

# Unlocking Learning

## Examining public and professional attitudes towards the role of education in relation to crime and punishment of young offenders

This briefing provides information on how public opinion could be mobilised to support sentencing measures that focus on education and training in the community rather than custody. It also highlights barriers within education institutions and youth justice and indicates some ways in which these may be overcome. It draws on surveys of the public, of magistrates and of professionals working in the education sector.

### Key lessons

- The general public and many professionals significantly underestimate the influence of both educational attainment from an early age and positive attachment to school in preventing offending. Their reaction on discovering extremely low levels of literacy and numeracy amongst many young offenders provides a real opportunity to garner public support for the rethinking of sentencing centred on education.
- Public support, educational leadership and the willingness of magistrates could be harnessed for the introduction of a comprehensive and systematic approach to youth justice built upon educational attainment, school attachment, a prevention curriculum, and a significant reduction in custodial sentences in favour of compulsory education in the community.
- Magistrates have the potential to exert influence on the education and training on offer for young offenders. A higher profile could be given to the education and training needs of young people by ensuring adequate information, which is currently often missing. In addition, magistrates could exert pressure so that local education authorities fulfil their statutory duty of making suitable, full-time education available to all people of school age.
- Educationalists (particularly senior managers in secondary and further education) are strongly in favour of a community-based approach and are negative towards a custodial approach for young people. Teachers, however, did not always reflect this opinion and are more resistant to the inclusion of young people who offend in mainstream education.

debat policy  
**rethink**  
justice

# “ Which is best, to pay for the policeman or the schoolmaster – the prison or the school? ”

(extract from The Times 1867 in Furlong, V J 1985)

## Education and offending

The interrelationship between education and youth crime has long been recognised. The question posed in The Times in 1867 (Furlong 1985) has never been satisfactorily answered and public opinion and social policy have seesawed between these options ever since. Similarly, the professional response has often been to adopt polarised positions whereby learning is the prerogative of teachers and the criminal justice remit is confined to offending behaviour.

This research was designed to explore the ambiguities and contradictions that apparently lie within public attitudes towards offending and education.

Education has a powerful, unique role as a universal service which offers the opportunity for children and young people to equip themselves with the skills and knowledge to gain employment. But it has other equally (if not more) important functions in terms of socialising young people and inculcating the prevailing moral and behavioural standards. Is there the potential for reformulating sentencing approaches to combine the two powerful impulses of self-improvement and social control? And, if public opinion supports such an approach, what are the barriers within our educational institutions to this being achieved?

## Research evidence

There are four main areas where there appear to be significant links between education and offending by young people:

- educational underachievement, particularly with respect to literacy and numeracy
- detachment from mainstream education
- impact of custodial sentences and periods in care
- efficacy of school organisation.

These four areas (shown in figure 1) have complex and negative interrelationships. It is highly likely, for instance, that the barrier to learning represented by low levels of basic educational attainment is a significant factor

in pushing young people out of formal learning. Once outside mainstream education, a young person's attainment will tend to fall even further behind. Despite the interplay between these areas, however, there is evidence to support the argument that each area represents an independent risk factor for youth offending.

One of the objectives of the research was to assess the extent to which public and professional opinion was in tune with the research findings.

**Figure 1: Educational risk factors and youth crime** (Blyth, Hayward and Stephenson, 2004)



## Research findings

### Members of the public

Based on the evidence from the 1,332 members of the public surveyed, this study aimed to discover the extent to which public opinion chimes with the research evidence on the risk factors associated with offending by young people. Interestingly, public opinion appears to see a greater role for education and training in terms of preventing reoffending rather than in

# “ The public believed very strongly that mainstream schools should teach about the causes and consequences of committing crimes. ”

preventing offending in the first place (Youth Justice Board 2001).

Of the ten main reasons offered by the general public for young people committing crimes, the three most important (in rank order) were:

- drug, alcohol and other substance misuse
- poor parental supervision/discipline
- criminal friends/siblings.

While poor parental supervision/discipline and criminal friends/siblings are closely associated with the onset and continuation of offending in children and young people, respondents showed an exaggerated belief in the role played by the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances. In contrast, respondents appeared to underplay the role of deprivation, which plays a more important role than research evidence would suggest.

While being unable to read and write was seen as the least important reason for young people beginning to commit crimes, it was rated as one of the most important factors in reducing reoffending. Academic underachievement and lack of qualifications were seen to be of relatively low importance in terms of explaining why young people start to commit crimes, although the public rated non-attendance at school relatively highly as a cause of crime.

Questions on the influence of the culture and organisation of schools on the likelihood of offending revealed that teachers and schools were seen by respondents from the general public as more important than any other professional group (including the police) and far more important than custodial institutions or the courts in preventing offending. The public believed very strongly that mainstream schools should teach about the causes and consequences of committing crimes.

While only a small minority of respondents from this group disagreed with the disruptive effects of custody on education, a larger number (although still a minority) were in favour of a custodial rather than

a community approach, which echoes the findings of other research. This ambivalence was brought out more fully in the focus groups:

*“These children... perhaps the system is failing them. They need more assistance. We do think that perhaps more punishment in schools. We used to have the strap or the ruler” (pro-custody female, aged 35+, Manchester).*

It may be that factors that are perceived as being more structural in origin, such as deprivation or low academic attainment, have been given less weight than those perceived as the result of negative individual choices or behaviour such as poor parental supervision/discipline, using drugs or not attending school. The moral shortcomings of individuals seem more likely than the failure of institutions and professionals to attract the blame for crime. The perceived lack of discipline enforced by parents and schools is echoed in a pervasive belief that the criminal justice system has become far more lenient towards young people who offend. Again, this finding is very much in line with other research (Roberts and Hough 2002).

## **Public awareness/attitudes to the youth justice system**

Public knowledge of the youth justice system appears to be limited:

- one third of respondents from the general public professed to knowing a little about it
- nearly half professed to knowing not very much
- nearly two thirds of respondents from this group were ‘not very confident’ or ‘not at all confident’ in the effectiveness of the youth justice system.

Interestingly, confidence levels were significantly higher (although still a minority) in relation to the local area in which the respondent lived with almost a third being fairly confident in their local youth justice system.

# “ Education and rehabilitation often appear to be inextricably linked in the minds of the respondents... ”

## Public awareness/attitudes to young people

The three most important purposes of the criminal justice system in dealing with *adults* who have committed crimes were:

- to punish
- to discourage young people from committing further crimes
- to rehabilitate.

There was a discernible (although not large) difference in belief about the purpose of the criminal justice system in dealing with young people as compared with adults. In order of priority, the purposes of the criminal justice system in dealing with young people were:

- discouraging young people from committing further crimes
- rehabilitating
- providing education and training in order to gain employment
- punishing.

While punishment and education/training were ranked as equally important for young people, there was a much higher rating for the use of punishment for adults.

A large majority of respondents from the public felt that children and young people aged 10 to 17 should be treated differently to adults in the criminal justice system (nearly 60% supported this notion and 1 in 5 strongly agreed with it).

Education and rehabilitation often appear to be inextricably linked in the minds of the respondents:

*“And I think they need educating about who they are, why they're there [in prison] and how they're going to perform. So I think that probably comes under rehabilitation” (pro-custody female, aged 35+, London).*

The term 'juvenile offender' tended to evoke negative connotations amongst respondents and was inextricably linked with images of 'troublemakers' and 'thugs'. Discussions of education encouraged some participants to become more understanding and sympathetic, but this and similar terms appear always to be a catalyst for negative perceptions.

However, attitudes towards the education of young people who have offended appeared in the focus groups to be dependent on the age of the young person, their individual circumstances and the type of offence committed.

## Education, custody and reoffending

Views about the profile of education change significantly when respondents considered education in the context of custody and reoffending. Acquiring literacy and numeracy skills, for example, was seen as the most important thing for young people in custody and was ranked higher than offending behaviour programmes, guidance regarding qualifications or employment, and vocational training.

## Rethinking custody through education

This research asserted how public opinion could be modified. First, several key questions were repeated after the respondents had been given certain key facts regarding education and youth crime. Subsequent significant variation in views on the use of community sentences could indicate the extent to which a rational case against custody would change opinion.

Second, respondents were invited to consider a radical, alternative sentencing option in the form of compulsory, suitable full-time education in the community.

Given that the profile of those who preferred custody was established earlier in the survey, these two approaches provide an opportunity to see how easily 'custody votes' can be switched to community options.

Those who considered custodial sentences to be of more benefit than community ones tended to be

## “ Magistrates... have the potential to shape educational provision as part of the approach to sentencing. ”

older males of lower socio-economic status, with no qualifications, who read tabloids and had little confidence in the youth justice system (based on the belief that it is much too lenient).

Towards the end of the interviews, respondents were presented with the following findings from research:

- In areas where more young people are out of school for whatever reason, the youth crime rate is likely to be higher.
- The average reading age for a 17 year old on entry to custody is below that of an 11 year old.
- Many juvenile offenders enter custody with a history of educational underachievement.
- Being out of education is a major risk factor for juvenile offending and reoffending.
- Fewer than 1 in 10 young people had education, training or employment arranged for them during the first month on release from custody.

Within the 30% of the sample who were surprised by these findings, there was a higher representation of some of those who were in favour of custody (such as people over 65, tabloid readers, victims of crime, those possessing no qualifications and those of lower socio-economic status).

Having been given these facts, several earlier questions were now repeated to respondents in order to see whether this more negative portrayal of custody in relation to education and training would change opinions.

Indeed, there were quite substantial reductions in support for a custodial option in terms of its benefits for education and training. The number of respondents who preferred the custodial option was nearly halved (from 30% to 17%) and the new choices were split fairly equally between the community option and believing that neither made a difference.

However, this was partly offset by a switch of some of those who had initially preferred community options

who now either stated a preference for custodial options or to the view that it made no difference.

While initially 45% more people chose community options than custodial, this increased to 58% following presentation of the above facts.

Consideration of these facts also appears to have had an impact on how people perceived the purpose of the youth justice system. Fewer respondents (a drop of 8%) continued to believe punishing young people to be the primary purpose of the youth justice system. More respondents (a rise of 6%) believed that the aim of the youth justice system should be to provide education and training in order to gain employment.

This might suggest that consideration of the extremely poor education and training outcomes for young people who receive custodial sentences reduces the tendency to a more punitive approach and reinforces belief in the importance of education and training.

The sentencing proposition was that “10 to 17 year olds who have offended and cannot read and write should receive compulsory education, rather than custody”. This elicited a marked positive response: two thirds of respondents ‘agreed’ and over one third ‘strongly agreed’. Particularly strong support was recorded from those who worked in education or possessed no qualifications, were aged 65 and over and (not surprisingly) those who believed in community sentencing options rather than custody.

Although those who initially believed custodial options to be more beneficial to education and training than community sentences still had a higher proportion who did not agree with this proposition (30%), significant numbers appear to be attracted to this non-custodial option. Over one half of the original ‘custody group’ (52%) preferred the notion of compulsory education in the community for those who cannot read and write rather than a custodial sentence; nearly one quarter ‘strongly agreed’ with this notion.

**“ ...magistrates receive relatively little information on the access, participation and progression of young people in education, training and employment. ”**

## **Magistrates**

Magistrates are influential in relation to the links between education and offending and have the potential to shape educational provision as part of the approach to sentencing.

While magistrates share many of the opinions held by the general public regarding the perceived causes of crime, they differ markedly in their attitude towards custody and in the emphasis they place upon education.

This may be partially explained by the fact that almost half of the magistrates questioned had worked in the education system during the last five years and that a further 14% belonged to households where someone had worked in education.

## **Causes of crime**

Magistrates echoed the views of the general public in so far as the misuse of drugs, alcohol and substances, poor parental supervision and discipline, and association with criminal peers or siblings were given the highest ratings. Magistrates, however, gave much more weight to educational factors: non-attendance at school, academic underachievement and lack of qualifications, and not being able to read and write. In fact, the magistrates' perceptions of the reasons for offending by young people were probably closer to the research evidence than was the case with either the general public or educationalists.

In terms of preventing reoffending, the biggest single difference between magistrates and the general public was the far lower rating given by magistrates to the importance of imprisoning young people.

## **Purpose of the youth justice system**

While magistrates identified the same three priorities for the youth justice system (to discourage the young person from committing further offences, to rehabilitate that young person, to provide education and training in order to gain employment) they placed significantly greater emphasis on the first two priorities

along with a lower rating on the importance of punishment.

## **The role of schools and colleges**

In terms of the importance of different professions and institutions in preventing children and young people from offending, magistrates placed even more emphasis on teachers and schools than the general public. Understandably, brand recognition of youth offending teams (Yots) was far higher amongst magistrates and may explain why much less weight was given to the role of the police and social workers (given that magistrates would perhaps have assumed they were part of the Yots).

A major difference could be seen regarding the perceived importance of the role of custody, which was identified by only 7% of magistrates compared to almost 20% of the general public. Those magistrates who emphasised punishment as the primary role of the youth justice system also tended to be those who gave most weight to the role of teachers and schools in preventing crime.

## **Yots and education**

Given the predisposition of magistrates towards community sentences along with the importance they attached to the role of education, there may be some potential for Yots to reduce the use of custody through emphasis on the provision of education. However, the evidence suggests that a majority of magistrates receive relatively little information on the access, participation and progression of young people in education, training and employment. Two thirds of magistrates feel that they do not know enough about the range of education and training placements available to young people who receive a community order. This information gap could be encouraging magistrates to make custodial disposals because they appear to assume that education and training programmes are more likely to be available in secure establishments.

This information gap is underlined by the fact that nearly one third of magistrates stated that they

# “ Only 11% of magistrates had visited a young offender institution in the last 12 months. ”

never receive any feedback on the education and training received by young people during their sentence; over three quarters of magistrates would welcome individual reports on education, training and employment of those young people whom they have sentenced. This interest also extended to the post-sentence period.

It is apparently rare for magistrates to request or receive a separate report from a school, local education authority (LEA), college or training provider. This is despite the fact that 60% of magistrates believed that access to, and participation in, education, training and employment was an important factor as part of the young person's welfare needs when deciding on an appropriate sentence.

In addition, over two thirds of magistrates were not aware of the Youth Justice Board's target to ensure that 90% of young people who offend are in suitable full-time education training or employment. Fewer than 1 in 10 magistrates believed that their local Yot was likely to meet this target.

## Education and custody

Magistrates' views differed markedly from the general public's regarding the relative benefits to education and training of a custodial as opposed to a community sentence. While 30% of the public believed a custodial sentence to be more beneficial to young person's education and training, only 7% of magistrates shared this view; nearly three quarters of magistrates supported a community sentence as being of the greatest benefit.

Magistrates did not appear to be any more aware than the general public of the disruptive effect on education almost inevitably caused by a custodial sentence. They were, however, far more concerned (perhaps because of their greater knowledge of the realities) that there should be provision for young people who offend to continue with their education upon their release from custody; over three quarters of magistrates 'strongly agreed' with this proposition.

There was considerable awareness amongst magistrates of the limitations of their knowledge regarding the education and training provision available in custody; 82% of magistrates wished to learn more about it. Current knowledge of the state of education in custody is likely to be more limited. Only 11% of magistrates had visited a young offender institution in the last 12 months (when the Youth Justice Board's educational reforms would have become more evident). Well over half of all magistrates had never visited a local authority secure children's home or a secure training centre and virtually all of these wished to visit these establishments.

Magistrates and the general public held similar views regarding the relative priorities for learning for young people in custody although they differed in their emphasis. For example, 91% of magistrates considered that the acquisition of literacy and numeracy skills was very important for young people in custody. While arts education was placed in similar rank order (10th for the public and 9th for the magistrates) only 4% of the general public thought it important to be studied compared to 58% of magistrates.

## Educationalists

### Causes of crime

Several groups of educationalists took part in this research: head teachers and deputy heads, teachers and learning support assistants from mainstream secondary schools, and principals and vice-principals from further education colleges.

There were some significant differences of view between the educationalists and the general public, as well as considerable differences between groups of educationalists (e.g. teachers and senior managers in both schools and colleges).

As might be expected, greater weighting was given to those educational factors that are implicated in offending by young people. Low attainment, for example, was generally seen as being notably important as a cause of offending (except by teachers).

**“ ... links with Yots appear weak; only 1 in 3 head teachers knew the name of their Yot’s education practitioner. ”**

Illiteracy, innumeracy and non-attendance at school were considered by educational managers and teaching assistants (more than the general public) to be more significant in explaining why young people committed crime. Teachers, however, rated these factors as only fractionally more important than did the general public.

There was relatively little difference between the views of educationalists and the general public on the influence of poor parental supervision and discipline, and substance misuse. However, educationalists did not place the same value on the impact of poverty and the role of financial motivation in committing crime as the general public.

In contrast, family conflict was seen to be more influential by educationalists in secondary schools than by the general public, further education managers and magistrates.

### **Purpose of the youth justice system**

There were major differences between the views of educationalists and the general public on the purpose of the youth justice system. While, for example, under half of the general public respondents thought the purpose of the youth justice system to be rehabilitation, between two thirds and three quarters of all educationalists thought this. Educationalists perceived the purpose of the youth justice system as being the discouragement of young people from committing further crimes and the rehabilitation of young people rather than their punishment.

This was mirrored (with some variations) in the attitude of educationalists towards custody; only 5% of head teachers and further education managers believed such sentences to be beneficial to young people whilst this approach was favoured by 30% of the general public. Similarly, very large majorities of educationalists believed that placing young people who offend in custody could disrupt their education (compared to just over half of the general public).

### **Links with Yots**

Background knowledge of the youth justice system was not extensive, particularly among teachers and teaching assistants whose knowledge was no higher than that of the general public. However, in contrast to respondents from the general public, the overwhelming majority of educationalists wanted to know more about the youth justice system.

It is clear that links with Yots appear weak; only 1 in 3 head teachers knew the name of their Yot’s education practitioner. The exchange of information is limited but there is a widespread desire to improve the situation. The notion of joint training with Yots was supported by large majorities of educationalists; whilst only 9% of schools had participated in joint training in the last three years, over half of head teachers would welcome doing so.

There was significant interest in the shadowing of Yot practitioners by school staff and 40% of head teachers would like the opportunity for their staff to shadow or teach in the juvenile secure estate.

A range of further roles was identified including Yot staff acting as mediators between young people and schools; joint work on attendance and punctuality; supporting homework; attending parents’ evenings and providing enrichment activities.

### **Reintegration and resettlement**

The survey of educationalists focused on the transition of young people from custody into mainstream education, but responses to the questions also offered insights into educationalists’ attitudes regarding the inclusion of young people who are persistent or serious offenders into schools and further education colleges.

### **Suitability**

One of the critical issues is the extent to which educationalists considered mainstream schools and colleges to be suitable for young people who offend (in how far their outlook is inclusive).

# “ The attitudes of a minority of teachers towards young people who offend also represent a significant barrier to inclusion. ”

There is a marked difference between the outlook of further education managers and that of secondary education. Almost two thirds of further education principals and vice-principals believed colleges to be a suitable option for 10 to 17 year olds on release from custody; only 14% disagreed. Within secondary education, however, although 40% of head teachers considered mainstream secondary school to be appropriate, almost one quarter disagreed. The situation was reversed amongst teachers; only just over one quarter was in favour and almost 40% were against.

For many respondents in secondary education, their views were not based on actual experience, as fewer than 1 in 5 schools could be certain that they had been involved in the reintegration of young people on release from custody in the last three years. Further education colleges appear to have far more experience in this respect; over three quarters of further education colleges had been involved in the reintegration of young people on release from custody.

## Barriers

Respondents identified a list of the critical barriers to the reintegration of young people into mainstream education. Staff in the secondary school sector viewed the attitudes of young people and their previous experiences of education as posing the main barriers. This was echoed by further education managers although they were much less concerned. Teaching staff recognised their lack of appropriate knowledge and skills in meeting the needs of these young people.

Other significant barriers were a lack of teaching time, negative parental attitudes and to a lesser extent a lack of suitable learning materials. The availability of school or college places appears to be relatively much less significant. Further education colleges identified a lack of suitable support systems and funding.

More specific issues for teachers and classroom assistants included concerns about the potential effect on peers, support in class, confidentiality and the safety of other pupils.

One barrier identified by headteachers was their view that the level of support from their LEA was not strong. It is significant in this context that 84% of head teachers were unaware of any service level agreements or protocols between Yots and their LEA (a requirement in Youth Justice Board national standards for all steering groups).

The attitudes of a minority of teachers towards young people who offend also represent a significant barrier to inclusion:

*“Why should decent young kids be exposed to such poor behaviour and influences?” (class teacher)*

*“They clearly need specialist help – they need to go to an appropriate institution – we are here to teach not police.” (class teacher)*

## Resources

In order of priority, the following resources and types of support were identified:

- behavioural support
- one-to-one support in lessons
- special educational needs support
- access to shared information
- access to further education bridging courses (secondary schools)
- parents'/carers' support groups.

In addition, the college principals and vice-principals identified support from Yots as being an important potential resource to facilitate a successful transition from custody to community.

## Effective transition practices

Over 80% of head teachers believed that establishing effective working relationships with local Yots would make for a successful transition from custody to the community and that their schools could help young people of compulsory school age to make

# “ There is a need for compulsory education and training for all 16 to 18 year olds in custody with goals for participation and attainment. ”

the successful transition. There was a commitment in principle (at least to measures such as ensuring that teachers meet with parents/carers both before and soon after young person left custody, and undertaking an educational review in conjunction with the Yot prior to release). The rating for ensuring the continuity of courses and curriculum was higher than practical measures such as sending materials (e.g. coursework syllabus) to the young person in custody. However, there was strong support for enabling the young person to visit the school prior to release on a temporary licence.

## Compulsory education

While there was a significant degree of public support for sentencing 10 to 17 year olds who are illiterate to compulsory education rather than custody, education managers and practitioners in secondary schools were less sympathetic. One third of the general public strongly agreed with this proposition compared to just over one quarter of teachers and less than one fifth of headteachers.

## Conclusions

This extensive series of surveys supported by focus groups provides some interesting insights into the public and professional perceptions of the relationship between offending and education. The history of the education of young people being looked-after in the care of local authorities provides a useful parallel, especially given that these young people very often share the same educational experiences and are far more likely to be involved in youth justice system.

After 25 years of the raising of public and professional awareness of the neglect of the education of these young people, it became a social policy priority (Social Exclusion Unit 2003). The Quality Protects Programme introduced a battery of measures through guidance, policy and training that has permeated local authorities and schools. Measured against its own targets, it has not yet achieved full success but it has cemented the education of these young people as a priority at a local level.

The debate in youth justice circles is at an earlier stage and this may be partly because offending is seen to be much more a matter of individual blame as opposed to reception into the care system, which can be seen more as due to circumstances. In addition, the reforms introduced by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 may have unintentionally allowed local education authorities and schools to absolve themselves of mainstream educational responsibilities to many young people who offend.

## Recommendations

Two general recommendations have come out of this research:

- The design and introduction of an educational framework for those in the youth justice system that could attract widespread public support from both those who favour a more punitive approach and those who place priority on the rehabilitation of young people who offend.
- A communication initiative led by the Youth Justice Board to raise public and professional awareness of how instrumental educational risk factors can be in offending and to promote a new approach to increase public confidence in community sentences built around education.

## Other recommendations include:

### Sentencing

There is a need for:

- Compulsory education and training for all 16 to 18 year olds on supervision orders with goals for participation and attainment.
- Compulsory education and training for all 16 to 18 year olds in custody with goals for participation and attainment.
- Early release from longer sentences for reaching set attainment levels.

**“ There is a need to bring the further education sector into a close effective working relationship with the youth justice system, particularly in the community. ”**

- Compulsory literacy and numeracy sessions for all young people placed on court orders who are below Level 1 (not functionally literate or numerate, i.e. below the level expected of an 11 year old).

### **Educationalists**

There is a need for:

- A duty placed on local education authorities/local learning and skills councils to allocate suitable, full-time mainstream education and training for all young people on court orders within a set minimum time period.
- Guidance issued to schools to promote the educational attainment of young people who offend, which would cover curriculum and assessment, welfare, guidance and continuity and would contain detailed policies and measures relating to staffing.
- Devise and introduce detailed educational reintegration measures taking account of the educational issues identified in these surveys.
- Joint training for schools and Yots to be developed with an emphasis on effective information exchange on educational access, participation and progression.
- Bringing the further education sector both formally and informally into a close effective working relationship with the youth justice system, particularly in the community.

### **Magistrates**

There is a need to:

- Develop effective dissemination of information on education matters to magistrates through, for instance, training and the Youth Court Bench Book so that they can act more confidently on access, participation and progression issues and be more encouraged to use community sentences.

## References

Blyth, M, Hayward, G and Stephenson, M (2004) "Effective educational interventions with young people who offend", editorial work in *What works in probation and youth justice*, editors Burnett R and Roberts C, Devon:Willan publishing 2004

DfES/DoH (2000) *Guidance on the Education of Children and Young People in Public Care*, London: DfES/DoH

Furlong, V J. (1985) *The Deviant Pupil*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press

Hough, M and Roberts, J.V. (2002) *Changing Attitudes to punishment*, Devon:Willan publishing

Social Exclusion Unit (2003). *A Better Education for Children in Care*. London: ODPM

Youth Justice Board (2001), *Risk and Protective Factors Associated with Youth Crime and Effective Interventions to Prevent It*, London: Youth Justice Board

This briefing draws on research conducted by Professor Martin Stephenson of Nottingham Trent University in conjunction with MORI and ECOTEC Research and Consulting Limited into public and professional attitudes towards the education of young people who offend.

The results are based on national surveys in England and Wales supported by focus groups. These were conducted during 2003 and 2004 and involved a total of 2,427 people: 1,332 members of the public; 1,309 magistrates and 786 educationalists, including head teachers, heads of departments classroom teachers, learning support assistants, further education college principals and vice-principals).

RCP supported this research but the findings presented here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.

Rethinking Crime & Punishment is a strategic grantmaking initiative of the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation which aims to raise the level of public debate about the use of prison and alternative forms of punishment.

Esmée Fairbairn Foundation  
11 Park Place  
London  
SW1A 1LP

Tel 020 7297 4700  
Fax 020 7297 4701

info@rethinking.org.uk  
www.rethinking.org.uk

