 14 (8), pp. 1500-1525. DOI: 10.1177/1077800408318325.
- Schoon, I. Bynner, J. Joshi, H. Parsons, S. Wiggins, R. and Sacker, A. (2002). 'The Influence of Context, Timing, and Duration of Risk Experiences for the Passage from Childhood to Misadulthood', *Child Development*, 73 (5), pp. 1486-1504. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8624.00485.
- Scott, E. S. and Grisso, T. (1997) The evolution of adolescence: a developmental perspective on juvenile justice reform, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 88 (1), pp. 137-189. DOI: 10.2307/1144076.
- Searle, C. (1999) *The quality of qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Searle, C. (2004a) 'Generating grounded theory' in Searle, C. (ed.) *Researching society and culture* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 240-247.
- Searle, C. (2004b) 'Validity, reliability and the quality of research' in Searle, C. (ed.) *Researching society and culture* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 72-83.
- Selous, A. (2014) 30 hours education a week for young offenders *Ministry of Justice*. 15th December 2014. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/30-hours-education-a-week-for-young-offenders>. (Accessed: 21st May 2018).
- Sharpe, G and Gelsthorpe, L. (2015), 'Girls, crime and justice', in Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (ed.) *Youth crime and justice* (2nd ed.), London: Sage, pp. 49-64.
- Shenton, A. (2004) 'Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects', *Education for information*, 22 (2), pp 63-75. DOI: 10.3233/EFI-2004-22201.
- Schildrick, T. and MacDonald, R. (2008) 'Understanding youth exclusion: critical moments, social networks and social capital', *Youth and Policy*, 99, pp. 46-64.
- Schildrick, T. A., MacDonald, R. and Antonucci, L. (2015) 'Focus: Hard Times for Youth?', *Discover Society* 05 May. Available <http://discoversociety.org/2015/05/05/focus-hard-times-for-youth/> (Accessed: 16th April 2018).
- Sim, J. (1994) 'Tougher than the rest? Men in prison' in Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (ed.) *Men, masculinities and crime: Just boys doing business*. London: Routledge, pp. 100-118.
- Sim, J. (2008) 'Pain and punishment: the real and the imaginary in penal institutions' in Carlen, P. (ed.) *Imaginary Penalties*. Devon: Willan, pp. 135-156.

Simmonds, J. (2016) *Children in Custody 2015–16: An analysis of 12–18-year-olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centres and young offender institutions*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: http://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/11/Children-in-Custody-2015-16_WEB.pdf. (Accessed: 16th November 2017).

Social Exclusion Unit (2005) *Transitions: young adults with complex needs*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/transitions_young_adults.pdf (Accessed: 12th February 2016).

Standing Committee for Youth Justice (2017) *SCYJ says breaking up the YJB is a retrograde step* 24th February 2017. London: Standing Committee for Youth Justice. Available at: <http://scyj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/SCYJ-says-breaking-up-the-YJB-is-a-retrograde-step-Feb-2017-final-1.pdf>. (Accessed: 27th February 2017).

Standing Committee for Youth Justice (2018) *SCYJ responds to Secure School Pilot announcement*. Available at: <http://scyj.org.uk/2018/10/scyj-responds-to-secure-school-pilot-announcement/>. (Accessed: 21st November 2018).

Stein, M. (2006) 'Young people aging out of care: the poverty of theory' *Children and Youth Services Review*, 28 (4), pp. 422-434. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2005.05.005.

Stein, M. (2008) 'Resilience and young people leaving care', *Child care in Practice*, 14 (1), pp. 35-44 DOI: 10.1080/13575270701733682.

Stein, M. and Dumaret, A. (2011) 'The mental health of young people ageing out of care and entering adulthood: exploring the evidence from England and France', *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33 (12), pp. 2504-2511. DOI: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.029.

Stephen, D and Squires, P. (2004) 'They're still children and entitled to be children': problematising the institutionalised mistrust of marginalised youth in Britain', *Journal of Youth studies*, 7 (3), pp. 351-369. DOI: 10.1080/1367626042000268962.

Such, E. and Walker, R. (2005) 'Young citizens or policy objects? Children in the 'rights and responsibilities' debate', *Journal of Social Policy*, 34 (1), pp. 39-57. DOI: 10.1017/S0047279404008256.

Sullivan, P. (2018) 'Increase in prison staff numbers ... or not?' *Inside Time* 31st May 2018. Available at: <https://insidetime.org/increase-in-prison-staff-numbers-or-not/>. (Accessed: 27th July 2018).

Summerfield, A. (2011) *Children and young people in custody: an analysis of the experiences of 15-to-18-year-olds in prison*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/prisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/03/children-young-people-2010-11.pdf> (Accessed: 27th January 2016).

Taflan, P. (2017) *Children in Custody 2016–17 An analysis of 12–18-year-olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centres and young offender institutions*. London: Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons and Youth Justice Board. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectrates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/11/6.3903_HMIP_Children-in-Custody-2016-17_FINAL_WEB_221117.pdf. (Accessed: 4th December 2017).

Tanner, J. and Arnett, J. (2009) 'The emergence of 'emerging adulthood' the new life stage between adolescence and young adulthood' in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of youth and young adulthood* Oxon: Routledge, pp. 39-46.

Taylor, Charlie. (2016) *Review of the Youth Justice System in England and Wales* December 2016. London: Ministry of Justice Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/577103/youth-justice-review-final-report.pdf. (Accessed: 15th December 2016).

Taylor, Clare. (2016) *Great expectations: towards better learning outcomes for young people and young adults in custody*. London: Prisoners Education Trust. Available at: <http://www.prisonerseducation.org.uk/data/files/Great%20Expectations%20Report.pdf>. (Accessed: 13th March 2017).

The Children's Society (2017) *Claiming after care: care leavers and the benefits system*. The Children's Society. Available at: https://www.childrensociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/claiming-after-care-care-leavers-and-the-benefits-system_0.pdf. (Accessed: 16th November 2017).

The Children's Society (2019) *Transitions to adulthood: the case for a cross-departmental taskforce*. The Children's Society, Coram Children's Legal Centre, Prince's Trust, National Children's Bureau, Safer London, Standing Committee for Youth Justice, Centrepont, Parents

Against Child Exploitation, Mencap, Child Poverty Action Group, Youth Action, Children and Young People's Mental Health Coalition and Association of Colleges. Available at: https://www.childrensociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/transitions-to-adulthood_0.pdf.

(Accessed: 20th April 2019).

Thomas, N. and O'Kane, C. (1998) 'When children's wishes and feelings clash with their 'best interests'', *The international journal of children's rights*, 6 (2) pp. 137-154. DOI: [10.1163/15718189820494003](https://doi.org/10.1163/15718189820494003).

Thomson, R., Holland, J. McGrellis, S. Bell, R. Henderson, S. and Sharpe, S. (2004) 'Inventing adulthood: a biographical approach to understanding citizenship', *The Sociological Review*, 52 (2), pp. 218-239. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00466.x.

Transition to Adulthood Alliance (2009) *Young adult manifesto*. Transition to Adulthood Alliance and Barrow Cadbury Trust. Available at: http://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/T2A-Young_Adult_Manifesto.pdf. (Accessed 16th June 2016).

Transition to Adulthood Alliance (2014) *Response by the Transition to Adulthood Alliance (T2A) to the Independent Review into Self-Inflicted Deaths in NOMS Custody of 18-24 year olds*. London: Transition to Adulthood. Available at: <https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Response-by-the-Transition-to-Adulthood-Alliance-to-IAP-FINAL.pdf>. (Accessed: 14th February 2018).

Transition to Adulthood Alliance (2016) *Young adult manifesto*. London: Transition to Adulthood Alliance. Available at: https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/T2A-Young_Adult_Manifesto.pdf. (Accessed: 20th June 2018).

Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform (2015) *You can't put a number on it: a report from young adults on why in criminal justice maturity is more important than age*. London: Transition to Adulthood Alliance and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 2015. Available at: <http://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/You-cant-put-a-number-on-it.pdf>. (Accessed: 1st June 2016).

Truss, L. (2017a) *Youth Justice Update*. 24th February, 2017. London: Ministry of Justice Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/youth-justice-update>. (Accessed: 27th February 2017).

Truss, L. (2017b) *Justice Secretary launches new prison and probation service to reform offenders* 8th February 2017. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/justice-secretary-launches-new-prison-and-probation-service-to-reform-offenders>. (Accessed: 15th August 2018).

Tyler, I. (2013) *Revolting subjects: social abjection and resistance in neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed Books.

Unison (2016). *A future at risk: cuts in youth services*. London: Unison. Available at: <https://www.unison.org.uk/content/uploads/2016/08/23996.pdf>. (Accessed: 19th September 2016).

United Nations. (1989) *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. New York: United Nations. Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>. (Accessed: 9th December 2015).

United Nations (1990) *United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (The Riyadh Guidelines)*. United Nations. Available at: <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/45/a45r112.htm>. (Accessed: 30th August 2016).

Urry, Y. Sanders, J. and Munford, R. (2015) 'The 'right time' – negotiating the timing of interviews with vulnerable young people', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18 (3), pp. 291-304. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2014.944120.

Valentine, G. (2003) 'Boundary crossings: transitions from childhood to adulthood', *Children's geographies*, 1 (1), pp. 37-52. DOI: 10.1080/14733280302186.

Vaswani, N. (2015) 'A catalogue of losses: implications for the care and reintegration of young men in custody', *Prison Service Journal*, 220, pp. 26-35. Available at: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/PSJ%20220%20July%202015.pdf>. (Accessed: 12th May 2016).

Voice, Barnardos and Youth Justice Board (2012) *Developing the Secure Estate for Children and Young People in England and Wales – Young People's Consultation report*. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/14532/1/Young%20Peoples%20Consultation%20Report.pdf>. (Accessed: 11th October 2016).

Wacquant, L. (2002) 'The Curious Eclipse of Prison Ethnography in the Age of Mass Incarceration', *Ethnography*, 3 (4), pp. 371-397. DOI: [10.1177/1466138102003004012](https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138102003004012).

Wallace, C. and Cross, M. (1990), 'Introduction: Youth in Transition' in Wallace, C. and Cross, M. (ed.) *Youth in transition: the sociology of youth and youth policy*. Basingstoke: The Falmer Press, pp. 1-10.

Wallace, C. and Kovatcheva, S. (1998) *Youth in Society: The construction and Deconstruction of Youth in East and West Europe*. Hampshire: Palgrave.

Walsh, D. (2004) 'Doing ethnography' in Searle, C. (ed.) *Researching society and culture* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, pp. 226-237.

Walther, A. (2006) 'Regimes of youth transitions: choice, flexibility and security in young people's experiences across different European contexts', *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, 14 (2), pp. 119-139. DOI: 10.1177/1103308806062737.

Ward, J. and Henderson, Z. (2003) 'Some practical and ethical issues encountered while conducting tracking research with young people leaving the 'care' system', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6 (3), pp. 255-259. DOI: 10.1080/1364557032000091851.

Warner, L., Hales, H., Smith, J. and Bartlett, A. (2018) *Secure settings for young people: a national scoping exercise*. St George's University of London and NHS Central and North West London. Available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/secure-settings-for-young-people-a-national-scoping-exercise-paper-1-scoping-analysis.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th October 2018).

Warr, J. (2019) 'Always gotta be two mans': lifers, risk, rehabilitation and narrative labour' *Punishment and society*. 0(0), pp. 1-20. DOI: 10.1177/1462474518822487.

Warren, C. (2001) 'Qualitative Interviewing' in Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Interview research*. California: Sag, pp. 83-99. Available at: <http://methods.sagepub.com.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/book/handbook-of-interview-research>. (Accessed: 5th December 2017).

Webster, C. Simpson, D. MacDonald, R. Abbas, A. Cieslik, M. Shildrick, T. and Simpson, M. (2004) *Poor transitions: young adults and social exclusion*. Bristol: Joseph Roundtree Foundation and The Policy Press. Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/1861347340.pdf>. (Accessed: 8th July 2018).

- Weis, L. (2009) 'Social class, youth and young adulthood in the context of a shifting global economy' in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of youth and young adulthood*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 48-57.
- Wells, D. (2018) Freedom of information request [email]. Price, J. yjb.enquiries@yjb.gov.uk. 28th September 2018.
- Westmarland, L. (2011) *Researching crime and justice: tales from the field*. Oxon: Routledge.
- White, R. (2009) 'Young people, crime and justice' in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of youth and young adulthood*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 444-451.
- Williams, H. (2012) *Repairing shattered lives: brain injuries and its implications for criminal justice policy*. Transition to Adulthood and University of Exeter. Available at: http://www.barrowcadbury.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Repairing-Shattered-Lives_Report.pdf (Accessed: 17th March 2016).
- Willow, C. (2015) *Children behind bars: why the abuse of child imprisonment must end* Bristol: Policy Press.
- Willow, C. (2017) 'Inquest into death of 16 year-old Daniel Adewole starts today', *Article 39*, 24th April. Available at: <http://www.article39.org.uk/news/2017/04/24/inquest-into-death-of-16-year-old-daniel-adewole-starts-today/>. (Accessed: 24th April 2017).
- Wincup, E. (2017) 'Revolutionary times? The changing landscape of prisoner resettlement' in Hudson, J. Needham, C. and Henis, E. (ed.) *Social Policy Review 29*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 43-62.
- Wong, K., Kinsella, R., Bamonte, J. and Meadows, L. (2017) *T2A Final process evaluation report for the Barrow Cadbury Trust*. Manchester: Policy Evaluation and Research Unit Manchester Metropolitan University. Available at: <https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/T2A-Final-Process-Report-OCTOBER-2017.pdf>. (Accessed: 20th October 2017).
- Wood, A. Bailey, S. and Butler, R. (2017) *Findings and Recommendations of the Youth Custody Improvement Board*. London: Youth Custody Improvement Board. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/594448/findings-and-recommendations-of-the-ycib.pdf. (Accessed: 27th February 2017).

Woodman, D. and Wyn, J. (2013) 'Youth Policy and Generations: Why Youth Policy Needs to 'Rethink Youth'', *Social policy and society*. 12 (2), pp. 265-275. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746412000589.

Wright, S. Liddle, M. and Goodfellow, P. (2016a). *Young offenders and trauma: experience and impact: a practitioners guide*. London: Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Young-offenders-and-trauma-experience-and-impact-a-practitioner%E2%80%99s-guide.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th December 2016).

Wright, S. Liddle, M. and Goodfellow, P. (2016b). *Developing trauma-informed resettlement for young custody leavers*. London: Beyond Youth Custody. Available at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Developing-trauma-informed-resettlement-for-young-custody-leavers-a-practitioner%E2%80%99s-guide.pdf>. (Accessed: 9th December 2016).

Wyn, J. (2014) 'Conceptualising transitions to adulthood', *Meeting the transitional needs of young adult learners* 2014, (143), pp. 5-16. DOI: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/15360717/2014/143>.

Wyn, J. and White, R. (1997) *Rethinking youth*. Australia: Allen and Urwin.

Wyn, J. and Woodman, D. (2006) 'Generation, Youth and Social Change in Australia', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9 (5), pp. 495-514. DOI: 10.1080/13676260600805713.

Xie, R., Bisaskha, P. and Foster, M. (2014) 'Vulnerable youth and transitions to adulthood' *Meeting the transitional needs of young adult learners* 2014, (143), pp. 29-38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.20102>.

Yates, J (2010) 'Structural disadvantage, youth, class, crime and poverty' in Taylor, W, Earle, R and Hester, R (ed.) *Youth Justice handbook: theory, policy and practice*. Cullompton: Willan, pp. 5-22.

Yin, R. (1994) *Case study research: design and methods* (2nd ed.). California: Sage.

Young, L. (2014) *The Young Review: Improving outcomes for young black and/or Muslim men in the Criminal Justice System*. Available at: http://www.youngreview.org.uk/sites/default/files/clinks_young-review_report_dec2014.pdf. (Accessed: 2nd May 2017).

Youth Justice Board (2012) *Youth to Adult Transitions Framework: Advice for managing cases which transfer from Youth Offending Teams to Probation Trusts*. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.

Youth Justice Board (2013) *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*, Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/296274/national-standards-youth-justice-services.pdf. (Accessed: 7th January 2016).

Youth Justice Board (2014a) *Independent Review into Self-Inflicted Deaths in NOMS Custody of 18-24 year olds Submission from the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales*. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <http://iapdeathsincustody.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Youth-Justice-Board.pdf>. (Accessed: 28th November 2016).

Youth Justice Board (2014b) *Custody and resettlement: section 7 case management guidance*. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/custody-and-resettlement/custody-and-resettlement-section-7-case-management-guidance>. (Accessed: 20th June 2016).

Youth Justice Board (2014c) *AssetPlus: assessment and planning the youth justice system*. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assetplus-assessment-and-planning-in-the-youth-justice-system> (Accessed on 15th December 2015).

Youth Justice Board (2014d) *Placement review process*. London: Youth Justice Board and Youth Custody Service. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/placement-review-process>. (Accessed: 14th May 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2015) *Joint national protocol for transitions in England: joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from Youth Offending Teams to Probation Services*, Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/481127/Joint_National_Protocol_for_Transitions_in_England.pdf (Accessed: 7th January 2016).

Youth Justice Board (2016a) *Youth Justice Statistics 2014/15 England and Wales*. London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales, Ministry of Justice Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/495708/youth-justice-statistics-2014-to-2015.pdf (Accessed: 28th January 2016).

Youth Justice Board. (2016b) *YJB response to Medway improvement board report* [Press Release]. 12th May. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/yjb-response-to-medway-improvement-board-report>. (Accessed: 16th October 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2016c) *Improving transitions between youth and adult custody: important information for YOTs and custody providers* YJBulletin Issue 58. 17th June 2016. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: <http://youthjusticeboard.newsweaver.co.uk/yots2/z95ta571atw1im9o3nina5?email=true&a=2&p=50433819&t=21098815>. (Accessed 20th June 2016).

Youth Justice Board (2017a) *Youth Justice Statistics 2015/16 England and Wales*. London: Youth Justice Board and Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/585897/youth-justice-statistics-2015-2016.pdf. (Accessed: 20th November 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2017b) *Youth custody data: December 2016* [Microsoft excel spreadsheet]. London: Ministry of Justice and Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-custody-data>. (Accessed: 8th March 2017).

Youth Justice Board (2017c) *YJBulletin Issue 92 13 October 2017*. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: <http://youthjusticeboard.newsweaver.co.uk/yots2/3nhzncc54g267v5zp3c2h0?email=true&a=11&p=52461855>. (Accessed: 19th October 2017).

Youth Justice Board (2017d) *Joint national protocol for transitions in England: joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from Youth Offending Teams to Probation Services*, Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <http://youthjusticeboard.newsweaver.co.uk/yots2/1ryw9vhqjn767v5zp3c2h0?email=true&a=5&p=52461855&t=21098815>. (Accessed: 16th October 2017).

Youth Justice Board (2018a) *Youth custody data: January 2018*. London: Ministry of Justice and Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-custody-data>. (Accessed: 4th April 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018b) *Length of time spent in youth custody 2016/17 England and Wales Statistic bulletin published 26th April 2018*. London: Youth Justice Board, Ministry of Justice, National Statistics. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/702361/length-of-time-spent-youth-custody-2016-17.pdf. (Accessed: 26th April 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018c) *Youth Justice Statistics 2016/17 England and Wales*. London: Youth Justice Board and Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/676072/youth_justice_statistics_2016-17.pdf. (Accessed: 25th January 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018d) *Joint National Protocol for Transitions in England: Joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from Youth Offending Teams to Probation Services*. London: Youth Justice Board, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service and National Probation Service. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/703310/Joint_National_Protocol_for_Transitions_in_England_for_PDF_-_Final_version.pdf. (Accessed: 27th April 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018e) *Youth Justice Board for England and Wales Strategic Plan 2018-2021*. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/706925/201804_YJB_Strategic_Plan_2018_21_Final.pdf. (Accessed: 29th May 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018f) *AssetPlus Joint Working Protocol A framework for collaborative case management*. London: Youth Justice Board, HM Prisons and probation Service, Youth Custody Service. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/705579/AssetPlus_Joint_Working_Protocol_v1.3.pdf. (Accessed: 14th May 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018g) *How to make resettlement constructive* 11th September 2018. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: <https://yjresourcehub.uk/yjb-effective-practice/youth-justice-kits/item/610-how-to-make-resettlement-constructive-yjb-document.html>. (Accessed: 12th September 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2018h) *Revised national standards for children in the youth justice system 2019*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revised-national-standards-for-children-in-the-youth-justice-system-2019>. (Accessed: 20th November 2018).

Youth Justice Board (2019a) *Youth Justice Statistics 2017/18 England and Wales*. London: Youth Justice Board and Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/774866/youth_justice_statistics_bulletin_2017_2018.pdf. (Accessed: 4th February 2019).

Youth Justice Board (2019b) *Youth Justice Board for England and Wales: YJB business plan, 2018 to 2019*. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/754188/yjb-business-plan-2018-19.pdf. (Accessed: 18th January 2019).

Youth Justice Board (2019c) *Standards for children in the youth justice system 2019*. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/780504/Standards_for_children_in_youth_justice_services_2019.doc.pdf. (Accessed: 26th February 2019).

Youth Justice Board (2019d) *Youth justice statistics: 2017-2018 supplementary tables. Chapter 7: children in youth custody*. [Microsoft excel spreadsheet]. London: Youth Justice Board. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics-2017-to-2018>.

Appendices

Appendix One. Young person participant information sheet

Exploring Pathways and Transitions between Juvenile and Adult Penal Institutions

You are being invited to take part in a research study. You do not have to take part.

Before you decide it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it involves.

Please take time to read this sheet.

If anything doesn't make sense, please ask me and I/the research team will seek to answer as best I can.

Take time to decide if you want to take part or not.

1. What is the purpose of the study?

The research will look at how young people feel as they move from juvenile young offender institutions to young adult young offender institutions/prisons.

It aims to understand how young people prepare for, and experience, the move between juvenile young offender institutions and young adult young offender institutions.

It is hoped that the findings can help other young people who will make the transfer in future.

2. Why have I been chosen to take part?

You have been asked to take part as you are currently in a juvenile young offender institution and will turn 18 soon.

As you turn 18 in custody, you will move to a young adult young offender institution and the interviewer would like to ask you about your experience.

The interviewer will be speaking to about fourteen other young people who will also turn 18 soon.

3. Do I have to take part?

No. The decision to take part in the research, or not, is entirely yours.

If you decide to take part, you can also decide if you want to stop at any time and you don't have to give a reason why.

Taking part in the research will not impact upon your association time.

4. What will happen if I take part?

If you decide to take part in the research the interviewer would like to hold two interviews with you.

One will take place before you turn 18 and one after you turn 18.

In the interviews the interviewer will ask you about the establishment where you are and how you feel before and after moving establishments.

The interview can be as long or as short as you want it to be.

The interview will take place in a secure and comfortable environment within your establishment.

Even if you decide to take part you don't have to answer a question if you aren't happy with it and you won't be at a disadvantage for refusing to answer.

5. Expenses and / or payments

We are unable to offer you any expense or payment for taking part. You will not receive any expense or payment for taking part.

Taking part will not impact upon your association time.

6. Are there any risks in taking part?

After the interview if you feel you want to talk to someone about anything that came up in the interview, or if you have any questions, there are people that you can speak to. This includes listeners and Samaritans. The research team will give you a list of how to contact them in your institution.

7. Are there any benefits in taking part?

The interviewer hopes that taking part in the research will be a positive experience for you as it will give you the opportunity to talk about your move between establishments and may help others who will make the transfer in future.

8. What if I am unhappy or if there is a problem?

You can make a complaint via Tania Moss, Senior Registered Forensic Psychologist at Werrington and Rachel Gibson, Specialist Registered Psychologist at Wetherby within your institution who will report this problem to the University of Liverpool.

9. Will my participation be kept confidential?

Yes. The interviewer would like to audio-record the interview and ask you to verbally consent to this before and after the interview. If you do not give consent to an audio-recording of the interview taking place (or the equipment isn't permitted in your establishment), the researcher will make notes during the interview. If notes are taken during the interview, they will be typed up and stored on a university computer in the same way as the audio data. Hard copies of the notes will be destroyed and disposed of using cross cut shredders and confidential waste consoles.

The data will be used for this project and other publications by the research team. The researcher (Jayne Price) and the supervisory team (Professor Barry Goldson and Dr Liz Turner, University of Liverpool and Catherine Shaw; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons) will have access the data.

All the information you give me will be kept on a computer which is secured with a confidential password and the University of Liverpool's software. Your information will have a unique code that only the research team will know so it will remain anonymous. Any data kept in hard copy format will be stored in locked cabinets in a locked office at the University of Liverpool.

The data will be stored for ten years and then it will be destroyed securely. Electronic data will be securely wiped or removed securely. All hard copies of data will be disposed of using cross cut shredders and confidential waste consoles. This is in line with the University of Liverpool's data protection policies and procedures.

10. Disclosure of criminal activity

The interviewer has an obligation to pass on certain information obtained during research to NOMS. This includes behaviour that is against Prison Service rules and/or any illegal acts (previous and planned) or behaviour that is harmful to yourself or others.

If you tell the researcher about any such behaviour or acts we will have to report it to NOMS.

11. What will happen to the results of the study?

The research team will write up the results of the study in a report for NOMS, publications and a larger report for the University as part of a higher education degree.

12. What will happen if I want to stop taking part?

You may also withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason.

You can also ask that your responses are withdrawn and destroyed too. However, once your responses have been anonymised, they can no longer be withdrawn, but nobody will be able to identify you.

13. Who can I contact if I have further questions?

Please contact Tania Moss, Senior Registered Forensic Psychologist at Werrington and Rachel Gibson, Specialist Registered Psychologist at Wetherby within your institution who will contact the research team.

You may also raise any questions with the interviewer before or during the interview.

Appendix Two. Key stakeholder participant information sheet

Exploring Pathways and Transitions between Juvenile and Adult Penal Institutions

You are being invited to participate in a research study. Before you decide whether to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and feel free to ask us if you would like more information or if there is anything that you do not understand. Please also feel free to discuss this with your friends, relatives and GP if you wish. We would like to stress that you do not have to accept this invitation and should only agree to take part if you want to.

Thank you for reading this.

1. What is the purpose of the study?

The research will investigate the processes of transition experienced by young people as they move from juvenile young offender institutions to young adult young offender institutions/prisons.

Young people are held within juvenile young offender institutions until they reach the age of eighteen at which point they are normally transferred into the young adult estate. It is widely recognised that this transition “represents a significant change in environment, regime and peer group, making it a particularly challenging part of (young people’s) time in custody.” (National Offender Management Service, 2012: 1). As such, processes of transition are attracting significant attention from the key stakeholders and this research will aim to contribute towards the further development of best policy and practice.

Aims of the research

The project has three principal aims as follows.

First, to advance understandings of the means by which young people prepare for, and experience, the transition between juvenile young offender institutions and young adult young offender institutions.

Second, in the light of the contemporary focus on transitions and the forthcoming PSI, to offer distinctive and timely qualitative insights towards informing the delivery of best practice.

Third, to draw conclusions and to offer recommendations in order to improve practice and inform policy. In this sense the research speaks directly to the 'Transforming Rehabilitation' and the 'Transforming Youth Custody' priorities identified in the NOMS Business Plan.

2. Why have I been chosen to take part?

We have identified you as a 'key stakeholder' within the transition process. Therefore, we feel your specialist knowledge of youth justice may support this research in exploring the pathways and transitions young people experience. The research team hope to interview up to twenty 'key stakeholders' and up to fifteen young people who experience the transition.

3. Do I have to take part?

No. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. Once you have read this information sheet if you decide to take part you will be given a consent form. You may also withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason. The decision to take part in the research, or not, is entirely yours.

4. What will happen if I take part?

If you decide to take part in the research I would like you to take part in one interview. Within the interview I seek to explore your knowledge about how young people prepare for and experience the transition from the juvenile secure estate to the adult penal system. The interview will take place at a time and location most convenient to you. The interview represents an opportunity for you to reflect on your knowledge of the experiences of young people within the juvenile secure estate transitioning to the adult prison system and subsequently inform future policy and practice to support individuals who will make the transition in future.

The interview may be audio recorded for the purposes of transcription only. If you do not wish for your interview to be audio recorded, please inform the researcher.

You may refuse to answer any questions at any point during the interview.

5. Expenses and / or payments

No expenses are expected to be incurred by yourself. If you agree to take part in the research we will arrange a meeting at time and location convenient to you.

6. Are there any risks in taking part?

There are no perceived disadvantages or risks involved in taking part. Should you experience any discomfort disadvantage as part of the research please inform a member of the research team immediately.

7. Are there any benefits in taking part?

We hope that taking part in the research will be a positive experience for you as it seeks to give you the opportunity to share your knowledge and expertise of the transitional period. This research provides you with a platform to feed into the knowledge base regarding transitions within a project that seeks to inform policy and practice for a wider group of people.

The decision to take part in the research, or not, is entirely yours.

8. What if I am unhappy or if there is a problem?

If you are unhappy, or if there is a problem, please feel free to let us know by contacting Professor Barry Goldson and we will try to help. If you remain unhappy or have a complaint which you feel you cannot come to us with then you should contact the Research Governance Officer at ethics@liv.ac.uk. When contacting the Research Governance Officer, please provide details of the name or description of the study (so that it can be identified), the researcher(s) involved, and the details of the complaint you wish to make.

9. Will my participation be kept confidential?

Yes. The interviewer would like to audio-record the interview and will seek your verbal consent to the audio-recording to this before and after the interview. If you do not give consent to an audio-recording of the interview taking place, contemporaneous notes will be made in order to record the interview. All data stored electronically will be encrypted and password protected. Every interviewee will be allocated a unique identification number/code and transcripts will be anonymised. Any data kept in hard copy format will be stored in locked cabinets in a locked office at the University of Liverpool. If contemporaneous notes are taken during the interview, they will be typed up and stored on a university computer in the same way as the audio data. Hard copies of the notes will be destroyed and disposed of using cross cut shredders and confidential waste consoles.

The data will be used for this project and subsequent publications by the research team. The researcher (Jayne Price) and the supervisory team (Professor Barry Goldson and Dr Liz Turner, University of Liverpool and Catherine Shaw; Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons) will have access the data.

The data will be stored for ten years and then it will be destroyed securely. Electronic data will be securely wiped or removed securely. All hard copies of data will be will be disposed of using cross cut shredders and confidential waste consoles. This is in line with the University of Liverpool's data protection policies and procedures.

10. Disclosure of criminal activity

The researcher has an obligation to disclose certain information obtained during research to NOMS. (This can include behaviour that is against Prison Service rules and can be adjudicated against (see rule 51 of the Prison Rules 1999), undisclosed illegal acts (previous and planned), and behaviour that is harmful to the research participant, (e.g. intention to self-harm or commit suicide) or others.)

The researcher will report any behaviour as listed above to NOMS.

11. What will happen to the results of the study?

The purpose of the research will be the production of a PhD thesis. The research team will also provide a report of the findings for NOMS. The contribution of knowledge from this research within this subject area will be a range of presentations and publications by the research team, the research will be disseminated as widely as possible to both academic and non-academic audiences. Your responses will not be identifiable from the results.

12. What will happen if I want to stop taking part?

You may also withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason. The decision to take part in the research, or not, is entirely yours. If you decide to withdraw your results up to the period of withdrawal may be used, if you are happy for this to be done. Otherwise you may request that they are destroyed and no further use is made of them. Anonymised results may only be withdrawn prior to anonymisation.

13. Who can I contact if I have further questions?

Professor Barry Goldson
Charles Booth Chair of Social Science

Department of Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology
School of Law and Social Justice
The University of Liverpool
Bedford Street South
Liverpool L69 7ZA
England, UK.
b.goldson@liverpool.ac.uk

Committee on Research Ethics

YOUNG PERSON PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Title of Research Project:

Exploring pathways and transitions between juvenile and adult penal institutions

Researcher:

Jayne Price

**Please
initial box**

1. I have read and understood the information sheet dated January 2017 for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information. I have asked any questions and am happy with the answers.

2. I understand that I can decide if I want to take part in this study. I can leave the study whenever I want without reason. This doesn't affect my rights. I don't have to answer any questions I don't want to.

3. I understand that I can ask to access any of the information I provide. I can also ask for any of the information I provide to be destroyed (Data Protection Act) before it is anonymised.

4. I understand that anything I say will be confidential and anonymous. No-one will be able to identify me from my responses or in any publications or reports published by the research team about this project.

5. It is okay for other members of the research team (Jayne's supervisors) to have access to my anonymous responses.

6. I understand that the researcher (Jayne) has a duty to pass on certain information to NOMS (including behaviour against Prison Service Rules, any previous or planned illegal acts and any behaviour that is harmful to me or anyone else).

7. I agree that my interview can be audio recorded.

8. I agree to take part in the above study.

Participant Name

Date

Signature

Name of Person taking consent

Date

Signature

Researcher

Date

Signature

Principal Investigator:

Name

Professor Barry Goldson

Work Address

School of Law and Social Justice

The University of Liverpool

Student Researcher:

Name

Jayne Price

Work Address

School of Law and Social Justice

The University of Liverpool

Committee on Research Ethics

KEY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Title of Research Project:

Exploring pathways and transitions between juvenile and adult penal institutions

Researcher:

Jayne Price

**Please
initial box**

1. I confirm that I have read and have understood the information sheet dated January 2017 for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, without my rights being affected. In addition, should I not wish to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to decline.

3. I understand that, under the Data Protection Act, I can at any time ask for access to the information I provide and I can also request the destruction of that information if I wish prior to anonymisation.

4. I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential. I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my anonymised responses. I understand that my name will not be linked with the research materials, and I will not be identified or identifiable in the report or reports (including academic publications) that result from the research.

5. I understand and agree that my participation will be audio recorded and I am aware of and consent to your use of these recordings for the purposes of transcription.

6. I understand that the researcher has an obligation to pass on to disclose certain information obtained during research to NOMS. (This can include behaviour that is against Prison Service rules and can be adjudicated against (see rule 51 of the Prison Rules 1999),

undisclosed illegal acts (previous and planned), and behaviour that is harmful to the research participant, (e.g. intention to self-harm or commit suicide) or others.

7. I agree to take part in the above study.

_____	_____	_____
Participant Name	Date	Signature
_____	_____	_____
Name of Person taking consent	Date	Signature
_____	_____	_____
Researcher	Date	Signature

Principal Investigator:

Name

Professor Barry Goldson

Work Address

School of Law and Social Justice

The University of Liverpool

Bedford Street South

Liverpool L69 7ZA

England, UK.

Student Researcher:

Name

Jayne Price

Work Address

School of Law and Social Justice

The University of Liverpool

Bedford Street South

Liverpool L69 7ZA

England, UK.

Work Telephone

N/A

Work Email

b.goldson@liverpool.ac.uk

Work Telephone

N/A

Work Email

Jayne.price@liverpool.ac.uk

Appendix Five. Interview schedule - young person pre-transition

Hello, Thank you for meeting with me. My name is Jayne.

Are you happy to talk to me today about your time here? I won't ask you anything about your offence. As it says on the consent form, you can withdraw from the research at any time. You may also refuse to answer any questions. [Invite them to sign consent form.]

Are you happy for me to record this? I may also write some things down as we talk.

Don't worry if you are unsure of an answer to any of the questions, you don't have to answer any you don't want to. I am interested in your experience and there are no right or wrong answers. We can pause or stop the interview at any time.

Anything you tell me will remain confidential and anonymous unless it is against Prison Service Rules, an undisclosed illegal act or behaviour that is harmful to you or someone else, as I will have to pass that on, does that make sense? Do you have any questions?

Date of interview:

Interview site:

Name:

Date of birth/age:

Ethnic origin: i. White British ii. White Irish iii. White Other iv. Black or Black British – Caribbean v. Black or Black British – African vi. Black or Black British - Other vii. Asian or Asian British - Indian viii. Asian or Asian British – Pakistani ix. Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi x. Asian or Asian British – Chinese xi. Asian or Asian British - Other xii. Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean xiii. Mixed race - White and Black African xiv. Mixed race - White and Asian xv. Mixed race – Other xvi. Arab

Home area:

Arrival date at current institution:

Sentenced? Yes No

1. About you

I'm going to ask you some questions about your circumstances before you arrived here.

1.1. Living arrangements:

- i. with parents ii. with parent (mother) iii. with parent (father) iv. with other family
v. residential care vi. foster carers vii. own flat/bedsit viii. lodgings/B&B ix. Hostel
x. Friends xi. Homeless/NFA xii. other

Please explain your living arrangements (*prompt: were you happy, were they suitable, how long had you been there etc.*)

1.2 Before you arrived here did you have a social worker? Yes No

Please explain:

1.3 Have you ever had a social worker? Yes No

Please explain:

2. Education

2. 1 Before you came here were you:

- i. In school (mainstream) ii. in school (SEN etc.) iii. Pupil referral unit iv. home tutor
v. at college vi. no education – reached school leaving age vii. no education – not attending viii. no education – excluded

Please explain your education circumstances (*prompt: when were you last in school, did you ever skip school? Excluded from school?*).

2. 2 Do you have any education qualifications? Yes No

Please explain:

2. 3 Were you in employment prior to entering YOI?

- i. employed (job) ii. training scheme iii. unemployed (with state benefit) iv. unemployed (without state benefit) v. other

Please explain your employment circumstances (*prompt: did you enjoy them, were they suitable, did you have enough money, did you have too much spare time etc.*):

3. Health

3. 1 Some young people in custody have health problems, have you ever had any health problems? Yes No

Please explain:

3. 2 Some young people in custody have mental health problems, have you ever had any mental health problems? (*prompt: depression etc. are you involved with CAMHS*) Yes No

Please explain:

- 3.3 Some young people in custody have drug-related problems, have you ever had any drug-related problems? Yes No

Please explain:

- 3.4 Some young people in custody have alcohol-related problems, have you ever had any alcohol-related problems? Yes No

Please explain:

4. Help, guidance and support

- 4.1 Most people have times when they need advice or support – someone to talk to. Did you ever have these times before you came here? Yes No

Please explain:

4.2 If / when you needed to talk to someone, was there anybody in particular that you could / would go to? Yes No

4.2 i. If Yes, who? Advocate Another young person here Case worker Chaplain ChildLine/Samaritans Family/Friends Gym staff Health services staff Independent Monitoring Board Peer mentor Personal officer Teacher/education staff Wing officer YOT worker

Please explain:

4.2 ii. If no, why? (*prompt: Would you have liked to have had such a person etc.*)

5. Arrival at the YOI

5.1 Have you ever been in an SCH STC or YOI before?

Please explain:

5.2 Did anyone talk and explain to you about YOIs before you came here? Yes No

5.2 i. If yes, what did they say and how did it make you feel at the time?

5.2 ii. Did anyone talk to you about *[name of institution]* before you came here? Yes No

5.2 iii. If yes who:

What did they say? How did it make you feel at the time? Please explain:

5.2 iv. If no, how/when did you find out that you were coming here?

5.2 v. How did you feel when you found out? (*prompt: what did you think it would be like?*)

5.3 What happened as soon as you arrived at reception here? (*prompt: how long were you there for, were you searched, how were you treated?*)

5.4 Were you given any advice when you arrived here? Yes No Was it helpful? Yes No

Please explain:

5.5 Were you given any written information when you arrived? Yes No Was it helpful?

Yes No

Please explain:

5.6 Was there anything else that could have happened at reception to help you understand the YOI? Yes No

Please explain:

5.7 What were you feeling when you arrived here? (*prompt: safe, comfortable, frightened*) Is it how you expected it to be?

5.8 Would you say you feel better or worse here as time passes? How do you feel now?

Please explain:

6. Living here

6.1 Can you talk me through what you do each day whilst here? From when you wake up through to when you go to bed.

6.2 What's your wing and cell like?

6.3 What are the other people on the wing like?

6.4 Are you taking part in any of the following: Education programmes Offending behaviour programmes Prison job Vocational or skills training Not involved in any of these

6.4 i. If not involved in any, please explain:

6.5 Do you get unlocked for association/activities each day? Yes No

6.5 i. If yes how long for?

6.6 What (if anything) are the best things about living here?

6.7 What (if anything) are the worse things about being here?

6.8 If you have a problem is there anyone you can go to for help or advice? Yes No

6.8 i. If Yes, who? Advocate Another young person here Case worker Chaplain
Childline/Samaritans Family/Friends Gym staff Health services staff Independent
Monitoring Board Peer mentor Personal officer Teacher/education staff Wing officer
 YOT worker Please explain (*prompt: how often do you see them? Is it as often as you
would like?*):

6.9 Do you feel safe here? Yes No

Please explain:

6.10 How (if at all) are the staff trying to help you?

6.11. Do they treat you any differently to other people on the wing?

6.12 Do you receive visits from your family? Yes No Other

Please explain (*prompt: distance, frequency of visit, is that often enough*):

6.13 Do you keep in touch with your family any other way? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

6.14 Do you receive any other visits? Social worker? YOT workers Probation

Please explain (*prompt: distance, frequency of visit, is that often enough*):

6.15 Do you keep in touch with social worker YOT workers Probation in any other way?

Please explain:

6.16 Do you have a training/sentence plan? Yes No Don't know

6.16 i. Were you involved in its development? Yes No

Please explain:

6.16 ii. How often is it reviewed?

6.16 iii. Who is involved in its review? You Caseworker Personal Officer Social worker
 Family Other

Please explain:

6.16 iv. Is there a better way that would help you to have your say at reviews and with the development of your plan? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

7 Transitions

7.1 What do you know about what happens when you turn eighteen?

7.1 i. What do you know about prisons for young people when they turn eighteen?

7.2 How do you think they are different from here?

7.2 i. What (if anything) have you been told by your caseworker?

7.2 ii. What (if anything) have you been told by your personal officer?

7.2 iii. What (if anything) have you been told by other young people?

7.2 iv. Have you been told about what will happen to your education and/or behaviour programmes when you turn eighteen?

7.2 v. What (if anything) have you been told about your health needs when you turn eighteen?

7.2 vi. Do you know when you might move prison? Yes No

7.2 vii. How do you feel about moving to a young adult prison?

7.3 Is there anything you are looking forward to?

7.4 Is there anything that you are concerned about? Please explain:

7.4 i. If you have concerns have you spoken to anyone about them?

Please explain:

7.5 If you were in charge of YOIs what would you do to make the move from a juvenile YOI to a young adult YOI better (more helpful) for young people?

8. Vulnerability

8.1 Young people in YOIs are sometimes described as vulnerable. What do you think is meant by this?

8.2 Do you think that young people in YOIs are vulnerable?

8.3 Do you think that being in a YOI has helped or changed you in any way? Please explain:

8.4 Do you think moving to a young adult YOI will help or change you in any way? Please explain:

8.5 Is there any other way the YOI could help you? Please explain?

8.6 If you were in charge of juvenile YOIs what would you do to make it better (more helpful) for young people?

Would you like to make any more comments about your experiences here or anything else that we have talked about?

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me today. I really appreciate it. If you would like to speak to anybody else about what we have spoken about today after our meeting, there are some services available to you here. I have left a list on contacts on this sheet here.

If possible, I would like to come and speak to you again once you have turned eighteen in your new establishment. Would that be okay?

Appendix Six. Interview schedule - young person post-transition

Hello, Thank you for meeting with me again. Do you remember the interview we had at x establishment?

Again, don't worry if you are unsure of an answer to any of the questions, you don't have to answer any you don't want to. I am interested in your experience and there are no right or wrong answers. We can pause or stop the interview at any time.

Anything you tell me will remain confidential and anonymous unless it is against Prison Service Rules, an undisclosed illegal act or behaviour that is harmful to you or someone else, as I will have to pass that on, does that make sense?

Do you have any questions?

Date of interview:

Interview site:

Name:

Date of birth/age:

Arrival date at current institution:

Sentenced? Yes No

1. About you N/A

2. Education

2. 1 Before you came here were you involved in any education programmes at your previous YOI?

2.1 i. If yes. Were you able to finish them before you moved here? Please explain:

3. Health

3. 1 Some young people in adult prisons have health problems, have you had any health problems since coming to this prison? Yes No

Please explain:

3.2 Some young people in adult prisons have mental health problems, have you had any mental health problems since coming to this prison? (*prompt: depression etc. involvement with CAMHS in previous institution, AMHS here*) Yes No

Please explain:

3.3 Some young people in adult prisons have drug-related problems, have you had any drug-related problems since coming to this prison? Yes No

Please explain:

3.4 Some young people in adult prisons have alcohol-related problems, have you had any alcohol-related problems since coming to this prison? Yes No

Please explain:

4. Help, guidance and support

4.1 Most people have times when they need advice or support – someone to talk to, have you had any of these problems since you came here? Yes No

Please explain:

4.2 If / when you needed to talk to someone, is there anybody in particular that you could / would go to? (*prompt: parents, social worker, probation officers, friends, relatives, priest, none*) Yes No

Please explain: (*prompt: if no, why? Would you have liked to have had such a person etc.*)?

5. Arrival at the young adult YOI

5.1 How close to your eighteenth birthday did you move here?

5.2 Did anyone talk and explain to you about young adult prisons before you came here? Yes

No

5.2 i. If yes, what did they say and how did it make you feel at the time?

5.2 ii. Did anyone talk to you about *[name of institution]* before you came here? Yes No

5.2 iii. If yes who:

What did they say? How did it make you feel at the time? Please explain:

5.2 iv. If no, how/when did you find out that you were coming here?

5.2 v. How did you feel when you found out? (*prompt: what did you think it would be like?*)

5.3 What happened as soon as you arrived at reception here? (*prompt: how long were you there for, were you searched, how were you treated?*)

5.4 Were you given any advice when you arrived here? Yes No Was it helpful? Yes No

Please explain:

5.5 Were you given any written information when you arrived? Yes No Was it helpful? Yes No

Please explain:

5.6 Was there anything else that could have happened at reception to help you better understand the young adult YOI? Yes No

Please explain:

5.7 What were you feeling when you arrived here? (*prompt: safe, comfortable, frightened*) Is it how you expected it to be?

5.8 Would you say you feel better or worse as time passes? How do you feel now?

Please explain:

6. Living here

6.1 Can you talk me through what you do each day whilst here? From when you wake up through to when you go to bed.

6.2 What's your wing and cell like?

6.3 What are the other people on the wing like?

6.4 Are you taking part in any of the following: Education programmes Offending behaviour programmes Prison job Vocational or skills training Not involved in any of these

6.4 i. If not involved in any, please explain:

6.5 Do you get unlocked for association/activities each day? Yes No

6.5 i. If yes how long for?

6.6 What (if anything) are the best things about living here?

6.7 What (if anything) are the worse things about being here?

6.8 If you have a problem is there anyone you can go to for help or advice? Yes No

6.8 i. If Yes, who? Advocate Another young person here Case worker Chaplain Childline/Samaritans Family/Friends Gym staff Health services staff Independent Monitoring Board Peer mentor Personal officer Teacher/education staff Wing officer YOT worker Please explain (*prompt: how often do you see them? Is it as often as you would like?*):

6.9 Do you feel safe here Yes No

Please explain:

6.10 How (if at all) are the staff trying to help you?

6.11 Do they treat you any differently to other people on the wing?

6.12 Do you receive visits from your family? Yes No Other

Please explain (*prompt: distance, frequency of visit, is that often enough*):

6.13 Do you keep in touch with your family any other way? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

6.14 Do you receive any other visits? Social worker? YOT workers Probation

Please explain (*prompt: distance, frequency of visit, is that often enough*):

6.15 Do you keep in touch with social worker YOT workers Probation in any other way?

Please explain:

6.16 Do you have a training/sentence plan? Yes No Don't know

6.16 i. Were you involved in its development? Yes No

Please explain:

6.16 ii. How often is it reviewed?

6.16 iii. Who is involved in its review? You Caseworker Personal Officer Social worker
 Family Other

Please explain:

6.16 iv. Is there a better way that would help you to have your say at reviews and with the development of your plan? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

7. Transition

7.1 What happened when you turned eighteen?

7.2 How is this establishment different than the juvenile YOI you were in?

7.3 What (if anything) is better since you moved?

7.4 What (if anything) is worse since you moved?

7.5 If you were in charge of young adult YOIs what would you do to make the move from a juvenile YOI to a young adult YOI better (more helpful) for young people?

8. Vulnerability

8.1 Young adults in YOIs are sometimes described as vulnerable. What do you think is meant by this?

8.2 Do you think that young people in young adult YOIs are vulnerable?

8.3 Do you think that being in a young adult YOIs has helped or changed you in any way?

Please explain:

8.4 Do you think moving to a young adult YOI has helped or changed you in any way? Please explain:

8.5 Is there any other way it could help you?

Please explain?

8.6 If you were in charge of young adult YOIs what would you do to make it better (more helpful) for young people?

9. The future

9.1 What are your expectations when you leave the young adult prison?

9.2 What are you looking forward to when you leave the young adult prison?

9.3 What (if anything) are you concerned about when you leave the young adult prison?

9.3 i. If you have any concerns, have you spoken to anyone about them?

9.4 What can the young adult prison do to help you achieve this?

Would you like to make any more comments about your experiences here or anything else that we have talked about?

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me today. I really appreciate it. If you would like to speak to anybody else about what we have spoken about today after our meeting, there are some services available to you here. I have left a list on contacts on this sheet here.

Appendix Seven. Interview schedule – key stakeholder

Hello, Thank you for meeting with me. My name is Jayne, I am a researcher from the University of Liverpool.

Can I just confirm that you have had the opportunity to read the participant information sheet? Do you have any further questions regarding the research? *[Invite them to sign consent form]*

As stated within the consent form, you have the opportunity to withdraw from the research at any time. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions.

Are you happy for me to audio record this? I may also take some notes during our conversation.

As you have read, the research is concerned with the experience of young people making transitions from juvenile YOIs to the young adult / adult penal system. I would appreciate your responses based on your knowledge and experience of best practice across the juvenile secure estate.

Date of interview:

Interview site:

Name:

Gender: Female Male

Ethnic origin: i. White British ii. White Irish iii. White Other iv. Black or Black British – Caribbean v. Black or Black British – African vi. Black or Black British - Other vii. Asian or Asian British - Indian viii. Asian or Asian British – Pakistani ix. Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi x. Asian or Asian British – Chinese xi. Asian or Asian British - Other xii. Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean xiii. Mixed race - White and Black African xiv. Mixed race - White and Asian xv. Mixed race – Other xvi. Arab

Job title and grade:

Length of service in current post:

Previous employment experience:

1. Assessing vulnerability

1.1 Young people in juvenile YOIs are sometimes described as vulnerable. What do you think is meant by this?

1.2 Do you agree that young people in juvenile YOIs are vulnerable? Agree Partially agree Disagree Don't know

1.3 Are there particular groups of young people in juvenile YOIs who are especially vulnerable? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

1.4 Are young people in young adult YOIs more or less vulnerable than those in juvenile YOIs? More Less No different Don't know

1.5 Are there particular groups of young people in young adult YOIs who are especially vulnerable? Yes No Don't know

Please explain:

1.6 Do you think that it is possible to adequately identify and/or define particular vulnerability indicators? Yes Partially No Don't know

Please explain (*prompt: what systems are available within institutions to support this i.e. e ASSET, T2A portal*)

2. Juvenile secure estate

2.1 What do you understand about maturity levels within the juvenile secure estate population?

Please explain:

2.2 Do you think that juvenile YOIs support young people who are considered vulnerable?

Yes No Don't know

2.2 i. Is it effective? Very effective Effective Partially effective Not very effective Not at all effective Don't know

Please explain:

2.3 Do you think that prison officers have adequate training, knowledge and skills to work with young people in juvenile YOIs? Yes No Don't know

2.3 i. Is it adequate? Adequate Partially adequate Inadequate Don't know

Please explain:

2.4 The literature suggests that violence is a concern within juvenile YOIs. How much do you agree with this statement? Mostly agree Slightly agree Neither agree nor disagree Slightly disagree Disagree

Please explain:

2.5 The literature suggests that safety is a concern within juvenile YOIs. How much do you agree with this statement? Mostly agree Slightly agree Neither agree nor disagree Slightly disagree Disagree

Please explain:

2.6 How effectively do juvenile YOIs safeguard vulnerable young people? Very effective Effective Partially effective Not very effective Not at all effective Don't know

Please explain:

3. Young adult estate

3.1 What do you understand about maturity levels within the young adult prison population?

3.2 Do you think that the young adult estate support young people who are considered vulnerable? Yes No Don't know

3.2 i. Is it effective? Very effective Effective Partially effective Not very effective Not at all effective Don't know

Please explain:

3.3 Do you think that prison officers in the young adult estate have adequate training, knowledge and skills to work with young people? Yes No Don't know

3.3 i. Is it adequate? Adequate Partially adequate Inadequate Don't know

Please explain:

3.4 The literature suggests that violence is a concern within the young adult estate. How much do you agree with this statement? Mostly agree Slightly agree Neither agree nor disagree Slightly disagree Disagree

Please explain:

3.5 The literature suggests that safety is a concern within the young adult estate. How much do you agree with this statement? Mostly agree Slightly agree Neither agree nor disagree Slightly disagree Disagree

Please explain:

3.6 How effectively can the young adult estate safeguard vulnerable young people? Very effective Effective Partially effective Not very effective Not at all effective Don't know

Please explain:

4. Current transition arrangements

4.1 Based on your experience, in a typical year how many young people make the transition from the juvenile secure estate to young adult estate?

4.2 What is your opinion on the current arrangements (NOMS, 2012) for when a young person turns eighteen within the juvenile secure estate?

4.3 Based on your experience how often does the juvenile YOI fulfil its obligations according to the guidance? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

Please explain:

4.4 Based on your experience how often does the young adult YOI fulfil its obligations according to the guidance? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

Please explain:

4.5 According to the guidance what information should be shared between establishments regarding the young person?

4.5 i. In your experience, how often is this the case? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

4.5 ii. What (if any) improvement could be made to this process? Please explain:

4.6 According to the guidance how should the establishments prepare the young person for transition? (*prompt: what should juvenile YOI do, what should young adult YOI do*)

4.6 i. How often is this the case? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time
Rarely Never

Please explain: (*what are they told, who by?*)

4.6 ii. What (if any) improvement could be made to this process? Please explain:

4.7 According to the guidance what information should the young person receive about the transition arrangements/new establishment?

4.7 i. How often is this the case? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time
Rarely Never

Please explain: (*prompt: written information / verbal information*)

4.7 ii. What (if any) improvement could be made to this process? Please explain:

4.8 According to the guidance what should the induction process be like for young people when they enter the juvenile YOI?

4.8 i. Is this adequate? Adequate Partially adequate Inadequate Don't know

4.8 ii. How often is this the case? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time
Rarely Never

4.8 iii. What (if any) improvement could be made to this process? Please explain:

4.9 What is the induction process like for the young person within the young adult YOI? Is it any different for them than other new arrivals?

4.9 i. Is this adequate? Adequate Partially adequate Inadequate Don't know

4.9 ii. How often is this the case? All of the time Most of the time Some of the time

Rarely Never

4.9 iii. What (if any) improvement could be made to this process? Please explain:

5. Current transition experiences

5.1 How is the regime different between juvenile YOIs and young adult YOIs? (*prompt: education, sufficient association time?*)

5.1 i. What impact does this have on young people who transition?

5.2 What differences in support is there for young people between juvenile YOIs and young adult YOIs? (*prompt: health, education*)

5.3 How should the young person be supported once they have made the transition? (*prompt: what channels are available in young adult YOI*)

5.4 How is the young person supported once they have made the transition? (*prompt: what are their relationships with staff like?, do they have sufficient family contact*)

5.5 Drawing upon your experience can you recall particular examples and/or cases which demonstrate good practice with regard to juveniles transitioning into the young adult estate?

5.6 Drawing upon your experience can you recall particular examples and/or cases which demonstrate bad practice with regard to juveniles transitioning into the young adult estate?

5.7 Drawing on your experience how would you describe the experiences of young people who transition from juvenile YOIs to young adult prisons?

5.8 Who has overall accountability for the transition arrangements and experiences for young people?

Please explain:

6. Future transition arrangements

6.1 How could juvenile YOIs make the transition experience better (more helpful) for young people?

6.2 How could young adult YOIs make the transition experience better (more helpful) for young people?

6.3 The Royal College of Psychiatrists describe transitions as 'frequently abrupt and inadequately planned' (Cited in the House of Commons Justice Committee 2013) how much do you agree with this statement? Agree Partially agree Disagree Don't know

Please explain:

6.4 What policy approaches could be developed to make the transition experience better (more helpful) for young people?

6.5 In your opinion how will the move of accountability of youth custody services from the YJB to the MoJ under HM Prison Service affect transition arrangements for young people?

6.6 In your opinion how will the Government accepted proposals from the Taylor review affect transition arrangements for young people?

6.7 The Government has declared its intention to release a new transitions protocol as a 'mandatory instruction' (MoJ, 2015) what is your opinion on this?

Do you have any further comments or questions?

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me today. I really appreciate it. If you would like to speak to me further after this meeting, I have provided my contact details and the contact details of my supervisor on the participant information sheet.

Appendix Eight. HMIP survey data across STCs August 2014 – July 2017



Survey responses from children and young people: STCs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 12-16 years	Aged 17-18 years
Number of questionnaires: 321			
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you male?	93.5%	78.5%
1.2	Are you aged under 16? ¹²		
1.3	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White Other category)	50.3%	27.5%
1.4	Are you Muslim?	16.4%	7.0%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	15.2%	9.7%
1.6	Are you a British citizen?	92.7%	94.2%
1.7	Do you have a disability?	20.8%	30.2%
1.8	Have you ever been in local authority care?	44.1%	42.4%
SECTION 2: YOUR TRIP HERE AND FIRST 24 HOURS			
2.1	On your most recent journey to this centre, did you feel that staff looked after you well?	91.8%	95.0%
2.2	When you arrived at the centre were you searched?	94.5%	95.0%
2.3	Did staff explain why you were being searched?	78.9%	85.8%
2.4	When you were searched, did staff treat you with respect?	86.4%	92.6%
On your first night here:			
2.5	Did you see a doctor or nurse before you went to bed?	93.4%	88.3%
2.6	Did anybody talk to you about how you were feeling?	75.8%	81.2%
2.7	Did you feel safe?	89.3%	87.0%
SECTION 3: DAILY LIFE			
3.1	In your first few days here were you told everything you needed to know about life at the centre?	73.7%	81.0%
If you had a problem, who you would turn to?			
3.2a	No-one	16.0%	11.7%
3.2b	Teacher/Education staff	6.7%	17.5%
3.2c	Key worker	20.6%	36.7%
3.2d	Case worker	31.4%	44.2%
3.2e	Staff on the unit	41.8%	62.5%
3.2f	Another young person here	19.1%	21.7%
3.2g	Family	52.1%	53.3%
3.2h	Advocate	10.3%	11.7%
3.3	Do you have a key worker on your unit?	76.4%	82.9%
For those who said they had a key worker:			
3.4	Does your key worker help you?	83.2%	93.0%
3.5	Do most staff treat you with respect?	92.6%	94.0%
3.6	Can you follow your religion if you want to?	74.0%	68.8%
3.7	Is the food here good/ very good?	26.8%	39.8%
3.8	Is it easy to keep in touch with family or carer outside the centre?	90.2%	90.6%
3.9	Do you have visits from family, carers or friends at least once a week?	52.7%	51.3%

¹² The figure did not appear on the SPSS output as the data has been analysed by age. However these figures could be acquired by the SPSS output which showed that 62% (n=200) of young people in STCs were aged under 17 years and 38% (n=121) were aged 17-18 years.



Survey responses from children and young people: STCs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 12-16 years	Aged 17-18 years
Number of questionnaires: 321			
SECTION 4: BEHAVIOUR			
4.1	Does the incentives and sanctions scheme encourage you to behave well?	72.9%	81.2%
4.2	Do you think the incentives and sanctions scheme is fair?	60.0%	74.6%
4.3	If you get in trouble, do staff explain what you have done wrong?	80.2%	86.6%
4.4	Do most staff let you know when your behaviour is good?	75.8%	81.4%
4.5	Have staff ever made you stay in your room away from the other young people because of something you did?	49.2%	36.2%
4.6	Have you been physically restrained since you have been here?	36.3%	28.8%
For those who had been restrained:			
4.7	Were you given a chance to talk to somebody about the restraint afterwards?	67.2%	74.2%
SECTION 5: HEALTH SERVICES			
5.1	If you feel ill, are you able to see a doctor or nurse?	88.8%	89.6%
5.2	Do you think that the health services are good here?	57.6%	64.0%
5.3	Do you have any health needs which are not being met?	26.8%	25.9%
SECTION 6: COMPLAINTS			
6.1	Do you know how to make a complaint?	96.8%	95.7%
For those who have made a complaint:			
6.2	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	56.7%	77.8%
6.3	Have you ever wanted to make a complaint but didn't because you were worried what would happen to you?	13.9%	14.7%
SECTION 7: EDUCATION AND ACTIVITIES			
7.1	Do you have a care plan which sets out targets for you to achieve while in custody?	39.6%	49.6%
7.2	Have you been given advice about training or jobs that you might like to do in the future?	63.2%	77.6%
7.3	Have you been able to learn skills for jobs that you might like to do in the future?	59.7%	70.4%
7.4	Do you think your education here will help you once you leave?	62.2%	69.4%
7.5	Have you been able to learn any 'life skills' here?	80.9%	84.1%
7.6	Are you encouraged to take part in activities outside education/ training hours?	87.8%	85.8%
7.8	Do you know where you will be living when you leave the centre?	70.8%	74.3%
For those who are sentenced:			
7.9	Have you done anything here to make you less likely to offend in the future?	55.2%	70.5%



Survey responses from children and young people: STCs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 12-16 years	Aged 17-18 years
Number of questionnaires: 321			
SECTION 8: SAFETY			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	20.6%	22.9%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe at the moment?	9.0%	5.0%
Have you experienced any of the following from young people here?			
8.4a	Insulting remarks?	26.8%	37.0%
8.4b	Physical abuse?	18.5%	22.2%
8.4c	Sexual abuse?	1.8%	1.9%
8.4d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	12.5%	18.5%
8.4e	Shout outs/yelling through windows?	25.0%	29.6%
8.4f	Having your canteen/property taken?	7.1%	6.5%
For those who have indicated any of the above, what did it relate to?			
8.5a	Your race or ethnic origin?	13.1%	9.3%
8.5b	Your religion or religious beliefs?	4.2%	2.8%
8.5c	Your nationality?	5.4%	6.5%
8.5d	Your being from a different part of the country than others?	6.0%	8.4%
8.5e	Your being from a Traveller community?	4.2%	1.9%
8.5f	Your sexual orientation?	1.2%	0.9%
8.5g	Your age?	4.8%	1.9%
8.5h	You having a disability?	3.0%	3.7%
8.5i	You being new here?	11.9%	14.0%
8.5j	Your offence or crime?	7.7%	14.0%
8.5k	Gang related issues or people you know or mix with?	8.9%	5.6%
8.5l	About your family or friends?	11.9%	5.6%
8.5m	Drugs?	5.4%	5.6%
8.5n	Medications you receive?	1.8%	0.9%
8.5	Your gender?	2.4%	0.9%



Survey responses from children and young people: STCs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 12-16 years	Aged 17-18 years
Number of questionnaires: 321			
Have you experienced any of the following from staff here?			
8.7a	Insulting remarks?	15.3%	14.7%
8.7b	Physical abuse?	6.7%	3.7%
8.7c	Sexual abuse?	2.7%	2.8%
8.7d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	9.3%	8.3%
8.7e	Having your canteen/property taken?	8.7%	3.7%
For those who have indicated any of the above, what did it relate to?			
8.8a	Your race or ethnic origin?	7.3%	2.8%
8.8b	Your religion or religious beliefs?	6.0%	1.8%
8.8c	Your nationality?	4.7%	1.8%
8.8d	Your being from a different part of the country than others?	4.0%	2.8%
8.8e	Your being from a Traveller community?	2.0%	0.9%
8.8f	Your sexual orientation?	2.7%	2.8%
8.8g	Your age?	5.3%	1.8%
8.8h	You having a disability?	2.0%	2.8%
8.8i	You being new here?	6.0%	1.8%
8.8j	Your offence or crime?	5.3%	1.8%
8.8k	Gang related issues or people you know or mix with?	4.0%	1.8%
8.8l	About your family or friends?	4.7%	2.8%
8.8m	Drugs?	4.7%	1.8%
8.8n	Medications you receive?	4.0%	0.9%
8.8o	Your gender?	3.3%	1.8%
8.8p	Because you made a complaint?	4.7%	2.8%
8.10	If you were being bullied or 'picked on', would you tell a member of staff?	52.7%	70.2%

Appendix Nine. HMIP survey data across YOIs August 2014 – July 2017



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1,726			
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age? ¹³	4.9%	14.8%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5.8%	5.7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99.4%	99.0%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97.1%	98.0%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	56.6%	40.6%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	25.1%	20.6%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7.6%	7.3%
1.8	Do you have any children?	10.7%	9.6%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16.5%	19.0%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38.6%	37.8%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	72.6%	78.5%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	33.6%	34.1%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	17.4%	16.0%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	55.7%	58.8%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	77.1%	80.7%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31.7%	35.4%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7.0%	6.8%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:			
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	11.3%	13.0%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	42.6%	42.3%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51.0%	53.7%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	10.0%	14.9%

¹³ These figures must be an anomaly – whereby some young people have indicated that they are aged 15-16 years and also checked a positive response on the survey to the question 'are you 18 years of age'. This occurred only within this survey as it was the only one that asked this additional question regarding age.

In the YOI survey data 20% (n=35) of young people indicated that they were aged 15-16 years and 73% (n=1,376) indicated that they were aged 17-18 years.



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	80.0%	79.0%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82.4%	81.0%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64.5%	68.0%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	45.3%	48.4%
4.4b	Loss of property?	17.0%	18.6%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	24.5%	27.4%
4.4d	Gang problems?	50.5%	44.3%
4.4e	Contacting family?	53.2%	54.3%
4.4f	Money worries?	14.6%	16.1%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	31.9%	33.1%
4.4h	Health problems?	57.4%	53.8%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	41.9%	39.6%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79.9%	75.4%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	46.1%	45.6%
4.5b	Loss of property?	11.5%	12.0%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	10.2%	12.2%
4.5d	Gang problems?	18.9%	15.4%
4.5e	Contacting family?	35.5%	30.8%
4.5f	Money worries?	18.3%	14.2%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	12.1%	13.9%
4.5h	Health problems?	14.9%	13.4%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	41.0%	29.8%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	80.2%	80.7%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	61.8%	49.4%
4.6c	Something to eat?	85.5%	80.3%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	79.3%	75.5%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	58.9%	56.1%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	31.8%	31.4%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	41.6%	46.2%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	8.8%	11.8%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	15.7%	17.5%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	7.2%	11.0%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	70.6%	69.6%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77.9%	77.2%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	56.2%	57.2%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	92.2%	86.4%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18.4%	31.7%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	11.9%	16.9%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	56.9%	47.8%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	45.5%	51.5%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60.3%	56.8%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64.1%	66.3%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25.7%	30.7%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	13.4%	21.6%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	36.5%	40.3%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	61.8%	68.2%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	24.7%	24.8%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	26.3%	34.8%
For those who have met their personal officer:			
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	27.9%	37.0%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	36.2%	52.1%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	55.8%	64.8%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	64.4%	68.3%
For those who have made an application:			
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	54.3%	61.3%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	30.6%	46.0%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46.8%	53.1%
For those who have made a complaint:			
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	30.7%	38.9%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	22.7%	33.3%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	13.0%	11.0%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	19.7%	26.5%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	39.0%	45.6%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40.8%	46.5%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	43.8%	48.9%
For those who have had a minor report:			
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	57.0%	72.9%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	72.6%	65.5%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):			
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	79.2%	83.0%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	46.3%	41.9%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	43.1%	37.7%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42.5%	37.2%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19.2%	13.1%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	31.0%	28.5%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18.7%	15.7%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14.4%	11.6%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0.6%	0.8%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	14.1%	11.3%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	6.0%	4.6%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0.6%	1.1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1.5%	2.1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1.5%	1.6%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3.9%	3.8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2.1%	2.1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1.8%	2.7%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4.2%	3.5%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2.4%	1.5%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0.0%	0.8%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1.8%	0.7%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2.1%	1.5%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	6.0%	8.1%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4.2%	3.4%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10.2%	6.0%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	28.3%	27.3%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16.4%	13.3%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10.9%	7.0%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	1.8%	0.8%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	6.4%	7.0%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	3.6%	4.0%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0.6%	1.1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0.3%	0.2%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0.6%	0.8%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4.0%	3.6%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2.7%	2.7%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2.4%	1.9%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1.8%	1.7%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1.5%	0.6%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0.3%	0.4%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1.8%	1.4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0.6%	0.6%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	2.4%	2.5%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1.8%	1.5%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1.8%	1.0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	4.3%	4.9%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	25.5%	27.5%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24.0%	27.3%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	40.1%	40.7%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	45.3%	52.3%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	57.3%	66.6%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	22.8%	32.2%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	50.5%	51.9%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	40.1%	53.4%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	23.0%	24.7%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	65.3%	58.3%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4.9%	7.3%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	2.8%	4.2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	28.6%	35.8%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	3.7%	7.4%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	17.2%	22.6%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	18.6%	20.0%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	45.3%	38.3%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	90.1%	85.7%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	72.2%	73.6%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	78.0%	74.3%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	12.7%	23.5%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8.3%	13.1%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	15.1%	17.9%
11.4e	Nothing	17.2%	16.2%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:			
11.5a	Education?	64.0%	60.3%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	30.7%	44.1%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	35.6%	44.2%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	32.3%	48.3%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	37.2%	66.2%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	63.4%	61.5%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	9.6%	9.1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	81.1%	81.0%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53.7%	45.6%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	35.3%	36.3%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	27.7%	32.5%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	40.1%	36.4%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	24.1%	26.7%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	32.2%	32.4%
13.1c	Getting a job?	45.5%	54.1%
13.1d	Money/finances?	31.3%	36.8%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	9.7%	15.6%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	8.8%	9.0%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	15.6%	16.4%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	14.7%	16.5%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	43.0%	47.2%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:			
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	87.7%	85.1%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	91.6%	92.5%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	92.2%	87.5%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	38.8%	46.9%
For those with a social worker:			
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	75.0%	72.5%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	38.7%	40.4%



Survey responses from children and young people: YOIs August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged 15 - 16 years	Aged 17 - 18 years
Number of questionnaires: 1726			
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?			
13.9a	Finding accommodation	25.0%	28.3%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	29.1%	28.6%
13.9c	Getting a job	25.0%	31.8%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	21.9%	23.1%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	12.0%	17.6%
13.9f	Continuing health services	17.2%	14.1%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	19.6%	18.7%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	15.8%	13.9%
For those who were sentenced:			
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	88.7%	90.7%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	51.3%	52.1%

Appendix 10. HMIP survey data across Young Adult Institutions August 2014 – July 2017



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
Number of completed questionnaires returned: 1,539			
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age? ¹⁴		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	86.7%	98.0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5.5%	7.3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14.6%	4.6%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2.0%	8.6%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10.9%	6.8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99.1%	99.2%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98.4%	99.0%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	40.1%	41.3%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4.5%	3.8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	21.6%	20.0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3.0%	4.3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17.5%	15.4%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1.6%	1.3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	56.0%	52.6%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	21.0%	26.8%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	46.2%	49.4%
	For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		

¹⁴ In the young adult institution survey 74% (n=1142) of respondents indicated that they were aged under 21 years and 26% (n=397) indicated that they were aged 21-70+ years.

2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	61.2%	67.0%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10.3%	10.1%
2.4	Was the van clean?	44.6%	43.8%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	79.4%	77.8%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59.6%	61.5%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59.4%	57.4%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	7.0%	9.1%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85.8%	82.8%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	68.2%	61.9%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80.1%	82.7%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66.9%	68.8%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	59.5%	58.1%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15.5%	18.3%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	10.4%	8.5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2.2%	1.0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	24.7%	17.5%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1.1%	1.0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14.0%	9.0%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	16.0%	13.9%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	5.1%	5.7%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	14.8%	15.2%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8.6%	8.7%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20.3%	17.5%
For those with problems:			
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	31.3%	29.4%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:			
3.6	Tobacco?	83.7%	85.5%
3.6	A shower?	49.9%	41.5%
3.6	A free telephone call?	75.8%	73.3%
3.6	Something to eat?	63.4%	52.5%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50.7%	50.4%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	55.7%	50.6%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	57.7%	59.9%
3.7	Someone from health services?	64.3%	71.5%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	20.2%	25.2%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	22.5%	32.9%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	44.1%	49.4%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	33.6%	38.2%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	36.0%	40.3%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38.3%	42.3%
3.8	Health services?	47.9%	53.2%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	47.4%	50.1%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73.4%	71.1%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82.4%	85.3%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	42.7%	48.2%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	80.0%	82.1%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29.7%	28.6%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	44.7%	43.7%
4.1	Get bail information?	14.2%	10.7%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	40.7%	44.8%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	22.0%	32.4%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	43.4%	52.8%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	62.9%	64.1%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	61.8%	65.2%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	32.6%	37.7%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	24.1%	30.5%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	51.9%	57.1%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	22.5%	32.4%

4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	20.2%	16.9%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42.5%	41.8%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	35.9%	40.1%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	48.5%	49.1%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57.9%	60.3%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	46.3%	44.8%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73.7%	80.4%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	51.4%	56.1%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	26.6%	29.0%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50.6%	59.4%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	30.6%	30.7%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	27.7%	31.9%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	22.2%	27.6%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	16.0%	18.9%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37.8%	46.4%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47.2%	47.8%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	23.2%	20.5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	24.7%	37.7%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67.0%	70.1%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	63.0%	72.0%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	28.0%	30.1%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	19.5%	25.6%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	56.2%	77.4%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	51.5%	55.1%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44.0%	47.4%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21.5%	19.0%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	33.0%	35.1%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18.7%	17.8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	16.4%	18.6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2.4%	1.8%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	20.4%	23.5%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	11.5%	13.7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2.8%	1.3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	7.4%	9.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4.7%	4.7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4.8%	5.2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4.5%	4.4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4.0%	4.4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7.7%	5.9%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1.3%	1.3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2.5%	2.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1.7%	1.3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3.6%	4.1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	12.6%	9.0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7.5%	11.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8.6%	9.6%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	32.7%	36.1%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15.0%	18.2%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8.9%	8.1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2.1%	1.6%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	12.7%	15.1%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1.4%	2.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2.5%	2.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1.5%	1.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5.5%	7.5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4.8%	6.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4.2%	3.9%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3.8%	6.2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1.0%	0.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1.7%	1.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2.6%	2.3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1.9%	3.1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7.4%	6.5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4.4%	6.0%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3.8%	2.9%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	38.3%	37.6%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	39.0%	41.9%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	51.9%	57.9%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	22.0%	14.7%
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:			
9.2	The doctor?	58.8%	52.8%
9.2	The nurse?	64.4%	62.4%
9.2	The dentist?	45.6%	38.7%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	52.2%	47.5%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	26.0%	29.5%
For those currently taking medication:			
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	54.3%	77.9%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	31.4%	29.6%
For those who have problems:			
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	50.5%	53.1%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	26.2%	31.1%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13.9%	20.1%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27.1%	36.7%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	9.6%	13.0%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7.7%	9.2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4.0%	4.8%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:			
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	57.8%	78.5%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	58.5%	74.3%
For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:			
10.9	Was the support helpful?	71.1%	79.6%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	25.8%	34.6%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	32.8%	39.6%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	53.5%	58.4%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	22.8%	32.9%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	35.3%	53.4%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	10.0%	16.2%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29.2%	15.9%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6.1%	13.7%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	66.5%	82.2%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	52.5%	49.5%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	60.4%	73.8%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	48.9%	66.2%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	78.4%	82.6%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	58.3%	60.5%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	55.6%	75.8%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	46.1%	58.4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22.8%	26.6%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	29.3%	33.2%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	14.8%	14.9%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	49.5%	57.8%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	45.2%	47.8%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	5.1%	7.2%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	32.7%	33.4%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	51.2%	55.4%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36.9%	38.9%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	28.1%	29.4%



Survey responses from adults: young adults institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	75.1%	85.2%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	47.8%	38.0%
13.2	Contact by letter?	20.5%	28.4%
13.2	Contact by phone?	8.7%	26.8%
13.2	Contact by visit?	33.1%	30.7%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	62.3%	84.5%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	55.1%	75.1%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	49.7%	51.9%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	52.4%	43.2%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	28.4%	39.8%
13.6	Offender manager?	21.4%	27.8%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	12.6%	16.9%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	6.0%	17.3%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	62.3%	70.3%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	21.8%	22.7%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	32.6%	24.5%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6.9%	4.3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16.0%	19.7%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.12	Employment?	32.5%	36.0%
13.12	Accommodation?	33.9%	32.5%
13.12	Benefits?	27.9%	30.1%
13.12	Finances?	20.7%	24.4%
13.12	Education?	34.2%	37.5%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	38.0%	42.7%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	53.7%	60.0%

Appendix 11. HMIP survey data across Adult Male Prisons August 2014 – July 2017



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
Number of completed questionnaires: 18,991			
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age? ¹⁵		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	67.6%	85.9%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6.7%	8.0%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	17.3%	11.6%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0.8%	6.5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13.8%	10.2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97.7%	98.2%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97.0%	97.4%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	34.5%	25.2%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5.4%	4.5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	19.3%	12.6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3.1%	4.2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20.9%	23.8%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2.4%	6.0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52.2%	38.4%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	22.4%	51.9%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32.1%	38.3%
	For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	47.9%	62.4%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10.3%	8.6%
2.4	Was the van clean?	46.2%	60.0%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	75.6%	76.6%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57.6%	70.6%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59.7%	63.0%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	10.2%	9.2%

¹⁵ In the adult male survey 4% (n=732) indicated that they were aged under 21 years and 96% (n=18259) indicated that they were aged 21-70+ years.

2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	75.1%	81.9%
-----	---	-------	-------



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	46.0%	49.9%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75.5%	81.7%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55.3%	70.0%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	70.0%	67.4%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	18.9%	17.3%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	14.6%	15.9%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3.4%	3.4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	31.1%	25.2%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2.1%	2.1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21.0%	17.9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	18.5%	19.4%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	6.5%	15.5%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	17.8%	21.4%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8.1%	6.4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	27.1%	23.3%
For those with problems:			
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	25.4%	34.9%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:			
3.6	Tobacco?	79.6%	70.7%
3.6	A shower?	25.5%	29.2%
3.6	A free telephone call?	51.0%	45.0%
3.6	Something to eat?	66.5%	61.6%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50.7%	48.6%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	57.9%	51.9%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47.9%	49.1%
3.7	Someone from health services?	57.9%	67.1%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	31.5%	33.2%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	23.6%	23.3%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	41.6%	47.0%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	38.6%	38.1%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	37.3%	39.9%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	37.4%	36.6%
3.8	Health services?	42.0%	48.2%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	41.7%	43.9%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68.1%	75.3%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	80.8%	84.0%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	46.1%	55.5%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	79.2%	80.1%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30.8%	41.8%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	46.0%	46.9%
4.1	Get bail information?	15.2%	14.2%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36.9%	40.4%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24.9%	40.6%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46.4%	58.7%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	67.9%	84.5%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	55.3%	66.2%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	42.8%	59.3%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	20.1%	30.7%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	55.4%	63.1%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	18.9%	24.0%

4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22.1%	28.1%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48.2%	48.5%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	38.9%	55.6%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	45.2%	50.3%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	43.8%	55.3%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	42.9%	48.0%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70.5%	77.3%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	45.1%	52.8%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35.7%	37.0%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47.4%	55.2%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	23.3%	30.6%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	22.4%	26.5%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	23.0%	20.5%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	12.8%	26.0%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30.6%	45.2%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	39.5%	42.1%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	22.0%	8.4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	26.6%	35.9%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	61.1%	77.2%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	59.7%	71.8%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	22.9%	29.4%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14.2%	19.9%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	36.0%	52.9%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	44.8%	65.0%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43.7%	42.2%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19.8%	18.7%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	29.2%	29.9%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12.5%	12.7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11.8%	8.6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2.0%	1.7%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	15.2%	17.4%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	8.9%	7.4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3.4%	4.8%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4.8%	3.9%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4.5%	4.1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4.2%	4.1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3.7%	3.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2.8%	3.1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3.5%	4.1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2.1%	1.1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1.3%	1.8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4.8%	2.5%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1.6%	3.5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8.9%	5.8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5.9%	5.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7.9%	4.8%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	35.1%	30.2%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15.1%	11.4%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10.1%	4.6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2.4%	1.1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14.4%	12.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2.7%	4.6%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2.1%	1.5%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2.7%	2.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5.0%	4.1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4.1%	3.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3.6%	2.8%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4.9%	2.7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1.9%	1.1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1.9%	1.2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	7.0%	2.0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3.1%	3.0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8.9%	4.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6.6%	4.5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6.5%	2.3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	33.0%	38.1%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24.1%	27.8%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	40.1%	48.8%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13.2%	13.6%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	45.5%	44.7%
9.2	The nurse?	51.0%	54.4%
9.2	The dentist?	37.6%	39.1%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40.1%	39.3%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	25.9%	53.4%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	58.2%	71.3%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	32.1%	37.2%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	39.7%	46.4%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	28.2%	26.7%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13.2%	18.2%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26.5%	39.3%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14.6%	20.6%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	8.3%	8.8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5.4%	7.0%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	36.5%	61.7%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	53.5%	60.5%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	65.6%	76.8%



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 11: Activities			
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:			
11.1	A prison job?	24.5%	43.0%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	27.3%	36.9%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	42.4%	52.4%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	17.8%	22.2%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:			
11.2	A prison job?	30.4%	56.6%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8.5%	12.4%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	27.7%	23.3%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	5.9%	9.7%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	57.1%	79.8%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:			
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	43.5%	41.4%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	47.9%	68.1%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:			
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	42.3%	51.6%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	62.2%	75.6%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:			
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	51.4%	54.9%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	45.0%	64.4%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:			
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	40.7%	46.2%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26.0%	38.1%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	26.2%	41.3%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	24.4%	30.6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55.8%	48.3%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	41.5%	55.6%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	5.8%	17.4%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	28.5%	34.5%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	49.6%	44.1%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38.3%	26.3%

12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	34.7%	30.5%
------	--	-------	-------



Survey responses from adults: adult male institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
For those who are sentenced:			
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	65.7%	75.5%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	50.8%	34.3%
13.2	Contact by letter?	21.8%	32.7%
13.2	Contact by phone?	9.6%	28.1%
13.2	Contact by visit?	31.0%	33.5%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	35.2%	58.6%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	39.4%	55.1%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	45.3%	57.3%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	59.9%	41.4%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	26.6%	41.5%
13.6	Offender manager?	14.7%	29.4%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	6.8%	15.9%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	9.6%	17.0%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	52.0%	61.2%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	22.2%	21.3%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	35.4%	29.5%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6.6%	6.3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10.6%	15.4%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
13.12	Employment?	32.7%	30.5%
13.12	Accommodation?	33.9%	33.1%
13.12	Benefits?	30.8%	34.9%
13.12	Finances?	21.6%	24.3%
13.12	Education?	29.6%	31.3%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	29.0%	41.4%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	46.9%	52.6%

Appendix 12. HMIP survey data across Adult Women Prisons August 2014 – July 2017



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
Number of completed questionnaires: 4,556			
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age? ¹⁶		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	67.8%	84.8%
1.3	Are you on recall?	3.4%	6.2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	22.0%	23.1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0.0%	3.0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11.8%	9.6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100.0%	97.9%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98.5%	97.5%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	24.9%	18.7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9.0%	5.5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16.2%	5.8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	35.6%	25.7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20.4%	33.6%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1.0%	1.3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	70.7%	53.6%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	23.9%	55.6%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	42.8%	41.4%
	For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	59.2%	55.8%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	12.0%	11.0%
2.4	Was the van clean?	44.2%	60.3%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	75.2%	77.2%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74.4%	79.4%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77.7%	72.6%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3.9%	8.9%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	69.5%	82.9%

¹⁶ In the adult women prisons survey 5% (n=208) indicated that they were aged under 21 years and 95% (n=4348) indicated that they were aged 21-70+ years.



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	53.4%	55.4%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85.4%	89.5%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72.8%	77.9%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	77.5%	77.0%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19.4%	11.0%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	21.4%	24.6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0.0%	2.5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	29.5%	26.8%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2.5%	4.5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21.4%	24.0%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	39.0%	35.6%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	7.5%	23.9%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	29.9%	36.4%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8.5%	4.7%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28.0%	25.0%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	39.4%	49.1%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	83.9%	78.9%
3.6	A shower?	44.2%	42.1%
3.6	A free telephone call?	70.4%	72.5%
3.6	Something to eat?	79.1%	78.3%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51.0%	55.4%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	67.8%	68.2%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	54.3%	51.8%
3.7	Someone from health services?	63.5%	70.7%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	51.8%	43.0%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	27.4%	28.1%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	57.1%	52.5%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	48.8%	48.6%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	46.1%	43.2%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	45.1%	39.8%
3.8	Health services?	49.8%	50.9%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	42.9%	48.3%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62.6%	71.1%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89.3%	88.5%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	51.9%	56.3%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	80.5%	82.8%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29.4%	38.7%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	58.9%	52.0%
4.1	Get bail information?	16.8%	15.4%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	30.3%	39.8%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	29.8%	42.3%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62.4%	69.9%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94.7%	91.7%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	93.6%	88.6%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	74.3%	80.0%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	43.8%	42.3%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	59.7%	66.3%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	21.9%	28.6%

4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25.1%	34.4%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54.7%	50.5%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	70.6%	65.6%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	52.7%	59.8%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58.4%	68.4%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	45.3%	53.8%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82.4%	83.6%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	58.6%	64.2%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	38.0%	46.6%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53.3%	61.1%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	34.0%	41.5%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	33.7%	37.8%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14.9%	18.1%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	17.9%	38.0%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51.5%	53.8%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	60.0%	50.1%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	19.3%	4.7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	45.7%	48.8%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	70.7%	79.5%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72.9%	80.5%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	43.4%	38.1%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	32.8%	24.3%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	66.5%	59.1%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	63.0%	66.7%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	46.0%	45.7%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24.0%	15.1%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	39.8%	38.3%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	25.4%	21.3%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	17.4%	8.6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1.0%	1.6%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	31.0%	26.3%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	10.0%	7.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4.5%	6.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2.5%	1.6%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5.0%	4.4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5.0%	4.0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2.5%	2.5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3.5%	3.4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4.0%	3.2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1.0%	1.0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6.0%	2.0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	14.9%	3.3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2.5%	4.6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	17.4%	9.2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11.4%	7.7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9.0%	3.4%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24.7%	28.1%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10.1%	12.0%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3.5%	1.9%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1.0%	1.0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16.7%	11.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4.5%	5.0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1.0%	0.6%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2.0%	2.5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3.5%	2.1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2.5%	1.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2.0%	1.4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1.0%	1.5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2.0%	0.8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2.0%	2.3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	13.6%	1.5%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2.5%	3.1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2.0%	4.0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6.6%	4.0%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3.5%	1.3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	39.0%	52.0%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31.3%	27.4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	45.8%	50.9%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16.7%	14.8%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	52.0%	45.1%
9.2	The nurse?	63.3%	53.1%
9.2	The dentist?	54.5%	41.6%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	46.1%	38.6%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52.3%	76.0%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	33.7%	47.6%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	56.6%	59.7%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	62.8%	53.9%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	31.8%	41.1%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	27.2%	28.4%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	21.4%	30.3%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6.2%	4.6%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6.6%	5.2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8.7%	8.2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	59.4%	81.3%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	75.6%	77.7%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	82.3%	80.6%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	41.3%	53.0%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	38.8%	43.4%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	49.5%	57.0%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	28.2%	31.4%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	55.0%	65.3%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	5.9%	15.8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	33.3%	32.1%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	15.4%	14.8%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	70.9%	82.5%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	63.0%	54.4%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	48.6%	69.0%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	67.6%	59.8%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	70.0%	78.4%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	79.5%	66.4%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	51.7%	65.2%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	68.8%	57.7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33.2%	45.6%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	49.2%	50.4%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19.9%	22.6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	39.5%	42.0%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	52.5%	53.1%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9.7%	20.4%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	48.6%	50.3%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	53.8%	39.3%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27.2%	22.7%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	30.6%	31.4%



Survey responses from adults: adult women institutions August 2014 - July 2017

		Aged under 21	Aged 21 - 70+
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
For those who are sentenced:			
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	67.5%	73.9%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	54.5%	38.1%
13.2	Contact by letter?	23.4%	30.0%
13.2	Contact by phone?	15.6%	17.2%
13.2	Contact by visit?	27.3%	37.0%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	44.3%	58.9%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	40.0%	55.1%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	47.1%	62.0%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	30.6%	31.7%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	37.5%	44.5%
13.6	Offender manager?	18.4%	29.0%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	8.3%	23.6%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	28.6%	27.8%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	74.5%	72.2%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	14.0%	17.4%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	25.5%	31.6%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4.2%	6.3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	17.6%	23.4%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
13.12	Employment?	59.5%	50.3%
13.12	Accommodation?	60.9%	55.4%
13.12	Benefits?	61.7%	57.0%
13.12	Finances?	45.8%	41.0%
13.12	Education?	55.9%	48.7%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	67.2%	66.9%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	65.5%	57.6%

Appendix 13. Interviewees

Young peoples' pseudonyms and their establishments

Alejandro – Juvenile Institution Two – Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Casper – Juvenile Institution Two - Young Adult/Adult Institution Four

Christopher – Juvenile Institution Two - Young Adult/Adult Institution Four

Craig – Juvenile Institution Two - Young Adult/Adult Institution Five

Darren – Juvenile Institution One - Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Edward – Juvenile Institution Two - Young Adult/Adult Institution Four

Kendrick - Juvenile Institution One – Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Lewis – Juvenile Institution Two - Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Luke - Juvenile Institution One – Young Adult/Adult Institution Four

Nabi – Juvenile Institution One - Young Adult/Adult Institution One

Niall – Juvenile Institution Two – Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Noah - Juvenile Institution One – Young Adult/Adult Institution One

Sadir - Juvenile Institution One – Young Adult/Adult Institution Three

Warren – Juvenile Institution Two – Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Key stakeholders

'Insider' key stakeholders

Caseworker One Juvenile Institution One

Safeguarding Worker Juvenile Institution One

Engagement and Resettlement worker Juvenile Institution One

Caseworker Two Juvenile Institution Two

Caseworker Three Juvenile Institution Two

Probation Officer One Young Adult/Adult Institution One

Probation Officer Two Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Probation Officer Three Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Senior Officer One Young Adult/Adult Institution One

Offender Categorisation and Allocation Officer Young Adult/Adult Institution One

Offender Supervisor One Young Adult/Adult Institution Two

Offender Supervisor Two Young Adult/Adult Institution Three

'Outsider' key stakeholders

Academic One

Academic Two

Academic Three

Leaving Care Expert

Civil Servant One

Civil Servant Two

Inspector One

Inspector Two

Lawyer

Young Adults in the Criminal Justice System Expert