

‘We are still running around with the same rules, but we are not the same we were 20 years ago’ – Exploring the perceptions of youth justice professionals on Secure Training Centres.

Abstract

Debates on the incarceration of children in residential settings has been ongoing for decades, with the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child and academic literature (Alston, 1994; Goldstein, Freud and Solnit, 1973; Anglin, 2004) acknowledging that custody is *not* in the best interest of the child. In England, the Social Services Inspectorate Report (1999) noted problems in placing children in Secure Training Centres and, nearly twenty years later, a BBC Panorama (2016) exposed the abuse of children at the hands of staff in the same Secure Training Centre (BBC, 2016). This paper examines staff’ and other professional perceptions as to the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres, youth custodial environments, through thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with staff members employed in Secure Training Centres and other professionals in the youth justice sector (i.e. Social Workers, Youth Offending Officers and Managers). It seeks to identify perceptions on the purpose and challenge of Secure Training Centres in supporting children who have experiences adverse circumstances resulting in trauma. It illustrates the need for embedding trauma-informed ‘Child First’ approaches in Secure Training Centres, and youth custodial environments globally, to enable staff to adequately support children to build empowering relationships.

Keywords: Custody; Support; Interventions; Uncertainty; Children; Youth Justice

Introduction

The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child and academic literature (Alston, 1994; Goldstein, Freud and Solnit, 1973; Anglin, 2004) acknowledge that custody is *not* in the best interest of the child. Children in custody, and other residential settings, have experienced a range of adverse circumstances that result in trauma, risk-taking behaviour and victimisation (Agnew, 2002). Placing children in custody only serves to mirror adverse experiences - creating challenges for staff. Secure Training Centres are custodial environments for children (aged 12 to 17 years-old) in England and Wales (Secure Training Centre Rules, 1998). Discussions regarding the purpose of Secure Training Centres were questioned following the Social Services Inspectorate Report (1999) on Medway Secure Training Centre; however, despite attempts to improve Secure Training Centres, a BBC Panorama (current affairs and investigations) television programme in January 2016 exposed the abuse of children at the hands of staff in Medway Secure Training Centres (BBC, 2016). The problems with Secure Training Centres received further attention in the Youth Justice System (Taylor, 2016). The recent issues highlighted by the BBC Panorama programme (BBC, 2016) and the youth justice review (Taylor, 2016) are in direct contrast to approaches that supposedly situate 'Child First' (see Haines and Drakeford, 1998; Drakeford, 2010; Case and Haines, 2014) within the youth justice system. This approach promotes children's involvement through the legitimate engagement of children in the design of interventions. It enables the development of child-friendly and child-appropriate approaches to youth justice that tackle the risk-based approaches that hinder outcomes (Case and Haines, 2014). This paper draws on the accounts from staff members working in Secure Training Centres and other professionals from the youth justice sector (i.e. Youth Offending Officers, Youth Offending Managers, Qualified Social Workers, Police, and Senior Youth Justice Practitioners) to examine perceptions of the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres in England and Wales. It seeks to identify perceptions on

the purpose, function and challenges for Secure Training Centres in supporting children who have experiences adverse circumstances resulting in trauma.

The Backdrop: Context and Critical Issues in Youth Justice

Children in Custody

Scholars have repeatedly highlighted the ambiguities of youth custody, with a remit that lies somewhere between punishment, protection, and treatment (Henriksen and Prieur 2020, Henriksen and Schliehe, 2020). Children exhibiting behaviour in conflict with the law are amongst the most vulnerable in society (McAra and McVie, 2010), having problems with education, health, and associations with criminal families or friends in the community that impact on the outcomes for such children (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). The experiences of children in conflict mirror those of children in care, with higher rates of mental health difficulties than the general population (three quarters of whom are in residential homes) (Sinclair et al., 2019). This is heightened for children in residential settings, with research in the United Kingdom showing the detrimental impact it has their lives (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). This is supported by international research showing that children in residential settings experience higher rates of trauma (50-70 %) (Bettmann et al. 2011; Jaycox et al. 2004; Zelechowski et al., 2013).

The average occupancy rate for children in the Secure Training Centre was 80 children (per month) at the time of the research (Authors Own, 2018), with approximated 68% of children aged 15 to 16 years-old. Research examining the impact of Secure Training Centres on children found several factors experienced by children on entering custody, specifically substance misuse (87.5%), domestic abuse (51%), bereavement (25%) and/or experiences in the care system (43%) (Paterson-Young et al., 2019; Paterson-Young, 2021). Further data on the overall population of children in custody (under 18 years-old) is available from the Youth Justice Board (YJB) (2021). The challenges facing children on entering custody (including

experiences with domestic violence) illustrates the vulnerabilities of children and the importance of creating a ‘Child-First’ system that acknowledges trauma-informed approaches (Wright and Liddle, 2014). Trauma-informed approaches acknowledge that behaviour is impacted by risk factors (i.e. factors that increase the likelihood of involvement in crime and/or protective factors (i.e. factors that reduce the likelihood of involvement in crime) (Serin, Chadwick and Lloyd, 2015).

In England, the number of children sentenced to immediate custody had decreased from 14% to 12% over the period 2017-2018 (YJB, 2020). Reductions in custodial sentences follow on from previous increases, with the number of children sentenced to immediate custody greater in 2018-2019 than in the year ending March 2009 (YJB, 2020). The average custodial sentence has increased from 11.4 to 17.7 months since 2008-2009 (YJB, 2020) and in 2018/2019 the average monthly population of children in custody was 859. The three distinct custodial environments for children in England, are: Secure Children’s Homes, designed to accommodate children aged 10 to 17 years-old; Secure Training Centres, designed to accommodate children aged 12 to 17 years-old; and Young Offender Institutions, designed to accommodate children/young adults aged 15 to 21 years-old. A new category of custodial environments, Secure Schools¹ (recommended by Taylor in 2016), was scheduled to start operation in 2019 (HM Government, 2018). Overall, Secure Training Centres can each accommodate 50 to 80 children, with information from April 2018 and March 2019 showing the average number of children varied from 938 in April 2018 to 832 in March 2019 (Her Majesty’s Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS), 2019).

Secure Training Centres

Concerns over the management of children involved in criminal activity resulted in increased pressure for control and security, leading to the introduction of Secure Training

¹ Child-focused therapeutic environment for young people recommended by Taylor (2016).

Centres (Hagell and Hazel, 2001). Secure Training Centres were initially introduced to accommodate 12 to 14 year-old children receiving Secure Training Orders (STO) (replaced by Detention Training Orders (DTO)), but welfare and safety concerns led to an increase in the age of children accommodated in custody (12 to 17 years-old). These concerns arose in 2000 following the tragic deaths of Kevin Henson and David Dennis (both aged 17 years-old) whilst in custody (YJB, 2014). Secure Training Centres cost approximately £160,000 per person per annum (Parliament, 2016), lower than Secure Children's Homes (£210,000 per person) and higher than Young Offender Institutions (£76,000 per person) (Parliament, 2016).

In 2021, England and Wales had two Secure Training Centres in operation: Rainsbrook (operational since 1999) and Oakhill (operational since 2004). Secure Training Centres are managed by private companies (MTC Novo and G4S, respectively). In 2020, Medway Secure Training Centre was closed and is expected to be replaced by a Secure School (HM Government, 2018). Secure Training Centres are guided by the Secure Training Centre Rules (1998), with a statement of purpose outlining the centres aims as being: "*(a) to accommodate trainees in a safe environment within secure conditions; and (b) to help trainees prepare for their return to the outside community*". Children receive 25 hours of education (9am – 12pm and 2pm – 4pm) per week including core education (i.e. English and Maths) and vocational education (i.e. Mechanics and Hair Dressing). Other support offered to children include Psychology, Health Care and Substance Misuse (Author, 2018). These were to be achieved by ensuring a high standard of education and training, designing programmes to address offending behaviour, ensure links with the community, and collaborate with community services to support children on release.

Identifying the perceptions on the purpose and function of Secure Training Centres in supporting children who have experienced adverse circumstances resulting in trauma is the primary focus of this study. However, acknowledging the wider staff experiences in residential

settings contributes to our understanding on the challenges in such environments. Staff members working in Secure Training Centres experience challenges (i.e. violence), contributing to a stressful and challenging environment (Ofsted, 2016; Paterson-Young et al., 2019). Staff working in these environments are reliant on robust and effective community and/or support (Carpenter et al., 2012; McNamara, 2010). Staff in residential settings often report negative experiences; leading to emotional exhaustion, limited personal accomplishment, reduced commitment to the role and negative attitudes towards residents (Carpenter et al., 2012; McNamara, 2010). Fostering a supportive environment, with robust communication and support helps to reduce burnout (Maslach, 1993) and vicarious trauma - the individual's psychological, physical and emotional well-being through engagement with material depicting trauma (Pearlman and Saakvitne, 1995).

Critical Issues (Children in Custody)

Critical issues in custody for children were noted in the Social Services Inspectorate Report (1999) on Medway Secure Training Centre and, nearly twenty years later, a BBC Panorama (BBC, 2016) programme exposing the abuse of children in the same centre. Medway Secure Training Centre received significant criticism following the alleged physical and emotional abuse of children by staff in January 2016 (BBC, 2016). The Government responded to abuse allegations by appointing an Independent Improvement Board that recommended changes in policy and practice (Holden et al., 2016). The Independent Improvement Board's primary recommendation was for the introduction of clear guidance on the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres, with renewed focus on education and rehabilitation within an environment that promotes the safety and welfare of children (Holden et al., 2016). Children's experience with violence in secure settings is nothing new, with research in the Netherlands showing that residential settings promote violence (Alink et al., 2014).

Charlie Taylor² was appointed to review the youth justice system, following the Ministry of Justice plans to transform youth custody (Taylor, 2016). The review discussed the management of children involved in the criminal justice system, explaining the reasons children should be managed separately from adults (Taylor, 2016). It illustrated the need for support that acknowledges the particular complexities and challenges facing vulnerable children (Taylor, 2016). This review resulted in recommendations to redesign the youth justice system, with an emphasis on custodial accommodation, as a last resort, for children in small secure schools with a renewed focus on education (Taylor, 2016). These recommendations are reflected in research on the benefits of developing positive and supportive relationships in custodial environments that place emphasis on children needs (Andersson and Johansson, 2008; Paterson-Young et al., 2019). Since this review, the government has released proposals to close Medway Secure Training Centre entirely and replace it with a Secure School (HM Government, 2018). Replacing Medway Secure Training Centre, a site underpinned by notions of punishment and control, with a Secure School raises questions about the very implementation of the ‘Child First’ approach (Haines and Drakeford, 1998; Drakeford, 2010; Case and Haines, 2014; Case and Haines, 2020).

The issues highlighted by the BBC Panorama programme (BBC, 2016) and the youth justice review (Taylor, 2016) are in direct contrast to the approaches situating ‘Child First’ in the youth justice system. This approach promotes children’s involvement through the legitimate engagement of children in the design of interventions. This enables the development of child-friendly and child-appropriate approaches to youth justice that tackle the risk-based approaches that hinder outcomes (Case and Haines, 2014). Recent standards set out a child first outcome-focused approach, with the strengths and capabilities of children at the centre of

² Charlie Taylor is a former head teacher at a school for children with complex behavioural, expert advisor on behaviour for the Department of Education and chair of the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.

support (YJB, 2019). Support for children, from this perspective, should be future-focused with supportive relationships at its core (YJB, 2019); it requires services and interventions that empower children while minimising the stigma created by involvement in the criminal justice system. Establishing a Child First approach within custodial environments requires clear guidance as to the purpose and practice. Furthermore, it requires acknowledgement of trauma-informed practices which acknowledge that behaviour is impacted by risk factors (i.e. factors that increase the likelihood of involvement in crime and/or protective factors (i.e. factors that reduce the likelihood of involvement in crime) (Serin, Chadwick and Lloyd, 2015). This approach focuses on understanding trauma, recognising the impact of trauma, and designing appropriate support (Wright and Liddle, 2014). Trauma-informed practices positioned within a 'Child First' approach allows for the development of appropriate support for children that acknowledges their vulnerabilities.

Methodology

The research builds on research, with children and staff in Secure Training Centres, on 'how social impact measurement, as a form of organisational performance management can enhance outcomes for children in custody' (Authors Own, 2018). This research addressed children and staff views on the outcomes for children accommodated in a Secure Training Centres, however, it only partially addressed staff perceptions of the purpose of Secure Training Centres within a 'Child First' approach. This paper expands on this to provide an in-depth discussion on how staff and other professionals perceive the support available for children in Secure Training Centres. It draws on semi-structured interviews, collected between 2016 and 2018, with staff in a Secure Training Centre and other professionals in youth justice.

Ethics

Managing ethical issues was an integral part of the research, especially within a secure custodial environment for children. An ethics application was reviewed by a representative of the Youth Justice Board and the Head of Safeguarding, positioned within the Secure Training Centre. The reviewed application was submitted and approved by the University Research Ethics Committee [REC 2016 60.12]. The core issues addressed in the ethics applications were confidentiality and anonymity; voluntary informed consent from children and guardians; data protection and storage; and the safeguarding of participants. Participants in interviews were randomly assigned pseudonyms to protect confidentiality and anonymity. Participants' safety was paramount, with safeguarding training and an updated Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) completed. Interviews were determined by participants, with interviews conducted with staff members in Secure Training Centres or external locations (for example, privately booked rooms in community centres), whilst interviews with other professionals in the youth justice sector were conducted in privately booked rooms in offices and/or community centres. Formal ethical procedures are critical in completing research, however, research in confinement settings require an understanding of the characteristics of children in such settings and the demanding dynamics of such environments (Gomes and Duarte, 2020).

Participants

Staff members participating in semi-structured interviews were recruited via email invitations (sent internally to staff members) and posters in staff areas (for example, kitchens and break areas). 21 staff members were scheduled to participate in the research; however, staff turnover and sickness resulted in only 15 staff members ultimately participating. Interview participants were mostly female ($n = 11$), with the remaining participants male ($n = 4$). Staff qualifications ranged from secondary education (i.e. basic secondary school education) to university education (i.e. undergraduate or postgraduate degree), with roles varying from

Secure Care Officers, Resettlement, Education, Management, to Intervention staff. The service length of participants varied from 1 month to over 8 years. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the sample's demographics.

Other professionals in the youth justice sector were included in the research to collect views on the perception of Secure Training Centres beyond staff in the Secure Training Centre. Other professionals were recruited from networks in the youth justice sector, with 15 professionals participating in interviews across a three-month period. There were six female participants and nine male participants; the majority were from the Youth Offending Service ($n = 9$), with two Youth Offending Officers and seven Youth Offending Managers (the remaining participants were Qualified Social Workers, Police, and Charity CEO [Senior Youth Justice Practitioner]). Experience in the Youth Justice sector varied, with participants working in the sector from one year to 25 years. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the sample's demographics.

Procedure

Semi-structured interviews, lasting between 30 and 90 minutes, were conducted with staff members in a Secure Training Centre ($n = 15$) and other professionals in the youth justice sector (i.e., youth offending teams, social care, youth justice charities and police) ($n = 15$). A convenience sampling technique was adopted to promote voluntary responses from participants, however, it can lead to subjectivity and human bias with individuals only participating as the research invokes strong opinions (Bryman, 2012). Issues with bias were addressed through a transparent and rigorous process in which data from interviews were cross-checked with findings from quantitative research (Authors, 2018). Interview schedules were designed to investigate the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres in England based on semi-structured interviews with staff in Secure Training Centres and other professionals in the youth justice sector. Questions in the interview schedule were developed from a literature

review on the critical issues with children in custody, including the ‘Child First’ approach that offers a progressive approach to supporting children in the criminal justice system (Haines and Drakeford, 1998; Drakeford, 2010; Case and Haines, 2014; Case and Haines, 2020).

Interview schedules included questions for staff on “Do you feel the current principles and values are appropriate at the centre?”, “Do you think the centre supports children to desist from offending?”, “What are views of the support/interventions offered to children at the Centre?”, and “Do you think the Centre supports children to learn useful skills?” and “What are your relationships like with staff in the Secure Training Centres?”. Interview schedules for other professionals included questions on “What are your views on the use of custody for children?”, “What do you know about Secure Training Centres?”, “What services do you think are offered in Secure Training Centres?”, “What services do you feel should be offered to children involved in offending?”, and “What do you feel are the important factors in supporting children to desist?” Interviews, lasting between 30 and 90 minutes, were conducted in the Secure Training Centre environment with staff (for example, youth offending team officers) in a professional setting and were voice-recorded (with additional notes scribed) and transcribed by the researcher.

Analysis

Perceptions of staff and other professionals, as collected through semi-structured interviews, were analysed to establish: (i) professionals’ perceptions of the incarceration of children in Secure Training Centres; (ii) the service offered to children in Secure Training Centres; and (iii) the effectiveness of Secure Training Centres in improving children’s outcomes. Interviews were organised in NVivo 11.4.0 and analysed using a six-phase thematic analysis approach – ‘data familiarisation’; ‘data coding’; ‘theme development’; ‘theme review and development’; ‘theme refinement and naming’, and ‘reporting’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Clarke and Braun, 2017; Braun and Clarke, 2020). ‘Data familiarisation’, a detailed review of

interview transcripts, was essential for ‘data coding’. ‘Data coding’ involved identification of key codes (assigned shorthand labels) that were interrogated to identify categories (‘theme development’). The codes and categories were reviewed and developed in the ‘theme review and development’ stage which allowed for the creation of core themes: ‘uncertainty regarding the purpose of Secure Training Centres’, ‘delivering the right support to children’, and ‘limited resources and interventions’ (Table 3).

Results

Uncertainty regarding the purpose of Secure Training Centres

Secure Training Centres were designed for the purpose of “*accommodating trainees in a safe environment within secure conditions; and helping trainees prepare for their return to the outside community*” (Secure Training Centre Rules, 1998). Originally, Secure Training Centres were established to accommodate children aged 12 to 14 years-old on Secure Training Orders and, whilst, the age of children accommodated has increased (12 to 17 years-old), the purpose has remained largely static despite (Pitts, 2001; Authors, 2018; Author, 2019). Staff members discussing the purpose of Secure Training Centres argue that it has lost clarity:

“It’s absolutely lost its way and vision... The party line that we were given was that the Secure Training Centre was set up by the Government to provide a short sharp shock to persistent offenders who were stealing cars and that kind of level. And it... rare that we would have a 15-year-old in custody as they went, automatically, to a Young Offenders. Whereas obviously now we have kids just short of 18. And...the purpose and function has not changed to reflect that change” (Jane - Staff Member)

Jane discussed issues about the purpose and function of Secure Training Centres, reflecting on the ages of children accommodated in them. The mention of ‘short sharp shock’ and ‘persistent

offenders' mirror the rhetoric that led to the creation of Secure Training Centres. This comment was reiterated by Ella.

"I think some of the values need to change sometimes, especially with the older boys we have now. Seven years ago, we mostly had 13- and 14-year-olds, but now we have 16-, 17-, and 15-year-olds and I think we need to change with the times. I think they are still there, but it can be a bit of a grey area and we should change with the cliental of young people we have here now" (Ella – Staff Member)

Concerningly, staff appear to suggest that the cohort of children in Secure Training Centres are *not* children. These perceptions were most common amongst staff employed at Secure Training Centres as the cohort changed. Another staff members furthered this point:

"I mean the values and principles are clearly displayed around the centre and we receive information on our training, but I don't think they work in the centre.... the kids we used to have here were much younger, like 13 and 14. Most of the kids, if you can call them kids that we have here now, are like 16 and 17. The older kids are intense because they are set in their ways and don't want to listen to the rules... I think the need to change the values and principles to reflect our current kids" (Val – Staff Member)

Another member of staff said the Secure Training Centre rules are appropriate for the Centre, reflecting on the rules established in 1998. Pat believes that the environments should be specific to the age groups, acknowledging the differences between children aged 12 and children aged 16:

"They are appropriate for the centre but not for our clientele, in terms of the young people. Things have moved [since 1998] forward but unfortunately [the principles and rules] haven't moved with it and changed enough to deal with the young people we are

dealing with now... We should be working with the younger age groups here and should set up another centre or something for the older age groups” (Pat – Staff Member)

Staff members perceive Secure Training Centres to be inappropriate for the children currently accommodated, arguing that the Centres are for “younger age groups” (an argument that does not align with the ‘Child First’ approach).

Other professionals in the youth justice sector argue the opposite, claiming that the children in Secure Training Centres require a supportive and caring environment:

“Children in these places really need support and encouragement. I worked with a young man... he came from a difficult family, and they initially wanted to send him to a YOI, but we argued that he needed a more supportive and caring environment – you know. It is awful to think of any child in a prison. People really forget that at 15 and 16 you are still a child. I would have been terrified at that age.” (Rob – Other Professional)

Perceptions of the purpose of Secure Training Centres were often associated with education, with Dave reflecting on the challenges of providing education provisions that meet the needs of all children.

“...my understanding is that they provide education and rehabilitation for young people in a caring environment.... if you visit... you find that they are very similar to prisons...I think I expected them to provide a range of education – mainstream, vocational, innovative education... some young people may have really high abilities and require A-levels, but others may have struggled or have been excluded from a young age which will mean they need different education.” (Dave – Other Professional)

Another youth justice professional said that the services in Secure Training Centres are unknown, which makes it difficult to identify appropriate accommodations for children:

“We have had a few of our lads sent to secure training centres so I know a bit about secure training centres. Although, I think the actual services offered by these places are unclear...I don’t think the education is effective... they offer basic education for all young people, but they don’t tailor the education to abilities.” (Sophie – Other Professional)

Another participant said that Secure Training Centres are like holiday camps:

“... I would describe it as a holiday camp.... we are putting young people in there as a way of punishment and I.... I agree and disagree with that... I think, in there, there could be a lot more development for young people.” (Mike – Other Professional)

The perceptions of staff in the Secure Training Centre do not align with the ‘Child First’ approach, with views that children were *not* actually children, and the Secure Training Centre should only accommodate very young children. This is in contrast with other professionals who argue that they should be treated more like younger children.

Delivering the right support to children

Helping children transition to the community and desist from offending was a guiding principle of Secure Training Centres, in the sense of “...*helping trainees prepare for their return to the outside community... establishing a programme designed to tackle the offending behaviour of each trainee and to assist in his development*” being a core purpose of Secure Training Centres (Secure Training Centre Rules, 1998). Staff members discussed their views on the effectiveness of Secure Training Centres in terms of helping children return to the outside community and desist from offending:

“In terms of his offending, have we stopped his offending behaviour? Probably not, but I don’t know if that’s our fault or the length of time he was here” (Jane – Staff Member)

This raises question over the purpose of Secure Training Centres and whether children receive the right support. Another staff members discussed children's desire to change, reflecting on the fact that some children do *not* want to change:

“Sometimes the young people don't actually want to change. We try as much as possible, and I have worked with young people on a one-to-one basis and at the end they will say “I'm really sorry K, thanks for all your help, but I'm going back to what I know and where I have come from”. As much as you have those conversations and as much as you do the consequences of behaviour work, you can't change everyone. I sort of learnt that after I started” (Ella - Staff Member)

The myth that children involved in criminal activity do not *want* to change is evident from staff perceptions.

One staff member reflected on the fact children return to the same environment and that the support offered in Secure Training Centres is ineffective at solving this problem. This point was furthered by Pat who claimed that, regardless of support offered in Secure Training Centres, children have limited support when returning to the community:

“Ok, you can come here and put all the interventions into the world, and they could reap the most amounts from this centre, but if this stuff isn't continued in the community, then they haven't got a hope in hell. Because if they come here, for example, on a 12 [and] do six, they spend six months getting all this support and stuff then go out and they don't have anything, and the community aren't putting that in (social services, YOT services), then literally all the work that has been done can potentially be undone in half the amount of time. And then in a few months they are committing” (Pat – Staff Member)

Staff members were sceptical about the Secure Training Centre's effectiveness at helping children to stop offending. They cited the challenges to maintaining a crime-free life on return

to the community, specifically for children returning to the same environments. This view was mirrored by other youth justice professionals:

“...my problem with secure training centre is that some are really good, if you like, but since a lot of them have been taken over by private companies... And one particular case I have in a secure training centre... what happens when they do something that is not right they get sanctioned... these sanctions are not followed through so when other staff come in, if a young person is put down to basic meaning they can't have a telly, the next lot of staff with come in and give them a telly.” (Felicity – Other Professional)

The support available for children leaving Secure Training Centres was criticised, with comments from Liz reiterating the fact that children received limited resettlement support:

“I have got a young person currently in a Secure Training Centre and I am working quite closely with the case manager.... you don't always find out anything about the Secure Training Centre. It's just a given that they go in, get looked at, they get education... and then they come out. And it's almost as if young people come out of Secure Training Centre and take on a massive responsibility when they come out to try...if they are not from a particularly supportive background” (Liz – Other Professional).

Children in custody experience a wealth of challenges in the community, with children experiencing substance misuse (87.5%), domestic abuse (51%), bereavement (25%) and/or experiences in the care system (43%) (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). This illustrates the vulnerabilities facing children entering custody and the need for trauma-informed practices that help children understand trauma and recognise the impact of trauma.

Limited resources and interventions

Secure Training Centres have a core objective to “...help trainees prepare for their return to the outside community” through the delivery of interventions (Secure Training Centre

Rules, 1998). The resources available for delivering interventions in custody were discussed by staff members:

“There aren’t enough staff offering psychology interventions and I don’t think there is enough time. Because contractually, (children) have to do 25 hours of education. Yes, education is a priority but how can a young person that doesn’t understand themselves learn anything else. I find it really difficult when some of these young people have witnessed so much, intervention is way more important than sitting them in a classroom colouring for an hour” (Karen – Staff Member)

Karen reflected on the limited resources available for delivering interventions, specifically for the provision of essential psychology and substance misuse services. This reflection was reiterated by Sam:

“...we are really tight on resources for psychology... if we had more people on the team then there would be a lot more that we could do with the young people. I mean I had a young person that was getting psychology support and it wasn’t frequent support. And that’s one thing, because we have to cut things and we have young people that are on shorter sentences, we have to prioritise them, and he missed out” (Sam – Staff Member)

Limited resources create a stressful environment for staff, increasing incidents of vicarious trauma (Pearlman and Saakvitne, 1995) and burnout (Maslach, 1993). Another staff member, Naz, discussed the fact that children were not receiving essential services as a result of staffing issues:

“I don’t think our service is big enough for the young people that require it... I mean we have 80 young people, and we have 1.2 psychologists or assistant psychologists. And they are expected to do everything for everyone, and their waiting list (is long). So unfortunately for a lot of our young people who require interventions, our most complex kids that require the most in-depth intervention can’t get it” (Naz – Staff Member)

The concerns raised by Naz were supported by Val who reflected on the lack of appropriate interventions that encourage children to stop offending:

“No, we definitely don’t. We don’t provide [the right] intervention so the kids just leave with the same attitude. The only time we make a difference is with the kids that have only offended once, but honestly, I don’t think those kids would offend again. For the ones that have [committed] multiple offences, they just laugh it off” (Val – Staff Member)

Another issue highlighted by staff members relates to the priorities of Secure Training Centres and the need for flexibility over delivering services and/or support:

“This is a profit-making organisation and I mean things like (for years and years) it’s always been that the kids must do 25 hours’ education. We have had numerous criticisms from the YJB because we can’t take kids out of school to do psychology work. We have one full-time psychologist (who looks about 12) and a part-time psychologist trying to see 80, potentially, I mean they all should be seen, really vulnerable kids and really damaged kids outside the school day. It’s physically impossible” (Jane – Staff Member)

The rigid adherence to education schedules impacts on access to psychology and/or psychiatry services that are essential for children that have experienced trauma. Another point discussed by staff was the need for offending-focused interventions:

“I think we could do more around offending work. I will probably say that about most things, because if we can’t, we will never have it 100 per cent correct. There is always stuff we can learn, stuff we can do and external provisions we can pull in. I think the level of intervention around that could be higher” (John – Staff Member).

The view that children require offending-focused interventions does not align with the 'Child First' approach. This raises an interesting question as to why this staff member is recommending interventions that are focused on offending behaviour.

Children in Secure Training Centres are a vulnerable group, requiring a partnership approach to transition from custody (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). Other professionals' views of the services available in Secure Training Centres vary:

"...I personally do not agree with incarcerating young people... [Secure Training Centres] offer a range of services dependent upon the behaviours that are being displayed by an individual from mainstream education... right the way through to psychology..." (Sam – Other Professional)

John discussed the need for wraparound support for children in Secure Training Centres, while reflecting on the fact that custodial environments should be a last resort:

"Other things I would expect – psychology interventions, mental health support and therapeutic interventions. For young people in custody, I think a big issue surrounds mental health and therapeutic or holistic approaches. But, from experience of working with young people that have been in secure, I don't think that actually happens much. Especially with short sentences and that kind of thing." (John – Other Professional)

This was reiterated by Dan, who commented on the need for additional support and resources in Secure Training Centres:

"I know they also offer interventions (substance misuse and psychology) but there needs to be increased resources to really make them effective. Plus, with young people receiving short sentences, there is really limited time to support them to the right level." (Dan – Other Professional)

Staff and other professionals comment on the need for wraparound services that address the *real* needs of children in custody.

Discussion

Secure Training Centres were originally designed to accommodate 12- to 14 year-olds receiving STO (or DTO) but now accommodate older children (aged 12- to 17 years-old). Changes were introduced following the deaths of Kevin Henson (17 year-old) and David Dennis (17 year-old) (YJB, 2014). Welfare and safety concerns have arisen as a result of Secure Training Centres changing to accommodate children aged 12- to 17 years-old, with provision for accommodation of vulnerable children extending to 18 years-old in custody (Pitts, 2001). The purpose of Secure Training Centres has remained largely static over the years, with changes in the cohort of children accommodated not being adequately reflected in the *de facto* operation of Secure Training Centres. Staff members participating in the research reflect on the changing cohort of children, with participants explicitly stating that the rules have not changed to acknowledge the children accommodated in Secure Training Centres. The static nature of Secure Training Centres created precarity for staff and other professionals with regard to their purpose, which impacts on the delivery of services. This precarity exists despite the Independent Improvement Board's recommending the introduction of clear guidance on the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres (Holden et al., 2016).

Concerningly, staff appeared to suggest that the cohort of children in Secure Training Centres are *not* children but rather "persistent offenders" who require a risk-based approach. This risk-based approach is evident from the practice of physical restraint in Secure Training Centres (Paterson-Young, 2021). Secure Training Centres routinely use Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint (MMPR) techniques (HM Inspectorate of Prison, 2015) with children in custody. In 2020, the Youth Justice Board (2020) reported that 7,200 children and young people experienced restraint in the year ending March 2019, with MMPR techniques in

68% of incidents (YJB, 2020). This does not align with the ‘Child First’ approach (children should be viewed as children), or the perceptions of other youth justice professionals, and thus clarifying the actual purpose of Secure Training Centres is essential to the delivery of effective and sustainable services (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). Furthermore, children entering custody experience a wealth of challenges which illustrates the need for trauma-informed practices – recognising the impact of trauma on children. Research shows that staff require targeted support and training to reduce reliance on restraint and develop trauma-informed approaches to dealing with children (Denison et al., 2018). Increasing staff understanding of trauma-informed practices whilst embedding trauma-informed practices throughout the Secure Training System could reduce reliance on restraint. This requires a dual approach to embedding trauma-informed practices, with staff training (bottom-up) complemented by policy and practice (top-down)

Staff members and other youth justice professionals reflect on the need for wraparound support for children. Resource issues mean that access to essential services, such as Psychology and Substance Misuse, are limited for children (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). This reduces the opportunities for children to access services, children who have experienced challenges in the community including substance misuse (87.5%), domestic abuse (51%), bereavement (25%) and/or experiences in the care system (43%) (Paterson-Young et al., 2019). Another problem raised by staff and other youth justice professionals was associated with the effectiveness of current interventions. Staff members were sceptical about the Secure Training Centre’s effectiveness in helping to improve the outcomes for children. The recommendation that Secure Training Centres need *more* interventions to address offending behaviour was somewhat concerning, illustrating the risk-based approach that has shaped youth justice practice (Case and Haines, 2014). Embedding trauma-informed practices that recognise the experiences of

children (i.e. domestic abuse and/or experience in the care system) enable staff to support children in the awareness, understanding and responsiveness to traumatic experiences.

‘Child First’ (Haines and Drakeford, 1998; Drakeford, 2010; Case and Haines, 2014) approaches encourage meaningful participation and engagement with children. Without the resources and support for child-focused and/or developmentally geared approaches, staff members are unable to perform their jobs effectively (McNamara, 2010). Staff members noted that inadequate resources for psychology and/or substance misuse services mean that children are not receiving the right support. Provision of resources for children, such as education, psychology, and substance misuse, along with interventions for tackling offending and supporting children to move to prosocial behaviour, was mentioned by staff members and other youth justice professionals. Given ambiguities around the remit of youth custodial environments (Henriksen and Prieur, 2020; Henriksen et al. 2020), along with limited resources and unclear direction, there are significant challenges to supporting children in Secure Training Centres.

This research is not without limitations, with only a small sample of staff (selected from one Secure Training Centre) and other youth justice professionals participating in interviews. The targeted sample for semi-structured interviews with staff members and other professionals in the youth justice sector was 40. Staff member participation was hindered by staff turnover and sickness, whilst other professionals’ participation was hindered by availability. Another limitation is that in-depth information on staff and other professionals qualifications/training were not collected for the research. Further research with staff members and other youth justice professionals would add to our understanding of the challenges in Secure Training Centres and young custodial environments in general.

Conclusion

Custodial environments are cut off from the outside world, with research showing that custodial sentences have a negative impact on outcomes for children (Paterson-Young et al., 2019; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021). Secure Training Centres were created to accommodate children in safe environments that offer education and support to address offending behaviour. Originally designed to accommodate 12- to 14 year-olds receiving STO (or DTO), Secure Training Centres now accommodate older children (aged 12- to 17 years-old). Changes in the cohort of children accommodated in Secure Training Centres have not been adequately reflected in the daily operation of the Centres. This creates severe challenges for staff working in Secure Training Centres, with the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres currently being unclear – an issue raised by the Independent Improvement Board.

Ambiguity as to the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres creates challenges for staff and other professionals' ability to understand the services offered. Interventions delivered in Secure Training Centres are designed to ensure children have access to the right services in custody, so ambiguity and uncertainty over the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres impacts negatively on children. Uncertainty about the purpose and direction of Secure Training Centres, coupled with limited resources, illustrate a wider problem within youth justice. Secure Training Centres, and youth custodial environments globally, require substantial resources (specifically, substance misuse and psychology services) to ensure staff members have the right skills and support to deliver appropriate services for children. This research supports previous studies (Wright and Liddle, 2014; Denison et al., 2018; Paterson-Young, 2021) that children entering custodial environments experience a wealth of vulnerabilities that would benefit from trauma-informed practices. Trauma-informed practices positioned within a 'Child First' approach allows for the development of appropriate support for children that acknowledges their vulnerabilities. Embedding trauma-informed

‘Child First’ approaches in Secure Training Centres, and youth custodial environments globally, would enable staff to adequately support children with a child-focused approach that helps children recognise traumatic experiences and build empowering relationships.

Reference List

- Agnew, R. (2002). Experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain: An exploratory study on physical victimization and delinquency. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(4): 603–632.
- Alston, P. (Ed.) (1994). *The best interests of the child: Reconciling culture and human rights*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Andersson, B, and Johansson, J. (2008). Personal Approaches to Treatment among Staff in Residential Care: A Case Study. *Journal of Social Work*, 8(2):117-134. doi:[10.1177/1468017307088493](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017307088493)
- Anglin, J.P. (2004) Creating “Well-Functioning” Residential Care and Defining Its Place in a System of Care. *Child & Youth Care Forum* 33, 175–19. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:CCAR.0000029689.70611.0f>
- BBC News. (2016). Teenage Prison Abuse Exposed. Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b06ymzly>. Accessed on: 12 September 2016.
- Bettmann, J. E., Lundahl, B. W., Wright, R., Jaspersen, R. A., & McRoberts, C. H. (2011). Who are they? A descriptive study of adolescents in wilderness and residential programs. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 28, 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0886571X.2011.596735>
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), pp. 77-101. DOI:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2020). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, DOI: 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238.

Carpenter, J., Webb, C., Bostock, L. and Coomber, C. (2012). Effective Supervision in social work and social care. Social Care Institute for Excellent - Research briefing 43.

Case, S. and Haines, K. (2014). Children First, Offenders Second: The Centrality of Engagement in Positive Youth Justice. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 54. DOI:10.1111/hojo.12099.

Case, S. and Haines, K. (2020) Abolishing Youth Justice Systems: Children First, Offenders Nowhere. *Youth Justice*, 00(0), pp. 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1473225419898754>

Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297-298. DOI: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

Denison, M., Gerney, A., Van Leuken, J. B. and Conklin, J. (2018). The Attitudes and Knowledge of Residential Treatment Center Staff Members Working with Adolescents Who Have Experienced Trauma, *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 35(2):114-138. DOI:10.1080/0886571X.2018.1458689

Drakeford, M. (2010). Devolution and youth justice in Wales, *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 10(2), pp. 137–54. DOI:10.1177/1748895809360967

Goldstein, J., Freud, A., & Solnit, A. J. (1973). Beyond the best interests of the child. New York: Free Press.

Gomes, S. Duarte, V. (2020) What about ethics? Developing qualitative research in confinement settings. *European Journal of Criminology*, 17(4):461-479. doi:[10.1177/1477370818801305](https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370818801305)

- Hagell, A. and Hazel, N. (2001). Macro and Micro Patterns in the Development of Secure Custodial Institutions for Serious and Persistent Young Offenders in England and Wales. *Youth Justice*, 1(1), pp. 3-16. DOI:10.1177/147322540100100102
- Haines, K. and Drakeford, M. (1998). *Young People and the Youth Justice*, London: Macmillan. DOI:10.1007/978-1-349-14388-7
- Henriksen A-K. and Schliehe, A. (2020). Ethnography of young people in confinement: on subjectivity, positionality and situated ethics in closed space. *Qualitative Research*, 20(6), pp. 837-853. DOI:10.1177/1468794120904873
- Henriksen A-K., and Refsgaard, R.C.B. (2020). Temporal Experiences of Confinement: Exploring Young People's Experiences in Danish Secure Institutions. *YOUNG*, 29(1), pp. 45-61. DOI:10.1177/1103308820937519
- Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) (2019). *Youth custody data: Monthly statistics on the population in custody of children within secure estates*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-custody-data>. Accessed on 07 April 2019.
- HM Government. (2018). *The Site for the First Secure School*. London: Cabinet Office. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/752377/site-brochure.pdf . Accessed on 07 April 2019
- HM Inspector of Prisons. (2015). *Behaviour management and restraint of children in secure accommodation: A review of the early implementation of MMPR*. ISBN:978-1-84099-724-8.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2021). *Children in Custody 2019-20: An analysis of 12-18-year-olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centres and young offender*

institutions. Available online at:
<http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/CYP.pdf>. Accessed on 10 April 2021.

Holden, G., Allen, B., Gray, S., and Thomas, E. (2016). *Medway Improvement Board – Final Report of the Board’s Advice to Secretary of State for Justice*. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/523167/medway-report.pdf. Accessed on 7 July 2016.

Jaycox, L. H., Ebener, P., Damesek, L., & Becker, K. (2004). Trauma exposure and retention in adolescent substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 17*, 113–121. DOI: 10.1023/B:JOTS.0000022617.41299.39

Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research*. Washington: Taylor and Francis. DOI: [10.4324/9781315227979-3](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315227979-3)

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

McNamara, P. M. (2010) Staff support and supervision in residential youth justice: An Australian Model. *Journal of the Residential Treatment of Children and Young People, 27*(3):214-240.

Ofsted. (2018). *Inspection of secure training centres – Inspection Rainsbrooke*. Retrieved from: <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50040904>. Accessed on 09 April 2019.

- Parliament. (2016). *Youth Custody: Costs: Written question – 144303*. Available online at: <https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2018-05-15/144303/>. Accessed on 13 August 2020.
- Paterson-Young, C. (2021) Exploring how children subjected to violence in the home cope with experiences in Secure Training Centres. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, Volume 117, July 2021, 105076. DOI:10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105076
- Paterson-Young, C., Hazenberg, R. and Bajwa-Patel, M. (2019). *The Social Impact of Custody on Young People in the Criminal Justice System*. Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN: 978-3-030-18422-3.
- Pearlman, L. A., and Saakvitne, K. W. (1995). Trauma and the therapist: Countertransference and vicarious traumatization in psychotherapy with incest survivors. New York: Norton. ISBN-100393701832
- Pitts, J. (2001). *The New Politics of Youth Crime: Discipline or Solidarity*. Dorset: Russell House Publishing. ISBN 978-0-230-51267-2.
- Secure Training Centre. (1998). *Secure Training Centre Rules*. Available online at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/1998/472/contents/made>. Accessed on 8 June 2016.
- Serin, R. C., Chadwick, N. and Lloyd, C.D. (2016). 'Dynamic risk and protective factors', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 22:1-2, pp. 151- 170, DOI: 10.1080/1068316X.2015.1112013
- Sinclair, I., Luke, N. and Berridge, D. (2019) 'Children in care or in need: educational progress at home and in care', *Oxford Review of Education*, 45, 4, pp.443-460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1600488>
- Social Services Inspectorate (1999) *Report of an inspection of Medway Secure Training Centre*. London: Department of Health.

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

Wright, S. and Liddle, M. (2014). *Developing Trauma-Informed Resettlement for Young Custody Leavers – A Practitioner’s Guide*. Beyond Youth Custody. Available online at: <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/BYC-Developing-trauma-resettlement-youth-custody-practitioners-guide.pdf>. Accessed on 13 August 2020.

Youth Justice Board (YJB) (2021). *Youth Custody Data*. Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-custody-data>. Accessed on 11 August 2021.

Youth Justice Board (YJB). (2014). *Deaths of children in custody: action take, lessons learnt*. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/362715/deaths-children-in-custody.pdf. Accessed on 30 June 2016.

Youth Justice Board (YJB). (2019). *Standards for Children in the Youth Justice System*. Available online 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 on 01 August 2020.

Youth Justice Board (YJB). (2020). *Youth Justice Statistics 2018/2019 – England and Wales*. Available online at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/862078/youth-justice-statistics-bulletin-march-2019.pdf. Accessed on 01 August 2020.

Zelechowski, A.D., Sharma, R., Beserra, K. (2013). Traumatized Youth in Residential Treatment Settings: Prevalence, Clinical Presentation, Treatment, and Policy Implications. *J Fam Viol* 28, 639–652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-013-9534-9>

[Table 1 – Characteristics of staff members participating in interviews (n = 15)]

[Table 2. Characteristics of professional participating in interviews (n = 15)]

[Table 3. Overview of themes and sub-themes]