Community Supervision: Context and Relationships Matter

9

Fergus McNeill

Introduction

This chapter explores the relationships between evidence, policy and practice in community-based interventions with young offenders. The debates and controversies about the effectiveness of community supervision are considered alongside an analysis of the emergence of correctionalism in contemporary youth justice. Furthermore, desistance from offending is discussed and, on the basis of evidence, the means by which community supervision might be reconstructed are explored. The central argument is that a critical reading of research evidence suggests that correctionalist discourses, policies and practices serve to inhibit and frustrate the achievement of their expressed purpose – the prevention of youth offending and re-offending. Given that such an outcome is likely to result in further use of custodial detention – a less effective, more expensive and more damaging sanction – a critical reconstruction of community supervision is urgently required.

Community supervision and its effectiveness

In England and Wales, a variety of orders are available to the courts that provide for some element of community supervision of young people who have offended including: action plan orders; reparation orders; and drug treatment and testing orders. The supervision order itself, however, is of most relevance here. Under sections 63–68 of the Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000, supervision orders can be imposed on children and young people at the point of conviction; the orders have no minimum length but the maximum is three years. Since the order is a community sentence, it can only be imposed

where the offending is 'serious enough' to require such a measure; the restriction of liberty involved must be commensurate with the seriousness of the offence and the order must be the most suitable method available for the young person. The main effect of the order is to place the child or young person under supervision (provided by a local authority, a probation officer or a member of a multi-agency youth offending team) in respect of which the supervisor is obliged to 'advise, assist and befriend' the supervisee. In addition to the standard conditions of supervision orders (retaining contact with the supervising officer and complying with instructions), in certain circumstances a wide range of additional conditions can also be imposed by the courts, including: requirements to undertake 'intermediate treatment' and/or 'specified activities'; to make reparation either to the community or to specific individuals; to submit to 'night restriction' conditions (curfews); to refrain from particular activities; to reside in local authority accommodation; to receive treatment for a 'mental condition'; and to comply with educational arrangements (Nacro, 2002).

Perhaps most significantly, intensive supervision and surveillance programmes (ISSPs) can now be deployed as part of a supervision order where a young person meets the (non-statutory) eligibility criteria; these include having been charged, warned or convicted of offences committed on four or more separate occasions in the preceding 12 months and having received at least one previous community sentence or custodial penalty; or being at risk of custody because the current charge is so serious that an adult could be sentenced to 14 years prisonment or more. As the name suggests, such programmes combine intensive supervision and *surveillance* either by tracking, tagging, voice verification or intelligence-led policing (Moore, 2005; Nellis, 2004).

The most recent study of the effectiveness of community interventions with young people in England and Wales (Jennings, 2003) concluded that such measures had delivered a fall of 22 per cent in predicted reconvictions within 12 months of reprimand, warning or conviction when measured against an 'adjusted predicted' rate. However, leaving aside the methodological limitations of this study noted by some commentators (Bateman and Pitts, 2005; Bottoms and Dignan, 2004), the largest improvements were associated with reprimands and final warnings. By contrast, orders (primarily supervision orders) aimed at young people involved in more persistent offending achieved at best marginal effects in terms of reconviction; a finding that the Audit Commission (2004) has recently underlined. A similar problem in tackling persistent offending was apparent in Feilzer et al.'s (2004) evaluation of 23 cognitive behavioural programmes in youth justice. Only 47 per cent of children and young people referred completed the programmes and 71 per cent of 'completers' re-offended within 12 months. Feilzer et al. (2004) concluded that 'methodological shortcomings' made it impossible to assess the independent effectiveness of the programmes in reducing offending. While the detailed conclusions from the ongoing evaluations of ISSPs are not yet available, Moore's (2004) optimistic

review of related research is ultimately equivocal in terms of the prospects for reducing both reconviction and the use of custody.

In Scotland, supervision orders may involve similar conditions and forms of intervention to those applied in England and Wales. The principal difference, however, is that they are located within a Children's Hearings system in which, in theory at least, the welfare of the child is paramount and no non-beneficial orders should be imposed (Children (Scotland) Act 1995, section 16).[1] Crucially, the latter principle requires a parsimonious approach to regulatory/correctional intervention. Although the relative dearth of evaluative studies makes it difficult to reach reliable conclusions about the effectiveness of the Children's Hearings System in tackling youth offending, some studies undertaken in the late 1990s exposed certain problems, including: a lack of clarity about decision-making; substantial 'drift'; and a failure to prevent escalation in the offending of a small group of typically older boys and young men at high risk of progression to the adult courts and thence to custody (often at the age of 16 in Scotland) (Hallett et al., 1998; Waterhouse et al., 2000). Despite such problems, however, there is some emerging evidence that the Hearings system can, in some circumstances at least, deliver encouraging reductions in youth offending. For example, 'Fast Track Hearings', targeted at young people involved in persistent offending, and aimed at reducing 'drift', were set up on a pilot basis in 2003, operating within the principles of the Hearings system but at greater speed and with additional resources. The interim evaluation report suggests that the measures are producing reductions in levels of offending and re-referrals to the Hearings (Hill et al., 2004). To some extent, the positive evaluation of the Freagarrach Project (which provides intensive supervision for young people involved in persistent offending) had already implied that such success could be achieved within the Hearings system, where the right kind of services were provided for children and young people (Lobley et al., 2001).

Despite predictable (if under-recognised) difficulties in addressing the complexities of the needs of children and young people involved in persistent offending (Liddle and Solanki, 2002; McNeill and Batchelor, 2002), there is reason to be optimistic about the potential of properly targeted, resourced and constructed community supervision. That said, the strongest case for increasing (and crucially, repeating) the use of community supervision with those involved in persistent offending rests on the compelling evidence about the ineffectiveness of custody, particularly in the light of its high fiscal and human costs (Goldson,

---

1. Children's Hearings are welfare tribunals headed by lay people from the local community. Children can be brought before a Hearing because they: are beyond the control of parents; are being exposed to moral danger; are likely to suffer unnecessarily or suffer serious impairment to health or development through lack of parental care; are the victim of a sex or cruelty offence; are failing to attend school regularly; are misusing drugs, alcohol or solvents; or have committed an offence. If the Hearing thinks compulsory measures of supervision are appropriate, it will impose a supervision requirement, which may be renewed until the child becomes 18.

2002; Hagell, 2005). No youth justice system that is serious about reducing youth crime has any option other than to look towards developing the effectiveness of community supervision.

Correctionalism and community supervision

The focus and nature of supervision are inevitably shaped by political discourses about youth crime and 'young offenders'. In this regard, some commentators have argued that a kind of authoritarian corporate correctionalism has recently emerged in youth justice, particularly in England and Wales (Goldson, 2001; Muncie, 2002; Pitts, 2001). This correctionalism, it is argued, narrowly emphasises constructions of individual responsibility and parental accountability for the behaviour of children and young people, entailing a concomitant policy and practice focus on correcting personal and/or parental 'deficits' (Goldson and Jamieson, 2002). Equally, the wider social and structural contexts within which youth crime is located are essentially overlooked.

Some similar conceptual trends are apparent in Scotland. Although the very different systemic context provided by the system of Children's Hearings might be seen to comprise a barrier to the imposition of crudely correctionalist approaches, hopes that these arrangements will continue to facilitate a significantly different policy and practice line from that in England and Wales (Allen, 2002; Smith, 2000) are beginning to seem unduly optimistic (McAra, 2004). Just as populist discourse in England and Wales has vilified 'yobs' and 'yob culture', so in Scotland, coverage of 'ned crime'[2] was prominent during the Scottish Parliamentary election campaign of 2003. Hard on the heels of similar developments in England and Wales, therefore, the Labour-Liberal Democrat Executive has, since the 2003 election, delivered 'tough' measures including: the tagging of young people involved in offending; an expansion of the secure estate; parenting orders (underwritten by the threat of imprisonment for parents who failed to control their children); and anti-social behaviour orders for the under-16s.[3] Thus, at the level of policy there is significant evidence of a much stronger focus neither on children and young people's needs nor on their rights, but on their deeds and risks, particularly in relation to persistent and prolific offending. Young people who offend persistently are increasingly cast in both jurisdictions not as vulnerable subjects of risks to their welfare but as dangerous or anti-social bearers of risks to the welfare of 'the community'.

Paradoxically perhaps, given this increasingly populist and correctionalist context, the question of 'what works?' and the promise that research might constructively inform policy formation and practice development have gathered momentum. A decade ago, McGuire and Priestley (1995) produced a highly

---

2. A 'ned' is the Scottish colloquial equivalent to 'yob'.
3. The Anti-social Behaviour (Scotland) Act 2004 contains these and other measures.

influential summary of six key principles for the design and delivery of effective supervision programmes to reduce re-offending, drawn from meta-analyses of programme evaluations. First, the level of service provided should match the level of 'risk' assessed; where the risk of re-offending is high, more intensive programmes are required. Second, only some factors contribute to, or are supportive of, offending; the focus of intervention should be on addressing offending by alleviating those factors that are 'criminogenic'. Third, the learning styles of people involved in offending vary but in general they require active rather than didactic 'programmes'. Fourth, programmes in the community fare better than those in institutions. Fifth, effective interventions recognise the variety of problems experienced by people who offend and, therefore, they employ a skills-oriented approach, using methods drawn from behavioural, cognitive, or cognitive-behavioural sources. Sixth, effective interventions connect the methods used to the aims stated, are carried out by appropriately trained and supported staff, are adequately resourced, and plan monitoring and evaluation from the outset.

Whereas McGuire and Priestley's principles derived from 'treatment' studies not limited specifically to juveniles, Lipsey's (1995) meta-analysis was concerned exclusively with the effectiveness of 'programmes' for young people. Notably, Lipsey (1995: 77) reached more circumspect conclusions, suggesting that 'the best general practical advice' was threefold. First, 'treatment' should be focused on behavioural, training or skills issues appropriate to the young people, using concrete, structured approaches as far as possible. Second, 'treatment' should be monitored, supervised and implemented well. 'Fidelity' to the 'treatment' plan should be maintained so that the 'treatment' is delivered as intended. Third, enough service should be provided. Lipsey recognised that such advice was necessarily 'general and broadbrush', adding the proviso that all 'treatment' must be 'carefully tailored in its details to the pertinent clientele and circumstances' (ibid.: 78).

In some respects, these principles of effective community-based intervention and supervision seem uncontroversial. More often than not, the principal contention/conclusion might be summarised thus: to say that 'nothing works' is erroneous given that the evidence suggests that some things 'work' with some people some of the time, but more research is required with regard to the specific details. However, such a considered (even cautious) approach, has been less evident in the drive of the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales to engineer 'what works' principles into youth justice practice (Bateman and Pitts, 2005). Critical commentators have argued that the resultant pre-occupation with standardised risk/needs assessments and targeted programmes in delivering effective practice has led to a managerialised and homogenising approach to assessment and intervention that has predictably struggled to cope with the heterogeneity of children and young people and the complexities of their circumstances (Eadie and Canton, 2002). Indeed some critics have argued that the current approach is more about the micro-management of the system than its likely impact on offending (Pitts, 2001).

The fundamentally flawed assumption underlying the managerialisation of practice through structured assessments and targeted programmes is, of course, that it is the standardised and quality assured application of 'assessment tools' and 'programmes' ('treatment') that lies at the heart of effective practice. Even within the 'treatment' literature, however, it is possible to find strong evidence that challenges this assumption. One authoritative recent review, for example, highlights the increasing attention that is being paid to the need for professional staff to use interpersonal skills, to exercise some discretion in their interventions, to take diversity amongst participants into account, and to look at how the broader service context can best support effective practice (Raynor, 2004: 201). Still stronger evidence is found in the broader literature exploring the effectiveness of psychological interventions more generally (that is, beyond criminal and youth justice contexts). Here, it is a recurring finding that no method of intervention is, in and of itself, any more 'effective' than any other; rather, there are common features of each intervention that are most likely to bring about positive change (Hubble et al., 1999; Bozarth, 2000). These 'core conditions' of effectiveness include: empathy and genuineness; the establishment of a working alliance; and the adoption of person-centred, collaborative and 'client-driven' approaches. Perhaps even more significantly, the most crucial variables of all – chance factors, external factors and 'client' factors – are derived from the personal and social contexts of the interventions as distinct from 'programme' content. For example, the extent to which a young person is prepared to change and prepared for change, the extent to which his or her significant others support or subvert change, and the extent to which his or her social networks create or constrain opportunities for change, are all factors beyond the reach of 'programmes' but critical to the success or failure of the change effort. Such findings, despite their disciplinary affiliation with 'treatment', in fact attest to the importance of relationships, social and material contexts above programmes. With regard to the policy and practice of community supervision, this 'scientific' evidence seems to counter the prevailing tendency of narrowing the gaze to responsibilising correctionalism and to challenge its more authoritarian and coercive imperatives.

Beyond correctionalism

Leaving aside the contested evidence about what matters most in 'treatment' effectiveness, critical commentators have raised more fundamental concerns about the assumptions underlying 'what works?' research, questioning whether its methodologies can adequately capture the nature of the human change processes involved in desistance from offending (for example, Farrall, 2002). The alternative methodologies involved in 'desistance' research explore how 'criminal careers' come to be truncated and terminated. Given that this is a principal purpose of tertiary crime reduction (and community supervision), the fact that

desistance research has had, until recently, a muted impact on policy and practice is somewhat surprising. Building an understanding of the human processes and social contexts within which desistance occurs should be a necessary precursor to developing effective community supervision; put another way, constructions of policy and practice should be 'embedded' in understandings of desistance. More bluntly, thinking about 'treatment' efficacy is the wrong starting point for evidence-based practice.

Explanations for desistance from offending tend to stress ageing and developing maturity (the 'growing out of crime' thesis – see Rutherford, 1992), the development of positive social bonds and changes in the way that 'desisters' construct their personal and social identities (McNeill, 2003). A study of young people in Scotland (Jamieson et al., 1999), for example, demonstrated age and gender-related differences in desistance from offending, suggesting that both offending and desistance are affected by the complex and gendered transitions from childhood through youth to adulthood. Earlier research by Graham and Bowling (1995) had found that young women tended to stop offending quite abruptly as they left home, formed partnerships and had children,[4] but that the process for young men was much more elongated, gradual and intermittent. Young men were less likely to achieve independence and those that did leave home, formed partnerships and had children, were no more likely to desist than those that did not. More recent studies have revised Graham and Bowling's (1995) conclusions, suggesting that similar processes of change do indeed occur for (some) young men but that they seem to take longer to 'kick-in'; in other words, the assumption of responsibilities in and through intimate relationships and employment does make a difference but this difference is more notable in men aged 25 and over (Farrall and Bowling, 1999; Flood-Page et al., 2000; Uggen and Kruttschnitt, 1998).

Farrall stresses the significance of the relationships between what we might term 'objective' changes in each person's life and his or her 'subjective' assessment of the value or significance of these changes:

> … the desistance literature has pointed to a range of factors associated with the ending of active involvement in offending. Most of these factors are related to acquiring 'something' (most commonly employment, a life partner or a family) which the desister values in some way and which initiates a re-evaluation of his or her own life … (2002: 11)

Desistance, therefore, seems to reside somewhere in the interface between developing personal maturity, the changing social bonds associated with certain life transitions, and the individual subjective narrative constructions which people

---

4. In a more recent article, Rumgay (2004) has suggested that women's desistance from crime is best understood as a process initiated by the *perception of an opportunity* to claim a pro-social identity during a period of *readiness to reform*, which is subsequently sustained by the deployment of strategies of resilience and survival in conditions of adversity.

who have been involved in offending build around these key events and changes. It is not just the events and changes that matter; it is what these events and changes mean to those involved. We might add to Farrall's (2002) summary a more structural perspective; it seems obvious that for young people both access to opportunities to desist and positive reasons to attempt desistance, have been structurally constrained in recent decades by the increasingly problematic nature of youth transitions to adult status, most notably in the labour market (Newburn and Shiner, 2005).[5]

Indeed, desistance itself is perhaps best understood as a process of transition. Maruna et al. (2004) suggest that it is helpful to distinguish primary desistance (the achievement of an offence-free period) from secondary desistance (an underlying change in self-identity). Though the desistance research has little to tell us, as yet, about how young people who have been involved in persistent offending navigate secondary desistance, and how youth justice interventions might contribute to this process, research studies involving adult desisters do offer some significant insights. For example, Burnett's (1992; 2000) research revealed that released prisoners who were most confident and optimistic about desisting had greatest success in doing so. This implies that nurturing and sustaining hope is a key task in community supervision but that, particularly in respect of desisting from persistent offending, youth justice workers and sentencers should expect the process of desistance to be neither linear nor straightforward nor swift. Establishing a desisting 'identity' will take time, effort and patience; moreover, the emergence of such identities is likely to be delayed or prevented by the imposition of punitive sanctions for any re-offending.

Maruna's more recent study (2001) offers a particularly important contribution to understanding the achievement of secondary desistance. Comparing the narrative 'scripts' of 20 adult 'persisters' and 30 adult 'desisters' who shared similar 'criminogenic traits' and backgrounds and who lived in similarly 'criminogenic environments', Maruna discerned a 'condemnation script' that emerged from the 'persisters'. Their stories echo the fatalism that previous studies of young people involved in persistent offending have revealed (Smith and Stewart, 1998). Though the desisters' 'redemption script' contains a similarly fatalistic account of their pasts, in their accounts of achieving change there is evidence that desisters have to 'discover' agency in order to resist and overcome the criminogenic structural pressures that play upon them. This 'discovery of agency' seems to relate to the role of significant 'others' in envisioning an alternative identity and an alternative future for the would-be desister even through periods when they cannot see these possibilities for themselves.

Although this research primarily relates to adult 'persisters' and 'desisters', it has particular resonance for those involved in supervising young people

5. That it is desistance from property offending that is, in general, significantly slower for young men may tend to support this suggestion (Flood-Page et al., 2000).

involved in offending during adolescence; a period of malleability during which there may be the opportunity to enable the development of positive identities before negative messages are internalised. However, this very malleability also carries with it the danger that correctionalist approaches, through their implicit focus on negative behaviours, risks and deficits, may frustrate the very change process that they purport to support.

Reconstructing community supervision

Some recent studies have began to explore critical questions around the role that community supervision might play in supporting processes of desistance (for example, Farrall, 2002; McCulloch, 2005; Rex, 1999). Again, to date, this evidence primarily relates to interventions involving adults subject to probation orders. However, such studies can be read and interpreted in the light of other research on young people. For example, in one study of 'assisted desistance', Rex (1999) explored the experiences of 60 probationers, 11 of whom were aged 20 or under, and found that those who attributed changes in their behaviour to community supervision described it as active and participatory. Probationers' commitments to desist appeared to be generated by the personal and professional commitment shown by their probation officers, whose reasonableness, fairness, and encouragement seemed to engender a sense of personal respect and accountability. Probationers interpreted advice about their behaviours and underlying problems as evidence of concern for them as people, and 'were motivated by what they saw as a display of interest in their well-being' (1999: 375). Such encouragement seemed especially important for younger probationers involved in recidivist offending. These findings accord with other studies which suggest that it is vitally important to young people that they are treated as 'ordinary human beings', not just as 'a client' (de Winter and Noom, 2003), and as whole people rather than as instances of some 'problem' or 'disorder' (Hill, 1999).

The evidence suggests, therefore, that relationships matter a great deal in promoting and sustaining desistance (Batchelor and McNeill, 2005; Burnett and McNeill, 2005; McNeill et al., 2005). Given that young people, in particular, often conceptualise relationships both as a primary source of the distress they experience (Armstrong et al., 1998), and as a key resource in the alleviation of their difficulties (Hill, 1999), the role of relationships in youthful desistance is likely to be particularly significant, not least because the relational experiences of most young people involving in offending are characterised by disconnection and violation (Liddle and Solanki, 2002; McNeill and Batchelor, 2002). If, as has been argued above, secondary desistance (for those involved in persistent offending at least) requires a narrative reconstruction of identity, then it becomes obvious why the relational aspects of community supervision are so significant.

However, youth justice workers and working relationships are neither the only nor the most important resources in promoting desistance. Young people's own resources and social networks are often better at resolving their difficulties than social services' personnel (Hill, 1999). The potential of social networks is highlighted by 'resilience perspectives' which – in contrast to 'risk factor' models of offending that focus primarily on young people's 'deficits' and problems – consider the 'protective factors and processes' involved in positive adaptation in spite of adversity. In terms of practice with young people, such perspectives entail an emphasis on the recognition, exploitation and development of their competences, resources, skills and assets (Schoon and Bynner, 2003). Thus promoting desistance also means striving to develop the young person's strengths – at both an individual and a social network level – in order to build and sustain momentum for change.

Barry's recent study (2004) provides another key reference point for exploring how themes of agency, identity and transition play out specifically for younger people desisting from offending. Through in-depth interviews with 20 young women and 20 young men, Barry explored why they started and stopped offending and what influenced or inhibited them as they grew older. The young people revealed that their decisions about offending and desisting were related to their need to feel included in their social world, through friendships in childhood and through wider commitments in adulthood. The resolve displayed by the young people in desisting from offending seemed remarkable to Barry, particularly given that they were from disadvantaged backgrounds and were limited in their access to mainstream opportunities (employment, housing and social status) because of their age as well as their social class. Barry recognises crucially that:

> Because of their transitional situation, many young people lack the status and opportunities of full citizens and thus have limited capacity for social recognition in terms of durable and legitimate means of both accumulating and expending [social] capital through taking on responsibility and generativity … Accumulation of capital requires, to a certain extent, both responsibilities and access to opportunities; however, children and young people rarely have such opportunities because of their status as 'liminal entities' not least those from a working class background. (2004: 328–9)

To facilitate desistance then, practitioners may need to assist young people in navigating transitions; both by acting as a conduit to 'social capital' and by seeking to build it. This implies, amongst other things, a re-assertion of the centrality of advocacy as a core task for youth justice staff. While this focus is justified normatively by recognition of the disempowered and disaffected social position of those young people whose behaviours are most commonly criminalised, the evidence from desistance studies suggests a strong empirical case for the necessity of social advocacy in the prevention of offending. Help in developing or

sustaining social bonds is doubly significant in the promotion of desistance. Whereas Farrall (2002) underlines its importance in overcoming practical obstacles to desistance, Rex (1999) suggests that this kind of assistance is also critical in establishing the loyalty and trust that people value in supporting their efforts to change. There is a synergy between acts of practical assistance and their subjective impact on the working relationship; the worker's actions confirm his or her compassion and trustworthiness, increasing the preparedness of the young person to take steps towards desistance. In terms of the worker's contribution to change, success may depend at least as much on her or his ability to access opportunities to reinforce positive identities as it does on her or his ability to foster individual motivation and build individual capacities or skills. In other words, effective youth justice is likely to be at least as much about addressing social–structural disadvantage as it is about 'correcting deficits'.

Conclusions

This chapter has attempted to show that while community supervision in certain forms can be effective in reducing offending, its effectiveness is likely to be diminished rather than enhanced by the increasingly correctionalist discursive context of practice. While other commentators have made this case on the basis of critiques of 'what works?' as implemented in youth justice practice in England and Wales (Bateman and Pitts, 2005), here the argument has focused on recent revisions to 'what works' principles in the context of the wider literature about 'treatment efficacy' and, in greater detail, on the evidence from desistance studies. As well as suggesting fundamentally that the construction of community supervision should begin not with evaluations of 'tools' and 'programmes' (belonging to 'experts' and 'professionals') but with understandings of processes and transitions (belonging to young people), the evidence that has been reviewed conveys three key messages. First, relationships matter at least as much as 'tools' and 'programmes' in influencing the outcomes of supervision. Second, social contexts are at least as significant to offending and desistance as individual problems and resources. Third, in supporting desistance, social advocacy is at least as necessary as individualised responsibilisation.

Neglecting these messages will limit the effectiveness of community supervision, especially with young people involved in repeat and persistent offending. That such young people should be the primary 'target group' for such supervision is justified both by the principles of proportionality (in England and Wales) and parsimony (in Scotland), and by the empirical evidence about the proper role that informal and diversionary work should play in any effective youth justice system (Goldson, 2000). Ultimately, developing properly targeted and effective community supervision matters as much as it does because, in a punitive climate, any perceived failure of community supervision may unleash ever more coercive modes of correction and control. Though technological innovations may

bring with them possibilities of increasingly coercive control in the community, ultimately the most likely consequence is an accelerated 'rush to youth custody' (Rutherford, 2002). Regrettably, the negative outcomes of that particular sanction, with its perverse and destructive impacts on the personal and social resources required to enable desistance, seem much more easily ignored than any limitations in the successes that may be achieved by community supervision. Thus, even without questioning the privileging of the 'prevention of offending' as the governing aim of youth *justice* in England and Wales, there are compelling ethical and empirical reasons for critiquing and resisting correctionalism, and for seeking to build other models and modes of practice in community supervision in the common interests of young people and of their communities.

References

Allen, R. (2002) '"There Must be Some Way of Dealing with Kids": Young Offenders, Public Attitudes and Policy Change', *Youth Justice,* 2(1): 3–13.

Armstrong, C., Hill, M. and Secker, J. (1998) *Listening to Children.* London: Mental Health Foundation.

Audit Commission (2004) *Youth Justice 2004: A Review of the Reformed Youth Justice System.* London: Audit Commission.

Barry, M.A. (2004) 'Understanding Youth Offending: In search of "Social Recognition"'. PhD dissertation, University of Stirling.

Batchelor, S. and McNeill, F. (2005) 'The Young Person-Worker Relationship', in T. Bateman and J. Pitts (eds) *The RHP Companion to Youth Justice.* Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing. pp. 166–71.

Bateman, T. and Pitts, J. (2005) 'Conclusion: What the Evidence Tells Us', in T. Bateman and J. Pitts (eds) *The RHP Companion to Youth Justice.* Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing. pp. 248–58.

Bottoms, A. and Dignan, J. (2004) *Youth Crime and Youth Justice: Comparative and Cross-national Perspectives*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Bozarth, J. (2000) 'The Specificity Myth: the Fallacious Premise of Mental Health Treatment', paper presented to the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Burnett, R. (1992) *The Dynamics of Recidivism.* Oxford: University of Oxford Centre for Criminological Research.

Burnett, R. (2000) 'Understanding Criminal Careers Through a Series of In-Depth Interviews', *Offender Programs Report*, 4(1): 1–16.

Burnett, R. and McNeill, F. (2005) 'The Place of the Officer–Offender Relationship in Assisting Offenders to Desist From Crime', *Probation Journal,* 52(3): 247–68.

de Winter, M. and Noom, M. (2003) 'Someone Who Treats You as an Ordinary Human Being', *British Journal of Social Work,* 33: 325–37.

Eadie, T. and Canton, R. (2002) 'Practising in a Context of Ambivalence: The Challenge for Youth Justice Workers', *Youth Justice*, 2(1): 14–26.

Farrall, S. (2002), *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance from Crime*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Farrall, S. and Bowling, B. (1999) 'Structuration, Human Development and Desistance from Crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 17(2): 252–67.

Feilzer, M. with Appleton, C., Roberts, C. and Hoyle, C. (2004) *The National Evaluation of the Youth Justice Board's Cognitive Behaviour Projects.* London: Youth Justice Board.

Flood-Page, C., Campbell, S., Harrington, V. and Miller, J. (2000) *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey.* Home Office Research Study 209. London: The Home Office.

Goldson, B. (2000) 'Wither Diversion? Interventionism and the New Youth Justice', in B. Goldson (ed.) *The New Youth Justice*. London: Russell House Publishing.

Goldson, B. (2001) 'A Rational Youth Justice? Some Critical Reflections on The Research, Policy and Practice Relation', *Probation Journal,* 48(2): 76–85.

Goldson, B. (2002) 'New Punitiveness: The Politics of Child Incarceration', in J. Muncie, G. Hughes and E. McLaughlin (eds) *Youth Justice: Critical Readings*. London: Sage. pp. 386–400.

Goldson, B. and Jamieson, J. (2002) 'Youth Crime, the "Parenting Deficit" and State Intervention: A contextual critique'. *Youth Justice*, 2(2): 82–99.

Graham, J. and Bowling, B. (1995) *Young People and Crime.* Home Office Research Study 145. London: Home Office.

Hagell, A. (2005) 'The Use of Custody for Children and Young People', in T. Bateman and J. Pitts (eds) *The RHP Companion to Youth Justice.* Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing. pp. 151–7.

Hallett, C. and Murray, C. with Jamieson, J. and Veitch B. (1998) *The Evaluation of Children's Hearings in Scotland. Volume 1: Deciding in Children's Interests.* Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

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 Practice*, 13(2): 135–45.

Hill, M., Walker, M., Khan, F. and Moodie, K. (2004) *Fast Track Hearings Research: Interim Report November 2003*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Hubble, M.A., Duncan B.L. and Miller S.D. (eds) (1999) *The Heart and Soul of Change: What Works in Therapy.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Jamieson, J., McIvor, G. and Murray, C. (1999) *Understanding Offending Among Young People.* Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Jennings, D. (2003) *One Year Juvenile Reconviction Rates: First Quarter of 2001 Cohort.* On Line Report 18/3. London: Home Office.

Liddle, M. and Solanki, A.-R. (2002) *Persistent Young Offenders.* London: Nacro.

Lipsey, M. W. (1995) 'What Do We Learn From 400 Research Studies on the Effectiveness of Treatment with Juvenile Delinquents?', in J. McGuire and P. Priestley (eds) *What Works: Reducing Reoffending. Guidelines from Research and Practice.* Chichester: Wiley. pp. 63–78.

Lobley, D., Smith, D. and Stern, C. (2001) *Freagarrach: An Evaluation of a Project for Persistent Juvenile Offenders.* Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Maruna, S., Immarigeon, R. and LeBel, T. (2004) 'Ex-Offender Reintegration: Theory and Practice', in S. Maruna and R. Immarigeon (eds) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration.* Cullompton: Willan, pp. 3–26.

McAra, L. (2004) 'The Cultural and Institutional Dynamics of Transformation: Youth Justice in Scotland, England and Wales', *The Cambrian Law Review,* 35: 23–54.

McCulloch, P. (2005) 'Probation, Social Context and Desistance: Retracing the Relationship', *Probation Journal*, 52(1): 8–22.

McGuire, J. and Priestley, P. (1995) 'Reviewing "What Works": Past, Present and Future', in J. McGuire and P. Priestley (eds) *What Works: Reducing Reoffending. Guidelines from Research and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley, pp. 3–34.

McNeill, F. (2003) 'Desistance-Focused Probation Practice', in W-H Chui and M. Nellis (eds) *Moving Probation Forward: Evidence, Arguments and Practice.* Harlow: Pearson Longman. pp. 146–62.

McNeill, F. and Batchelor, S. (2002) 'Chaos, Containment and Change: Responding to Persistent Offending by Young People', *Youth Justice*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 27–43.

McNeill, F., Batchelor, S., Burnett, R. and Knox, J. (2005) *21st Century Social Work. Reducing Re-offending: Key Practice Skills.* Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Moore, R. (2004) 'Intensive Supervison and Surveillance Programmes for Young Offenders: the Evidence Base So Far', in R. Burnett and C. Roberts (eds) *What Works in Probation and Youth Justice: Developing Evidence-based Practice.* Cullompton: Willan pp. 159–79.

Moore, R. (2005) 'The Use of Electronic and Human Surveillance in a Multi-Modal Programme'. *Youth Justice*, 5(1): 17–32.

Muncie, J. (2002) 'Policy Transfers and "What Works": Some Reflections on Comparative Youth Justice', *Youth Justice,* 1(3): 27–35.

Nacro (2002) *Youth Crime Briefing: Supervision Orders – An Overview*. London: Nacro.

Nellis, M. (2004) 'The "Tracking" Controversy: The Roots of Mentoring and Electronic Monitoring'. *Youth Justice*, 4(2): 77–99.

Newburn, T. and Shiner, M. (2005) *Dealing with Disaffection: Young People, Mentoring and Social inclusion*. Cullompton: Willan.

Pitts, J. (2001) 'The New Correctionalism: Young People, Youth Justice and New Labour', in R. Matthews and J. Pitts (eds) *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety.* London: Routledge. pp. 167–92.

Raynor, P. (2004) 'Rehabilitative and Reintegrative Approaches', in A. Bottoms, S. Rex and G. Robinson (eds) *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society*. Cullompton: Willan, pp. 195–223.

Rex, S. (1999) 'Desistance from Offending: Experiences of Probation', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice,* 36(4): 366–83.

Rumgay, J. (2004) 'Scripts for Safer Survival: Pathways out of Female Crime', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice,* 43(4): 405–19.

Rutherford, A. (1992) *Growing out of Crime: the New Era*. Winchester: Waterside Press.

Rutherford, A. (2002) 'Youth Justice and Social Inclusion', *Youth Justice*, 2(2): 100–7.

Schoon, I.J. and Bynner, H. (2003) 'Risk and Resilience in the Life Course: Implications for Interventions and Social Policies', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(1): 21–31.

Smith, D. (2000) 'The Limits of Positivism Revisited', paper presented at 'Theorising Social Work Research Seminar 4: What Works as Evidence for Practice? The Methodological Repertoire in an Applied Discipline', Cardiff.

Smith, D. and Stewart, J. (1998) 'Probation and Social Exclusion', in C. Jones Finer and M. Nellis (eds) *Crime and Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 96–115.

Uggen, C. and Kruttschnitt, K. (1998) 'Crime in the Breaking: Gender Differences in Desistance', *Law and Society Review*, 32(2): 339–66.

Waterhouse, L., McGhee, J., Whyte, B., Loucks, N., Kay, H. and Stewart, R. (2000) *The Evaluation of Children's Hearings in Scotland. Volume 3 – Children in Focus.* Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.