

## Supplementary Tables

Gender					
Male			Female		
86 (88.66%)			11 (11.34%)		
Ethnicity <sup>1</sup>					
White British	Black	Asian	Turkish	Mixed	Other
8 (8.2%)	52 (53.6%)	3 (3.1%)	5 (5.2%)	22 (22.7%)	7 (7.2%)
Religion <sup>2</sup>					
Christian	Muslim	Other	None	N/A	
38 (39.2%)	22 (22.7%)	2 (2.1%)	19 (19.6%)	16 (16.5%)	
Study-Order Type					
RO	YRO	YRO with ISS	DTO Custody License		
44 (45.36%)	33 (34.02%)	6 (6.19%)	14 (14.43%)		

Table S.1: Sample Descriptive Statistics.

<sup>1</sup> Classifications simplified from YOIS data in line with Youth Justice Annual Statistics (YJB, 2011, 2013b and 2014a)

<sup>2</sup> Classifications simplified from YOIS data to simplify comparison.

<b>Reason for breach</b>	<b>No. of young people</b>
Missed Appointments	4
Missed Appointments and EMC breach	3
Missed Appointments and unacceptable behaviour	2
Exclusion zone	1
Missed appointments and not residing at address	1
Non-attendance at School and EMC breach	1
Missed Appointments, EMC breach and re- offence (DTO License)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>

**Table S.2:** Stated reasons for breach

		Study Order Type				Total
		DTO	RO	YRO	YRO with ISS	
<b>Study</b>	Breach	2 (1.9) 0.1	2 (5.9) -1.6	8 (4.4) 1.7	1 (0.8) 0.2	13
	Re-offended	2 (3.2) -0.7	7 (10.0) -0.9	9 (7.5) 0.6	4 (1.4) 2.3	22
<b>Order</b>	Successful	8 (7.2) 0.3	32 (22.7) 2.0	10 (17.0) -1.7	0 (3.1) -1.8	50
	Transferred	2 (1.7) 0.2	3 (5.4) -1.0	6 (4.1) 0.9	1 (0.7) 0.3	12
<b>Outcome</b>						
Total		14	44	33	6	97

**Table S.3:** Contingency table for Study-Order Outcome by Study-Order type.

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below. Note that 9 cells of the contingency table had an expected count of less than 5

		<b>Order Outcome</b>				
		Breach	Revoked & resentenced	Successful	Transferred	Total
<b>EMC</b>	No	5	14	41	7	67
		(9.0)	(15.2)	(34.5)	(8.3)	
		-1.3	-0.3	1.1	-0.4	
	Yes	8	8	9	5	30
		(4.0)	(6.8)	(15.5)	(3.7)	
		2.0	0.5	-1.6	0.7	
Total	13	22	50	12	97	

**Table S.4:** Contingency table for Study-Order Outcome by Electronically Monitored Curfew (EMC).

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below.

Note that 2 cells of the contingency table had an expected count of less than 5.

		LAC Status		Total
		Not LAC	LAC	
<b>Breach of Study-Order</b>		58	14	
	<b>No</b>	(55.1)	(16.9)	72
		0.4	-0.7	
	<b>Yes</b>	(9.9)	(3.1)	13
		-0.9	1.7	
<b>Total</b>		65	20	85

**Table S.5:** Contingency table for breach of Study-Order by LAC status.

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below.

Note that one cell in the model had an expected score of less than 5

		Family score		Total
		0	1	
Breach of Study- Order	No	27	45	72
		(23.7)	(48.3)	
	Yes	0.7	-0.5	13
		1	12	
Total		28	57	85

**Table S.6:** Contingency table for breach of Study-Order by family score.

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below. (0 = absence of family issues). Note that one cell in the model had an expected score of less than 5.

		Substance Use		Total
		0	1	
Breach of Study- Order	No	21	51	72
		(17.8)	(54.2)	
	Yes	0.8	-0.4	13
		(3.2)	(9.8)	
Total	21	64	85	

**Table S.7:** Contingency table for breach of Study-Order by substance use.

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below. Note that one cell in the model had an expected score of less than 5. (0 = absence of substance misuse).

### **Ethics and data management**

Data were gathered, as described in the main paper, from the Youth Offending Information System (YOIS) and anonymised at the time of collection. To ensure anonymity, confidential information was stored on the researcher's password protected computer in a spreadsheet that identified each young person only by their participant number (See Procedure).

Approval to use this information was obtained from the Eastmanor Ethics Board in conjunction with ethical approval for the study from Middlesex University. There were no ethical concerns relating to consent or informing participants in this study because no young people were approached directly and no young person would be identifiable from the results because all data were compared between groups, not as individuals.

Information about the Case Responsible Officer (Core Leader) was also collected. Core Leaders were identified by their initials and this information was also stored on a password protected computer. Core Leaders were compared in a group, not as individuals, in the final study.

Once the data fields to be accessed had been agreed, a member of the council's Management Information Systems & Analysis Team extracted data to compile a list of all the young people whose Order started during the study period and provided a spreadsheet with some basic information about each young person. Each young person was allocated a participant number and this spreadsheet was stored on a Council computer in line with local data protection procedures. Detailed information about each young person, was then gathered from YOIS and stored securely in line with data protection legislation as described above.



**Data collation and coding**

**Descriptive data** (e.g. date of birth, ethnicity) were collated from the front page of each young person's YOIS file.

**Offending and sentencing data** came from the YOIS sentencing history, offences screen, case diary and the offence analysis page in the ASSET. Details of the type and length of the Study-Order were collected along with the Order start date, the index offence and presence of an electronically monitored curfew requirement. Summary information about previous and subsequent offences and sentences for each young person up until June 2014 was included.

**Breach data** were gathered from the YOIS sentencing history, offences screen, case diary, the offence analysis page in the ASSET and from Breach Reports as necessary. Data regarding breaches of the Study-Order included the date that the young person breached their Order, reasons for breaching and the Court disposal for the breach. Summary data of other breaches recorded on each young person's YOIS file were also collected.

**Personal circumstances information** about each young person was collected for use in Study One. These data were time specific because each young person's circumstances will change over time. This information was taken from each young person's ASSET assessment. National Standards for this period state that ASSETs should be reviewed at a minimum every three months (YJB, 2010a). This means that each young person could have a number of assessments during one sentence. To ensure that the information gathered was relevant to non-compliance, the researcher adopted the following criteria in selecting ASSET assessments:

- *For young people who did breach their Study-Order*, the ASSET assessment that most closely corresponded with the time of the breach/non-compliance

was used. In cases where there was no assessment that corresponded with the time of breach, the most recent ASSET prior to the date of breach was used. Care was taken to use the assessment that best described the young person's circumstances when they did not comply with their Order.

- *For young people who did not breach their Study-Order*, the researcher selected one ASSET from all the ASSET assessments completed during the time they were subject to the Study-Order. That is, one assessment from all the ASSETs completed between the sentence start date and the sentence end date. Following consultation with academic and practitioner supervisors, it was decided that the assessment during this period that resulted in the highest overall ASSET score would be used. Although the overall ASSET score represents the young person's risk of re-offending (Wilson and Hinks, 2011) and not their risk of breach, it also represents the time when they have the most unfavourable personal circumstances. Bateman (2011a and 2011b) suggested this would be linked to difficulty complying. For this reason it was chosen as a proxy for the point during their Study-Order when they were at the highest risk of breach.

Once the relevant ASSET assessment was identified, the Risk of Serious Harm<sup>3</sup> (ROSH) to others rating (low, medium, high or very high) and the total dynamic ASSET score were recorded. The supervising Core Leader at the time of this ASSET was also recorded.

When case responsibility remained with Eastmanor but the Order was supervised by

---

<sup>3</sup> ROSH rating is a compulsory score that is rated by Youth Justice practitioners for all young offenders and appears as part of the ASSET assessment form.

another borough via a caretaking agreement (YJB, 2014c), this was recorded as out of borough supervision.

Seriousness of recent offending was of interest in Study One to investigate any relationship this may have with breach. However, this is a complex variable to use in a statistical model because it consists of a number of factors including number of and time since previous offences, type of offences, disposal received and victim factors. It was decided that the overall ASSET score could be used in the model to represent seriousness of offending for the following reasons:

- The overall dynamic ASSET score is calculated using the sum of the scores given to each section in the ASSET (YJB, 2010b). High scores for many sections in the ASSET will reflect the assessor's concern that:
  - there are many contributing factors that have led to recent, serious offending,
  - these factors are likely to lead to re-offending,
  - these factors are severe and deep rooted.
- Young people with high ASSET scores are more likely to commit more serious offences in the future (Wilson and Hinks, 2011).
  - Therefore it was agreed that the dynamic ASSET score would serve as a suitable proxy for the level of each young person's recent offending, future likelihood of offending and the severity of that offending. The static score (YJB, 2010b) was not included because this is based on historical factors and does not reflect the young person's current situation. The association of offending history with breach is explored in Study Two.

Collating discrete personal data about young people's lives for statistical analysis was complicated by the multifaceted, interconnected nature of the factors being investigated during this study. Furthermore, the source of much of this personal information was ASSET assessments written and scored by Youth Justice Practitioners who will have made judgements during the assessment process regarding how to weight information in their evaluation and what aspects of the young person's life to focus on. The focus of the Youth Justice Professional would have been how each factor impacted on the young person's risk of re-offending and risk of harm. This study however, focuses on how these factors may have affected the young person's ability to comply with their Order. These two viewpoints may not weight information in the same way.

It was decided that the researcher would use the information in each ASSET assessment to code data relating to each relevant factor in a way that was pertinent to the study. The factors used were derived from previous research as discussed above (Bateman, 2011a; Hart 2010, 2011a and 2011b). Factors were rated as either 1 or 0. A rating of 1 meant that the young person had difficulties relating to this factor and a rating of 0 meant that they did not. (See next sections for a full list of data collected)

Information relating to learning needs and mental health issues was collected but ultimately excluded from the analysis due to the inconsistent manner in which this information was recorded.

**Descriptive, offending history and sentencing history data fields collected:**

Demographics

Date of Birth

Gender

Ethnicity

Religion

Offending History

Current Offence(s) relating to the disposal sentenced between June 2012 and May 2013.

Index offence was coded for analysis.

- In situations where there were multiple offences and it was not clear which offence was the index offence, the offence deemed by researchers to have caused, or have the potential to cause, the most harm (physical, emotional or loss) to a direct victim was chosen.
- Categories were used where appropriate for example all disorder type offences were coded a Public Order and all types of theft (including TWOC; n=1) were coded as Theft

Total number of previous and subsequent offences.

Summary of types of offences

Sentencing History

Current Sentence:

- Start date
- Order type

- Order length
- Order outcome
- Order completion date (if applicable)
- Electronic Monitoring Requirement (length noted if different to three months)

Previous and subsequent disposal types.

Other disposal outcome summary.

Final outcome date and description for contact with Eastmanor Youth Offending Service or current status of contact in June 2014.

#### Breach information

Breach details relating to current disposal:

- Did the young person breach? Y/N
- Date of breach (usually the date of third warning letter)
- Date the Order was returned to Court (breach prosecution date)
- Summary of reason for breach
- Disposal for breach

Summary of prior and subsequent breaches?

Dates and disposals of prior and subsequent breaches.

Total number of breaches

**Personal Circumstances and characteristics data field collected (For use in Study one).**

All the following data were collected from the ASSET that was chosen using the process outlined in the Data Collection and Coding section above.

General

Date of ASSET

Core Leader of Supervising Unit

Overall dynamic ASSET score

Risk of Serious Harm Rating

Living Arrangements

Yes/No answer given to:

- No fixed abode
- Unsuitable, does not meet his/her needs
- Disorganised/chaotic

Summary relevant points in the Evidence Section

Family and Personal Relationships

Summary relevant points in the yes/no questions and the Evidence Section

Particular note taken of yes answers to:

- Evidence of family members or carers with whom the young person has been in contact over the last six months being involved in heavy alcohol misuse
- Evidence of family members or carers with whom the young person has been in contact over the last six months being involved in drug or solvent misuse

- Significant adults fail to communicate with or show care/interest in the young person

- Experience of abuse

- Inconsistent boundary setting

### Substance Use

List of Ever and Current use substances

Summary of attitude from Evidence and yes/no responses to:

- Sees substance use as positive and/or essential to life

- Noticeably detrimental effect on education, relationships, daily functioning