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Abstract

This paper represents the research carried out into the effectiveness of a programme delivered by Glasgow City Council’s Outdoor Resource Centre, to young people at risk of offending. The programme delivered was purposeful in its approach, and drew on previous knowledge from both the Outdoor Education and the Youth Justice worlds. The focus of the programme was to deliver a skills based approach to teaching social problem solving. Previous Outdoor Education programmes for offenders have depended upon either a diversionary approach, an intensive counselling approach, a character trait approach or have relied on the ‘challenge’ aspect of Outdoor Education to suggest a punitive component to their programme. The evidence for their effectiveness in reducing offending is poor, and is losing support from a Youth Justice field that is becoming increasingly evidence based. Two measures of social problem solving were examined. The component parts, known as process measures, and the practical application, known as outcome measures. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to establish these measures. These were obtained through a process of behavioural observations made by the staff delivering the programme, and through semi-structured interviews with purposefully selected participants and their parents, teachers and social workers. Overall it was found that the programme was very effective, particularly, in terms of process measures. The data regarding the outcome measures showed that young people took the skills and applied them to some very important life decisions. Some weaknesses were noted in how certain components of social problem solving were applied in practice; these require further investigation. This research considers one possible meeting place between the worlds of Outdoor Education and Youth Justice. The meeting place was, in this case, very fruitful. More exploration of other possible meeting points would seem to be an area worthy of further enquiry.
1. Introduction

The programme being evaluated by this research is delivered by Glasgow City Council’s Outdoor Resource Centre (ORC). The ORC is a community based provider of adventurous outdoor activities, based within the Social Work Services department of the council. The Centre has been in existence since 1978 and delivers a number of programmes and services to the people of Glasgow. The programme that is the subject of this research is only one of them.

The ORC is quite unique as a Local Authority Outdoor Education provider, in that it is based within Social Work Services and not Education Services. Being based in Social Work Services means that the approach, and priorities, in service delivery are slightly different from our education colleagues. Defining Social Work is quite problematic, but in 2001, the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Federation of Social Work Schools agreed on this definition.

The Social Work profession promotes social change, problem solving in human relationships and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being.


(International Federation of Social Work Schools, 2001)

As can be seen from the definition given above, since the ORC sits within Social Work, its aims are not based around curriculum achievement or academic success, but are firmly rooted in the concepts of human behaviour and social systems. This does not mean that the ORC is not
concerned about educational objectives, but they are considered in the context of how educational objectives impact on human behaviour.

With this in mind, in 2003 the ORC was asked by Glasgow City Council to design and deliver a programme that would be funded by ‘The New Opportunities Fund’ (later to change its name to ‘The Big Lottery’). The objectives of the programme were to ‘Through the use of sport, divert young people between the ages of 5 and 16 from crime, or behaviours likely to lead to crime’ (NOPES, 2002, p. 22). The fund was to have a percentage ‘top sliced’ to be spent on the provision of ‘Outdoor Education/adventure programmes’ (NOPES, 2002, p. 8).

The ORC staff consulted both the literature available at the time, and with their Youth Justice colleagues. The literature is discussed in detail elsewhere in this dissertation, but three major issues emerged.

The first issue is that previous outdoor/adventure programmes in this area had adopted either a diversion approach, or a re-integrative approach. The former had expressed itself mainly as large-scale summer sport programmes, and the latter, as an intensive counselling approach (Taylor, Crow, Irvine & Nichols, 1999; Whyte, 2003). Neither of these approaches had produced convincing evidence of their effectiveness.

The second issue is that although the reasons postulated for the lack of effectiveness are complex, a couple of themes do surface. Coalter (2000), Utting & Vennard (2000) and Lipsey (1995) suggest that programmes based in remote rural locations are unlikely to provide lasting
outcomes when those who took part in them have to return home and try and apply the programme content in a completely different context. Also, personnel were suggested as being a limiting factor. Whyte (2003) states that:

Traditional facility-based programmes provided by professional recreation and sport staff seems unlikely to have the desired impact. The evidence suggests that people with excellent coaching skills are not necessarily good with difficult young people nor those that are skilled in working with difficult young people necessarily good sports or PE instructors.

The final issue that emerged was that the evidence for what constitutes a successful intervention with young people at risk of offending is complex, but does point towards some key factors. The approach should involve a pro-social modelling methodology (Trotter, 1993; 1996; Andrews, Holins, Raynor, Trotter & Armstrong, 2000), problem solving should be a major component of any successful programme (Keissling, 1982; Rooney, 1992), and the programme should be community based (Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte 2003).

With the above findings in mind the ORC designed a programme that

- was community based i.e. not based a long way from a young person’s home community (with the exception of one overnight sailing expedition);
- would be delivered by a staff group with significant experience of working with challenging young people, as well as a high level of Outdoor Education experience and in addition would have received training in pro-social modelling, problem solving and cognitive behavioural approaches to working with young people;
• delivered training using an evidence-based model of teaching problem solving skills;
• used activities to create experiential teaching of problem solving, or to facilitate prosocial modelling opportunities.

The programmes subsequently delivered were seven weeks long (one day per week). They used a combination of group teaching sessions followed by outdoor activities delivered in an experiential manner, including canoeing, kayaking, mountain biking, climbing, hill walking, white water rafting and sail cruising. These were all delivered within a one-hour drive of Glasgow.

The young people were asked to sign a contract before attending the programme. In this contract the voluntary aspect of the programme was emphasised, and boundaries relating to behaviour and engagement with the programme were agreed (Appendix 3).

Funders of the programme, the Big Lottery, determined the objectives. Using sport to ‘divert young people from criminal activity or behaviours likely to lead to such activity’ (NOPES, 2002, p. 22). In order to be effective in reducing offending, most commentators agree that services should be concentrated with those whose likelihood of offending is considered to be medium to high risk (Andrews, 1995; Lipsey, 1995; McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Utting & Vennard, 2000). The target young people for the programme, therefore, were those who were considered to be at risk of becoming involved in criminal activity.

Identifying a cohort of young people who meet the criteria of being at risk of offending, is not as
simple as it may at first appear. There is though, some consistency in identifying the risk factors beginning to emerge in the literature.

- Disrupted family life (Juby & Farrington, 2001; Whyte, 2003)
- Harsh or inconsistent family discipline (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Audit commission, 1996; Farrington, 1996)
- Early criminality (Rutter, Giller & Hagwell, 1998)
- Disaffection with school (poor attendance and achievement) (Graham, 1998)
- Associating with criminal others (Sutherland & Cressey, 1970)
- Abuse of drugs and/or alcohol (Loucks, Powers, Swanson & Chambers, 2000)

Loucks et al (2000), in a study of young people in custody in Scotland, found that it was not single factors like those above that indicated risk. It was when young people were exposed to a multitude of these factors that it indicated a likelihood that young people would become involved in offending or anti-social behaviour. The young people in Louck’s study were characterised by a history of many factors such as; disruptive and offending behaviour from an early age, poor school achievement and attendance, lack of stable employment, familial histories of offending, alcohol and drug abuse, and neglectful parenting.

By working in partnership with the pastoral care staff based in schools, and through the use of a referral process that attempted to capture the above aspects of a young persons life, groups of six young people were identified. Additionally, cognisance was taken of issues such as the suitability of the mix of the group and contamination. As mentioned above, associating with
criminal others is a risk factor. Therefore, care was taken not to introduce those with a low risk of offending to those with a high risk of offending (contamination) and run the risk of this association increasing the risk for one of the participants.

Once a group of cohorts was identified, the school pastoral care staff approached them in order to ask if they wished to be part of the programme. Consulting with the young people regarding their attendance on the programme was considered to be a very important stage of the recruitment process, as the programme was based on the principle of voluntary participation.

The young people recruited did not always have experience of all the risk factors identified above, but they did have experience of most of them. A high proportion came from homes that had experienced disruption and a significant number had experience of being either ‘looked after’ or ‘accommodated’ by the Local Authority. In some cases parents colluded with the young people in their absence from school and in their anti-social behaviour. The manifestation of collusion was normally seen in a young person staying off school so they could care for a parent at home, or they were actively involved in supporting a parent's offending. It is fair to say though that some of the young people had a supportive home life.

The findings are based on an examination of programmes delivered during one school term. The school term in question was eighteen months into the project and five programmes were delivered during the term being examined. Each programme had the capacity to have six participants, therefore there was a potential capacity to accommodate 30 young people, in five groups of six, during the period examined. Four of the programmes were delivered in
partnership with schools, and one was delivered in partnership with an ‘Alternative to Accommodation’ project based within Social Work Services. In the Social Work programme, a member of staff from the project co-delivered the programme. In the school delivered programmes, the Outdoor Resource Centre staffed all the delivery (two members of staff per programme).
2. Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter continues the theme of exploring the places where ‘Outdoor Education’ and ‘Youth Justice’ meet by examining the current literature in both fields. As will be seen, ‘Social Problem Solving’ emerges as a significant meeting area, therefore the literature in that area is also explored. Attention is drawn to the similarities, where they exist, between the areas of study and areas where there is some disagreement are pointed out.

The next chapter discusses research methods in detail. It is worth pointing out at the beginning of this chapter though, some of the issues around design that influenced the manner in which the literature was reviewed. The debate between the merits of positivist and relativist approaches to research design have been deliberated for many years (Chalmers, 1982; Outhwaite, 1987; Robson, 2002) and a detailed exposition is beyond this paper. A few comments will assist in explaining the way the literature search has been carried out.

Most writers would not place themselves in either positivist or relativist camps nowadays, in fact, Byrne (1998, p. 37) claims that positivism is not only dead, but ‘by now it has gone off and is beginning to smell’. Relativism, in its extreme form, would probably attract similar comments (Sarantakos 1998). The debate does ask us though, to consider whether an inductive or deductive approach is being made to the enquiry (Edwards & Talbot, 1994). The deductive approach would take the view that there is a linear connection between cause and effect. Research using this model starts out with an existing theory and tries to prove or disprove that
theory. Inductive approaches would suggest that life is more complex, and that many interrelated factors link cause and effect; therefore, studies using an inductive approach tend to try and evolve a theory from the data as it becomes available. Several writers have pointed out that it is unhelpful to categorise research as being inductive or deductive (Edwards & Talbot, 1994; Robson, 2002) as most research tends to draw on elements of both traditions. This observation would be true of this research, as it would appear to be deductive in nature as it is trying to establish the reliability of a hypothesis (that an outdoor education approach is an effective method of teaching social problem solving). As is stated in the introduction though, a literature review informed the original hypothesis on which the programme is based. The literature review was therefore inductive in nature; that is to say, the hypothesis only emerged after the literature review was carried out. The literature review in this chapter reflects that inductive journey, this inductive nature can be seen most clearly in the way that social problem solving emerges as the way forward.

2.2. Outdoor Education

The concept of changing the way people (particularly young people) behave has been an integral part of what we now loosely call ‘Outdoor Education’ since its early days between the first and second world wars (Nicol, 2002). What writings there were at the time reflected the use of Outdoor Education to prepare young men for war, or the effects of war, with Kurt Hahn and ‘Outward Bound’ being the main protagonists of this approach (Hogan, 1968). The forerunners in this field being Scouting and the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award Scheme (Hopkins & Putnam, 1993, p. 26).
These organisations often used the term ‘character building’ and there was some literature written by these forerunners describing character building approaches, including some of Baden-Powell’s own writings (Baden-Powell, 1908; 1909). Baden-Powell actually believed that Scouting was a ‘character factory’ (Rosenthal, 1986). Similar views to Baden-Powell’s are summarised in more recent observations of what was taking place at that time (McLeod, 1983).

Character building is a term that appears to say much, but is actually very difficult to define. Brookes (2003a, p. 49) cautions us to check for irony when the term is being used, as it may be referring to an experience that was unpleasant and seems to have been pointless. Brookes (2003b) points out that the term character building in the Outdoor Education setting is about improving positive character traits such as conscientiousness, independence, emotional stability, flexibility and maturity, while at the same time reducing negative traits such as aggression.

There does not appear to be any attempt to research these topics in the early years, as the field had yet to develop an academic consideration of its work. Most of the ideologies were driven by individuals’ ideas and experiences. These ideas were generally rooted in public school education, and reserved for the upper classes. An example of this was Hahn’s intention to train intellectual and aristocratic citizens for leadership (Brereton, 1968, p. 143). Even Baden-Powell’s ideas to transform lower-class youths into serviceable citizens for the empire were derived from the idea of exposing young boys to adventurous activities. These ideas were commonly associated with public schools (Cook, 2001).

It was to be much later before the field started to make connections with theoretical work from outside its own ranks. The likes of Dewey (1963), and his ideas about experiential learning,
informed much of the more progressive thinking in the 1960s. With the formation of the National Association of Outdoor Education (NAOE) in 1970, some consensus in the UK on what ‘Outdoor Education’ was, started to emerge. NAOE took the view that Outdoor Education was ‘a means of approaching educational objectives’ (Nicol, 2002, p. 30). The NOAE view linked Outdoor Education to other objectives beyond that of preparing for war or social leadership. These other objectives were perceived, at the time, as being an integration of Outdoor Education with other school subjects (Nicol, 2002)

Barret and Greenaway (1995) published a review of Outdoor Education literature, which brought together much of the work in the field and would appear to have been a catalyst for further work to be carried out. It confirmed that there was an emerging body of thought that was making a connection between Outdoor Education and personal development. In addition, it began the process of exploring this in a way that was not dependent on the concepts of character trait modification.

The concept of ‘character building’ or ‘personal trait development’ continued to influence much of the thinking in Outdoor Education beyond Barret and Greenaway’s (1995) work. It was not universally accepted though. Brookes (2003a) argues that the social psychology literature does not support the idea that character traits displayed by a person in one situation, will automatically be displayed when in a completely different setting. Brookes’ views would appear to question the long-standing assumption that it is possible to change character traits through adventurous activity programmes.
In more recent times the field becoming known as adventure therapy has begun to develop. This has been particularly so in North America where the term originated and is widely accepted. In the UK there is still a debate about whether such a field exists, and if it does, how it differs from therapeutic adventure. Additionally, there is concern over who, or what, defines the criteria for practitioners who operate in this area (Grant, 2003). Even in areas of the world where the term adventure therapy is accepted, the debate continues as to whether practice in this area is a stand alone theoretical model or a combination of other theories (Gillen, 2003). Adventure therapy is growing and consolidating, and a number of approaches have been considered and proposed as the theoretical basis of its delivery (Beringer & Martin, 2003; Gillen, 2003; Russell & Farnum, 2004). The acceptance of the legitimacy of adventure therapy might make it seem that it has some promise as a place for Outdoor Education and Youth Justice to meet, but, as will be seen in the review of Youth Justice literature, there is little support for approaches that depend on traditional therapy methods.

What of Outdoor Education programmes specifically provided for young people involved in offending? There has been some work carried out to evaluate the benefits of Outdoor Education programmes provided to young people in school who are experiencing ‘Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties’ (EBD). The term EBD is one that has gained much acceptance within the educational community (Fox & Avramidas, 2003), but it is often used in a way that suggests the term describes a fixed and homogenous group of young people. Viewing EBD in this way is unhelpful, as many young people may experience emotional difficulties such as being emotionally withdrawn, but may not be overly disruptive. The literature noted below actually refers more to young people whose behaviour in school is so challenging that it causes problems
for management within the school. Their behaviour is so severe that it puts them at risk of being permanently excluded. While this is not exactly the same group of young people as identified in this research, there are obvious similarities. These similarities become more obvious when we take into account some of the risk factors used to recruit for this programme such as, risk of exclusion or disaffection with school.

The studies in this area seem to concentrate on behavioural changes that are reported as being the result of participation in outdoor activity programmes. Farnham and Mutrie (1997) found that 19 pupils attending an EBD special school, experienced positive outcomes in group cohesion, anxiety levels and self-perception, following a short Outdoor Education programme. These supported earlier findings by Lane, Bonic and Wallgren-Bonic (1983), which found very similar outcomes in their review of literature. Pommier and Witt (1995) reported improvements in self-esteem and behaviour of young offenders after taking part in an Outward Bound programme compared to a control group.

While these studies seem very positive some caution needs to be exercised as they tend to be based on measuring constructs such as self-esteem or self-perception. It is worth digressing for a moment to explore this topic. Much of the justification for Outdoor Education, in general, relies on these constructs, but it would appear that the justification for the use of Outdoor Education in programmes for those with challenging behaviour is heavily dependent on it.

The construct of self-esteem has been around for a considerable time and has gone almost unchallenged. Its roots lie in the philosophical movement known as objectivism. Objectivism
places its central emphasis on reason, individualism, enlightened self-interest, political freedom and a heroic vision of life’s possibilities (Branden, 1984, p. 39). As can be seen from the description of the originating philosophy it is based on the value of “self” and does not owe any allegiance to community. There have been a number of assertions associated with it that most people have accepted as being correct. They may even have fallen into the trap of assuming that ‘studies’ suggest self-esteem is very important (Kohn, 1994).

The concept of self-esteem is being challenged on a number of fronts and many of the assertions made for it are becoming discredited. First and fore most is whether, as a construct, it has any legitimacy (Baumeister, Tice & Hutton, 1989; Beane & Lipka, 1986). Second, even if it has some legitimacy, is there a relationship between self-esteem and social behaviour or other outcomes? In the late 1980s the State of California funded a task force to review the available research on self-esteem to support their reliance on it at the centre of many of their policies, particularly in education. In his introduction to the publication Smelser (1989) conceded:

The associations between self-esteem and its expected consequences are mixed, insignificant or absent. The non-relationship holds between self-esteem and teenage pregnancy, self-esteem and child abuse, self-esteem and most cases of alcohol and drug abuse…If the association between self-esteem and behaviour is so often reported to be weak, even less can be said for the causal relationship between the two. (p. 15)

A more recent review of literature on self-esteem by Emler (2001) on behalf of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation comes to very similar conclusions. Most importantly in the context of this study, very little evidence could be found to establish a link between low self-esteem and
committing crimes (Emler, 2001). Emler (2001) actually suggests that there is some evidence that high self-esteem was more likely to be a predictor, rather than a mitigator, of some kinds of offence.

While self-esteem has been the raison d’être given by many Outdoor Education providers delivering programmes targeted at offenders, other links between Outdoor Education and reducing offending have been considered. Schafer (1969) tries to categorize the potential therapeutic benefits of taking part in sport in line with what he believed to be the causes of anti-social behaviour and delinquency. It should be noted that Schafer’s theory relates to sport in general, and specifically to athletics, but the arguments may apply to adventurous outdoor experiences. These fall under the following headings.

**Differential association:** The suggestion is that by participating in sporting activity participants are influenced by significant others, such as coaches, teachers and other participants. It is assumed that these role models will display non-delinquent behaviours and therefore provide an alternative to delinquent peer groups. The exposure to positive role models will eventually reduce or eliminate association with delinquent peers. Given some of the literature that is discussed later under the Youth Justice literature this would appear to have some merit, but the shortcomings are obvious. The amount of time that a young person would need to commit to their participation in sport to achieve this conformist behaviour would be very significant. Segrave and Hastad (1984) found that formal participation is not enough to generate commitment to institutions and non-delinquent values. Purdy and Richard (1983) also question this assumption. They support the argument in principle, but caution against ignoring the issues
relating to the length, intensity and priority that would need to be given to participation before there would be a change to more conformist behaviour.

In addition, we cannot assume that participation will automatically bring about the relationships with the coaches and teachers that are mentioned above, especially with those most ‘at risk’ (Svoboda, 1994). Nichols and Taylor (1996) suggest in their review of a small intensive ‘sport counselling’ programme for probationers, that positive relationships with the sports leaders are one of the keys to success. I would suggest, from my own experience, that this does not automatically come about. In order to achieve it there should be a purposeful attempt to do so on behalf of the coach.

**Development of self-discipline:** Schafer (1969) argues that participation in sport emphasises a number of traits such as deferred gratification and increased self-discipline or control. His implication is that participation in sport will have a positive effect on these character traits i.e. make you more self-disciplined, more controlled or more likely to defer gratification, not only when taking part in sport, but in any situation you find yourself. I have discussed earlier the merits of being able to change character traits and the value of this as an approach. It is sufficient to say that there is considerable doubt as to whether the process of transferring any changes observed to a different situation, actually occurs. It is therefore of limited value as an approach (Brookes, 2003a).

**Blocked aspirations, achievement and self-esteem:** From the perspective of the approach adopted by Schafer (1969), delinquency may be caused by a compensation for a blocked identity
formation or status achievement that may have been caused by educational failure and or unemployment. Others have noted the link between low educational attainment and delinquency (Rutter & Giller, 1983; Elliot & Voss, 1974; Utting, 1996). Schafer argues that sport is a functioning alternative that will allow young people to generate a status achievement from their participation in sport. However, Spady (1970) is not convinced and warns of the dangers of sport raising young people’s status perceptions without there being an outlet for this in terms of employment. He argues that sports need to be a compliment to education and not a substitute. Much has changed since these arguments were made in 1970 and it may no longer be true that there are poor employment outlets for these aspirations. The development of the field of Outdoor Education means that this has become an accessible option for many young people and should not be discounted.

**Antidote to boredom:** One of the most common assumptions in diversionary sports projects is that ‘the devil makes work for idle hands’ (Coalter, Allison & Taylor, 2000) and that vandalism and anti-social behaviour are a function of boredom. Much depends on how sophisticated a look at this topic you take as to whether it has any merit. If we just look at it from the point of view that by participating in sport young people are physically, although temporarily, not available to commit crimes, then there is some limited support for this. Diversionary approaches are often the rationale for holiday programmes (Coalter et al, 2000) such as the much-researched Staffordshire Police Activity and Community Enterprise (SPACE) programme. Heal and Laycock’s (1987) review of the programme found that although there were some reductions in crime in the area, these were statistically insignificant, and it was difficult to show that even these reductions, were brought about by the programme. They further argue that any effect that
does exist will diminish as the novelty of such programmes decline. More importantly they could not find any longer term impact on the attitudes and behaviour of participants.

If we look at the boredom issue in a bit more depth, we find that there is a connection between boredom and alcohol use (Orcutt, 1984) depression, hopelessness and loneliness (McGiboney & Carter, 1988) and deviant behaviour in school (Wasson, 1998). As will be seen in the review of Youth Justice literature these are risk factors in becoming involved in anti-social behaviour and or offending and there is therefore some merit in attending to this issue.

**Adolescent development needs:** The cathartic role that sport can play in the lives of young people is considered in this approach. Sport is viewed as providing an opportunity to address the needs of adolescents to develop perceptions of efficacy, competence, control, freedom and independence (Coalter et al, 2000). It would seem that there is some legitimacy in this. When considering this approach it is useful to consider that at the time in adolescence where young people may be seeking to gain some of these skills, there is a tendency for them to prefer more casual pursuits as opposed to organised clubs and activities (Walker, 1987). The preference for more casual pursuits would suggest that recreational outdoor activities (amongst other options) could play a role in building up these perceptions of ‘self’ during adolescence. The main advantage over other self-organised activities such as street football is that there is still an adult involvement. If the coaches involved were purposefully modelling the positive benefits of efficacy, competence, control, freedom and independence, and this is possible in a sustained way, then there would appear to be some promise in this approach.
While much of the literature discussed above crosses the divide between Outdoor Education and Youth Justice, it is worth considering the literature in the field of Youth Justice in its own right. It would seem to me to be naïve to not explore the broader issues that apply to Youth Justice before we consider applying Outdoor Education solutions to them. The scarceness of this approach can be seen in Taylor et al’s (1999) review of demanding physical activity programmes for young offenders under probation supervision (England). They asked those who provided this type of service to give a rationale for using demanding physical activities. There were 88 responses and they gave the following reasons.

- 46 responses identified personal and social development benefits including cognitive/behavioural benefits, self-esteem, discipline, health, peer influence, group work and links with organisations.
- 11 responses identified risk, challenge, excitement and adventure.
- Eight responses chose them because it was the young people’s preference.
- The remaining 23 responses used them because they were easily available or there was a history of use.

With the exception of cognitive/behavioural benefits there is very little evidence in the Youth Justice literature to support these rationales. Some of them (self-esteem, peer influence and group work) have been shown to have little or no effect (Trotter, 1999). A number of them (discipline and challenge) have actually been shown to be counterproductive (Andrews, Hollins, Raynor, Trotter & Armstrong, 2000; Trotter, 1999).

Drasdo (1972) and Mortlock (1973) proposed that benefits would surface automatically, if and when, adventures that are sufficiently challenging are provided. Some of these ideas are still
around 30 years later and the hazards of this approach can be seen from the summary given above, which seems to show that in some settings, the benefits they expect to surface automatically can be ineffectual or even counterproductive.

2.3. Youth Justice

Given that this is a review of Youth Justice it may well be worth noting, before we start, the difference in perception between young people and adults as to what the definitions are of criminality and anti-social behaviour. Fitzpatrick, Hastings and Kintrea (1998) found that adults defined the issues in terms of diversion/prevention or rehabilitation. Young people, however, defined the issues in terms of police harassment, with the associated desire to gain adult respect and tolerance and to change people’s attitudes towards them. The view that the police do not have a good understanding of the problems faced by young people was supported by 49% of those questioned in a survey of 892 Edinburgh young people in S1 to S4 (Asquith, Buist, Loughran, McCauley & Montgomery, 1998). They also noted that only 54% of those questioned felt that the police treated young people fairly. While I have found significant appreciation for this perception among those practitioners working within the field of Youth Justice, it is conspicuous by its absence in most of the following literature.

Youth Justice and Criminal Justice literature has taken a similar journey to that of Outdoor Education. It would appear that there was no significant attempt to analyse effective methods of reducing recidivism until the late 1960s and early 1970s. In the early 1970s a significant volume of research was published, reflecting several years of observing offender programmes and their effectiveness (Martinson, Lipton & Wilks, 1975). This was a huge piece of research and the
central message to emerge from the review of a variety of institutional and non-institutional settings over a 22 year period was ‘with few and isolated exceptions the treatments studied had no significant impact on further offending’ (Vennard, Sugg & Hedderman, 1997). Martinson et al.’s findings became known widely, and particularly in the media, as ‘nothing works’. The nothing works idea became the prevailing wisdom of the time, and in some cases, this view continues among academics today (Trotter, 2001).

The problem with Martinson et al.’s (1975) piece of work was that it produced so much data that, with the facilities and techniques available at the time, it was very difficult to categorize the data. Therefore, while it may have been acceptable to make the above claim in terms of the overall impact of corrections programmes, it actually camouflaged the likelihood that some interventions are helpful and some are harmful (Trotter, 2001). The data showed that some approaches actually led to more offending, some led to less offending and some had no impact at all. Martinson et al were not the only researchers at this time coming to these conclusions; Fischer’s review of the effectiveness of casework (1973) came to almost identical conclusions. He went as far as stating that ‘lack of effectiveness seems to be the rule rather than the exception’ (Fischer, 1973, p. 376).

There followed a period of considerable pessimism about the prospects for rehabilitative interventions, which lasted until the late 1980s and early 1990s. The cumulative effects of a number of literature reviews for example McIvor (1990), began to restore optimism about treatment or rehabilitation (McNeil & Batchelor, 2003). Once this began to be more widely accepted, the task then became one of establishing the types of programmes that were helpful
and the programmes that were harmful.

Much of this work was carried out in the UK (Raynor, 2000; Holin, 2000; McGuire & Priestley, 1995). Meta-analyses have been used to great effect in this area and some consensus of opinion has emerged.

It is generally agreed from the meta-analyses studies that the level of service provided should match the level of risk assessed; higher-risk individuals should receive higher levels of intervention and lower-risk, lower levels of intervention. The principle of matching risk to intervention should also stress minimal intrusiveness (McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Utting & Vennard, 2000). There is some suggestion that lower risk offenders should not receive any intervention and that only medium to high-risk offenders should attend programmes (Andrews, 1995; Trotter, 2001; Whyte, 2003).

Only some needs contribute to, or are supportive of, offending. The focus of intervention should be on addressing offending by alleviating those needs that are ‘criminogenic’. This principle underlies direct work on offending behaviour. The most promising targets of intervention (criminogenic needs), according to Andrews (1995) and Trotter (2001), are ‘anti-social’ attitudes, habitual patterns of thought and feeling associated with criminality, personal control issues, peer associations, developing social skills, and promoting family support.

A number of commentators mention learning styles (Andrews, 1995; Raynor, 2000; Holin, 2000). Using approaches that match worker and client learning styles work best. In general, it
seems that offenders require active, participative and experiential rather than didactic or unstructured methods. The most effective programmes seem to use behavioural or social learning principles, and to include a cognitive component challenging attitudes, values and beliefs (Andrews, 1995).

As already mentioned, programmes are best run close to home and not in settings that do not bear any resemblance to the participants home environment (Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte, 2003). In addition to this, programmes in the community fare better than those in institutions, this is thought to be the case because they facilitate real-life learning in the home environment. The effects of institutional programmes tend to ‘wash out’ in the ‘real world’ (McGuire & Priestley, 1995).

Effective interventions, it would seem, recognise the variety of offenders' problems (Lipsey, 1995; Weissberg & Caplin, 1994) they employ a skills-oriented approach, and they use methods drawn from behavioural, cognitive, or cognitive-behavioural sources (Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte, 2003). Therefore, programmes that adopt a multi-modal approach addressing a wide range of social competency issues such as problem solving, self-control and emotional intelligence are generally more effective.

Surrounding all of the above, the literature consistently notes that effective intervention connects the methods used to the aims stated, is carried out by appropriately trained and supported staff, is adequately resourced, and plans monitoring and evaluation from the outset. The plan is implemented with integrity and fidelity. Delivering with integrity and fidelity requires that the
programme is delivered as planned and is not allowed to wander and evolve onto topics which do not address criminogenic need (Andrews, 1995; Lipsey, 1995; McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte, 2003).

Lipsey (1995) ventures to suggest that programmes should have a minimum duration. He suggests that, preferably, it should consist of 100 or more total contact hours, delivered at two or more contacts per week, over a period of 26 weeks or more. Other writers resist stating a precise duration, but most consider that it should be ‘significant’ (Andrews, 1995; Utting & Vennard, 2005).

In the process of rebutting the ‘nothing works’ claim, the discussion or agenda has become known as ‘what works’ (Trotter, 2001). In the process of deciding what works, some approaches have been shown not to work.

‘Scared straight’ programmes such as, enforced visits to maximum-security prisons in order to see the severity of conditions, were popular in America for a while. These have been discredited as being ineffective and in some cases have been shown to actually increase the likelihood of a young person offending (Finckenaour, 1982; Buckner & Chesney-Lewis, 1983).

Approaches that depend on individual or peer counselling have failed to reduce substance abuse or delinquency and it may be possible that they can actually increase delinquency (Gottfredson, 1986; Gottfredson, 1987; Lipsey, 1992). Similarly, instructional programmes focusing on information dissemination, fear arousal, moral appeal, self-esteem and affective education fail to
reduce substance abuse (Botvin, 1990).

Programmes that are not community based have consistently been shown to be less effective (Whyte, 2002). This is also supported by some Outdoor Education literature. Huskins (1991) encourages us to reduce our dependence on ‘faith in miracles on the mountains’ and become more community based. Others in the field of Outdoor Education have argued for the transferability of skills from residential outdoor experiences (Sibthorp, 2003), but in terms of skills associated with reducing offending behaviour, this has very little support in the Youth Justice literature.

As was stated earlier though, despite all that is said above, there are still some practitioners and academics that hold to Martinson et al.’s belief that ‘nothing works’, such as Whitehead and Lab (1989), and Gough (1993). These views though, are receiving less and less favour (Trotter, 1999).

2.4. Social Problem Solving

As can be seen from the review of the literature in relation to Youth Justice, approaches that include challenges to the way of thinking as well as behaving, including addressing personal deficits are more likely to be effective (Utting & Vennard, 2000). These cognitive deficits, in relation to offending, include not being adept at problem solving. The conclusion is, that if a young person cannot problem solve they will repeatedly experience failure in their legitimate attempts to obtain what they want, and become frustrated. This frustration will lead to them opting for illegitimate means of achieving their goals (Ross & Fabiano, 1985).
What then, is social problem solving? D’Zurilla and Nezu (1999), define it as:

…the self-directed cognitive-behavioural process by which a person attempts to identify or discover effective or adaptive solutions for specific problems encountered in everyday living (p. 10)

Problem solving is conceived here as a conscious, rational, effortful and purposeful activity.

What though, is this ‘problem’ that we are being asked to put so much effort into solving? Again D’Zurilla and Nezu (1999,) help us out. They define a problem (or problematic situation) as:

…any life situation or task (present or anticipated) that demands a response for adaptive functioning, but no effective response is immediately apparent or available to the person due to the presence of some obstacle or obstacles (p.11)

‘Social’ in this context is not meant to limit the problem solving to any particular type of problem, only to highlight that it refers to problems that occur in the natural social environment.

Other writers have called it interpersonal problem solving (Shure, 1981), interpersonal cognitive problem solving (Spivac, Platt & Shure, 1976), personal problem solving (Heppner & Peterson, 1982) or applied problem solving (Heppner, Neal & Larson, 1984).

Teaching social problem solving as a skill, or social competence, is a relatively recent approach. It was not given much credence as an intervention approach in the light of the clinical and counselling psychology dependence on a ‘medical’ or ‘disease’ model. The medical model
defines psychopathology primarily in terms of the presence of deviant or maladaptive responses that are presumed to be signs or symptoms of intrapsychic conflicts (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999, p. 6). Within this model, normality is viewed as the absence of abnormality. ‘Healing’ is brought about through the use of psychodynamic insight therapy where understanding or ‘insight’ concerning the underlying causes of the maladaptive behaviour brought about change.

Direct re-education or ‘skill’ training approaches, such as problem solving, were viewed as merely supportive and only temporarily effective. It was assumed that if no insight took place the old symptoms, or new symptoms, would eventually appear because the underlying conflicts were not identified and resolved (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999).

The view that the symptoms would re-emerge was challenged by the likes of Perlman (1957) and Jahoda (1958) who argued that increases in social competences (including problem solving) could be associated with reductions in psychopathology. Studies carried out by Zigler and Philips (1961) added strength to this hypothesis.

At the 1965 staff conference of the National Institute of Mental Health, the subject matter for discussion was,

…to explore ways in which clinical interventions might be facilitated through placing a greater emphasis upon improving the social competence of a person who seek or need professional help with emotional or adjustment problems. (Gladwin, 1967, p. 30)

At this conference a definition of social competence was established. Included in this definition
was ‘the ability to use a variety of pathways or behavioural responses in order to reach a given
goal’ (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999, p. 6). As can be seen, this is essentially problem solving. The
acceptance of this definition began the process of acknowledging the legitimacy of skills based
interventions.

These developments took place at the same time as ‘Cognitive Behavioural Therapy’ was
gaining in acceptance (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999) and the collaboration of these two models to
bring about learning in Social Problem Solving was becoming obvious. By the early 1970s the
idea of skills based interventions using a cognitive-behavioural approach to present them was
widely accepted.

The potential relevance of problem solving to both clients and therapists needs little
elaboration. In terms of adaptive versatility and the ability to cope with an ever-changing
array of life problems, these cognitive skills may offer an invaluable personal paradigm
for survival. Their potential contribution to therapeutic efficacy and independent self-
improvement will hopefully become an issue of priority in future empirical scrutiny.
(Mahoney, 1974, p. 212)

In its simplest form, this approach refers to the process by which individuals identify and deal
with problems that occur in everyday life (Biggam & Power, 2002). From a mental health
perspective, problem solving serves as a general coping strategy that encourages individuals to
generate, select, and implement a whole host of effective behaviours that will enhance general
well being in psychological and social terms, and protect individuals from possible maladaptation
(D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1982; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). General thinking in psychology has, in
more recent times, begun to consider the possibility that psychopathology may actually result from deficiencies in skills and abilities that contribute to social competence, including problem solving as opposed to the previously assumed existence of conflicts within the psyche (Biggam & Power, 2002). A skill deficiency approach has been demonstrated in a number of groups that are of interest to this research such as maladjusted children (Renshaw & Asher, 1982), emotionally disturbed adolescents (Siegal & Platt, 1976) and heroin users (Platt, Scura & Hannon, 1973). Additionally, problem solving approaches used to treat clinical diagnoses such as depression (Marx, Williams & Claridge, 1992; Nezu, Nezu & Perri, 1989) and schizophrenia (Bellack, Sayers, Mueser & Bennet, 1994) have been effective.

Of most interest to this research though, is the impact that problem solving approaches can have with offenders. One of the earliest protagonists of a problem solving approach was Perlman (1957) where she proposed its use in social casework. Reid and Epstein (1972) continued to support, and develop, her ideas of the use of problem solving in casework. More specifically, in probationary settings, Keissling (1982) developed a problem solving approach to working with probationers. Rooney (1992) developed Keissling’s ideas for work with other involuntary clients. Reeker and Meissner (1977) believe that problem solving deficits contribute to impulsive behaviours that lead to incarceration and Zamble and Porporino (1988) consider impoverished problem solving to be a common characteristic of prisoners.

The above studies show that those who offend have impoverished problem solving, but does improving this, reduce the likelihood of continuing to offend? Certainly in other settings the curative effect of teaching problem solving has been shown to be effective. Rubin (1985) in his
review of effective casework comments:

These forms of practice (problem solving) were found to be successful with such diverse groups as mildly to moderately retarded adults, chronic schizophrenics in after care, young non-chronic psychiatric inpatients, women in public assistance and low-income children experiencing school problems. (p. 474)

Andrews, Keissling, Russell, and Grant (1979), in a study of Canadian Probation Services, found a significant correlation between the use of problem solving approaches and reduced re-offending by probationers. Trotter (1993; 1996) also found a connection between the use of problem solving and reduced offending in his studies of probation services in Australia. Shulman (1991) in his study in child protection, found a relationship between partialising client concerns (or specifically defining problems) and positive outcomes. Similar findings were concluded following Smokowski and Wodaski’s (1996) review of empirical evidence in child welfare.

The use of a problem solving approach with offenders is not without its critics. Some writers have commented that it is a negative approach and have pointed to the value of solution-focused approaches in preference to problem-focused approaches (DeShazer, 1998). However, when delivered using pro-social modelling approaches that depend on rewarding success, this does not appear to be relevant. Others have commented that it is difficult to use this approach when the service users consider that they do not have any problems (Jones & Alcabes, 1993). Young people referred to Youth Justice services would patently have problems, although as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the perception of what their problems were may not coincide
with what their worker feels are their problems. The most convincing argument for using a problem solving approach with young offenders, is the considerable body of research that supports it (Andrews et al. 1979; Jones & Alcabes, 1993; Trotter, 1996)

2. 5. Meeting place?

It would appear from the above that ‘Social Problem Solving’ is a potential meeting place between Outdoor Education and Youth Justice. The situations that are part of adventurous outdoor experiences create genuinely problematic situations, requiring imaginative and creative solutions, both in objective and interpersonal relationship contexts. When optimised by experienced facilitators these opportunities can allow valuable and relevant practice in a safe and productive environment.

2. 6. Summary

The literature reviewed seems to support the idea that interventions with young people who offend can be worthwhile if they are delivered within certain criteria. Additionally, the concept of the ‘central theme’ of a programme for young offenders being problem solving, would also seem to have considerable merit. The argument for an Outdoor Education component to the programme though, is less convincing. Whyte (2003), who in his paper ‘What works with children and young people involved in crime’ devotes a considerable portion of his paper to the consideration of the role of sport, leisure and adventure, but remains to be convinced of any predictable benefits.

Why then, would the programme being evaluated take the additional risk of taking unpredictable
and challenging young people into potentially challenging and harmful environments? Why are adventurous experiences an integral part of their programme? At the point where problem solving and Youth Justice meet, is emerging the idea of Pro-Social Modelling. Problem solving is a major component of pro-social modelling, but there is much more to it than that. Through the use of praise and other rewards, non-criminal expressions and actions are encouraged (Trotter, 2001). Additionally, the supervisor presents himself or herself as a pro-social model, but unlike some of the similar examples of role modelling discussed earlier in the sports literature, there is a concise and objective framework to this. Modelling approaches would seem to have a more significant chance of success if the amount of time spent with the young people is sizeable. The logic is simple: the more time you spend with a young person, the more likely you are to have opportunities to reward pro-social actions. Some of these rewards may even be the activities themselves. Additionally, in relation to teaching problem solving, Outdoor Education can provide experiences in which real every day problems occur. It can also bring a degree of social tension, competing needs and anxiety, which enhances the realism of the problematic situation. The realism allows the use of cognitive behavioural approaches such as reinforcement, rehearsal, and the components of pro-social modelling to be used to their maximum benefit.

A review of the literature has not found any record of this methodology being researched previously. This research hopes to start the exploration of this approach.
3. Research Methodology

3. 1. Introduction

This chapter lays out issues related to methods of professional inquiry in the context of this paper and justifies the different aspects of the chosen methods. It describes on what basis a sample of those participants were chosen for further study. The specific difficulties that are faced when researching problem solving will be discussed and the strategies used to tackle these difficulties explained. The chapter will conclude with an outline of how the ethical issues pertinent to this research were addressed.

3. 2. Researching Problem Solving

Researching problem solving has some unique difficulties. A choice of whether to evidence a person actually problem solving, or to identify the presence of the various components of problem solving has to be made. D’Zurilla and Nezu (1999) describe these as process versus outcome measures. Process measures directly assess the cognitive and behavioural variables that constitute the problem solving process, whereas outcome measures assess the product of this process when applied to specific problems (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999). Put simply, the outcome measures are the quality of solutions generated and applied. In terms of this research, this presented a choice. Are we observing the processes involved in arriving at a solution or are we looking at the quality of solutions that are arrived at?

Given that the programme being evaluated is based on the precept that young offenders have impoverished social problem solving skills (Biggan & Power, 2002; Ross & Fabiano, 1985), and
that this can be traced to impaired processes (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999), it would seem to make sense to design a research programme that would concentrate on process measures as opposed to outcome measures. As ever, this would be too simple. If the problem solving strategies that are learned, are not applied, then they will not have an effect on a young persons offending or anti-social behaviour. In order to be of value it was decided that the research would have to try and include both process and outcome measures.

3.3. Research design

Two different approaches were adopted in order to capture both the process and outcome aspects of problem solving.

3.3.1. Process measures

The process components of the model used in this programme were based on the work of D’Zurilla and Nezu (1999). These were categorised under five headings:

1. Identify desired outcome
2. Create options
3. Identify the outcome of each option
4. Choose and apply the option that will closest match the desired outcome
5. Review if desired outcome is being achieved

In order to capture the process elements of problem solving, a method where the staff working on the programme observed the young people and scored them against each of these headings was adopted. The observation criteria (see appendix ‘B’) were developed over the first year of
the programme (150 participants). In order to establish consistency, the first term of programmes were jointly assessed by all staff. In the second term comparative checks were made to ensure all staff were scoring consistently. In addition, scores were agreed between the two members of staff delivering the programme and where this could not be agreed it was discussed with the project manager. The observations were designed around the concepts of skill acquisition proposed by Fitts and Posner (1967). They propose that, when attempting to acquire a skill, the learner goes through three separate phases.

In the first phase the learner goes through what Fitts and Posner (1967) call the cognitive stage. In this phase a basic understanding of the skill is formed. The understanding is achieved by gaining information from the senses.

The next stage, associative, is best described as the practice phase. During this phase the learner can reproduce the skill occasionally, but as they further progress through the phase, this becomes more consistent. At this stage the learner begins to understand how the various components of the skill relate to each other. It is important to understand that during this phase the learner will often get it wrong. Getting it wrong occasionally does not mean they are not capable of performing the skill; it is an essential part of the process of establishing the relationships between the components.

In the final stage, autonomous, the skill can be reproduced more or less consistently. What is probably most significant about this stage is the ability to reproduce the skill in a range of situations. As we progress through this phase the skill can be performed without consciously
considering it. Transferring performance of the skill to new situations becomes possible when
the performer can execute the skill without knowingly thinking about it.

The observations were recorded as a score from one to six. This represented two points for each
of the phases identified by Fitts and Posner (1967).

These phases were originally observed in the acquisition of motor skills, the original research
being involved in the observation of fighter pilots learning to fly. Obviously this is not the same
as the learning of a cognitive or behaviourual skill like problem solving. As a construct of
learning theory though, it seems to have much to offer the understanding of how people learn to
problem solve. What the model particularly brings to the observation of learning problem
solving is a recognition that learners do not go from having no problem solving abilities
(impoverished problem solving) to being skilled problem solvers, in the blink of an eye. The
process is prolonged and requires consistent opportunities to rehearse good practice. The need to
recognise skill acquisition as a prolonged process, has been borne out by this programme, and in
the experience of others teaching problem solving (D’Zurilla & Nezu, 1999; D'Zurilla, Nezu &
Maydeu-Olivares, 2002).

Additionally, acknowledging this process as a journey brings an opportunity to recognise what
learners have achieved, even if they have not reached the end goal of the autonomous phase.
Recognising the ‘journey’ process creates opportunities for feedback to the programme
participants that has legitimacy and integrity.
All programme participants were observed using the problem solving scores and this was recorded at every point of contact with them. Recording at these points not only gave a final score at the end of the programme, but also noted the rate at which they acquired problem solving skills over the seven weeks.

Adopting this approach led to a fairly ‘structured observation method’. While it could have been possible to create a narrative account of this part of the research from this method (Fetterman, 1989), this was not the intention. The data gathered at this stage were intended to establish whether the programme was capable of teaching the process phase of problem solving and, as will be explained later, it was also used to help determine the sample for the outcome phase of the data collection.

3.3.2 Outcome measures

Measuring the outcome of a participant’s problem solving ability presented some difficult choices. There are a number of existing surveys of people’s problem solving ability that would claim to capture the outcome part of problem solving, as defined above, such as Kidcope (Spirito, 1988), SPSI-R:S (D’Zurilla et al, 2002) and SELF (McLean, 2003). These are all ‘Summated Rating’ (or Likert) scale methods. Serious consideration was given to using one of these scales for a number of reasons. Robson (2002) considers a number of these advantages and states them as:

- The results can be reasonably compared with other studies that used the same test
- There are existing reliability and validity norms
- Designing your own test is complex and time consuming
• Provides quantitative data

These were attractive attributes, but there were difficulties with the tests considered, as they were all self-reporting. This appeared to raise the possibility of measuring what the participant thought the researcher wanted to hear and not their actual behaviour. Robson (2002, p. 233) describes this as a ‘Social Desirability Response Bias’. In addition to this, all the questions referred to ‘what would you do if’ or ‘how do you feel when’ type of questions. Asking these ‘if’ or ‘when’ questions seemed to miss the point. I needed to establish which strategies were adopted when the programme participants were faced with making a decision in their home, school or communities.

It seemed that the only way this could be established would be either to observe the programme participants in these environments, or to question those who saw them operate in these environments. The ideal seemed to be to ask those who saw them operate. Asking those who saw the young people over long periods, and in a variety of situations, allowed for observations that could not be obtained in any other way.

In order to gather useful data it was decided to use some form of interview method with a sample of the young people. For each young person interviewed, two significant adults, who saw them in their respective environments, would also be interviewed. These significant adults would be chosen from their parents, teachers or social workers. Eight separate interviews were carried out with three young people and six adults. The adults comprised of two pastoral care teachers, one member of Social Work staff and three parents (two parents were interviewed simultaneously).
The use of interviews would concur with King’s (1994) views on when qualitative research interviews are most appropriate. He suggests that they should be carried out when ‘a quantitative study has been carried out, and the qualitative data are required to validate particular measures or to clarify and illustrate the meanings of the findings’ (p. 17).

A range of interview methods were therefore considered. Robson (2002) suggests that interviews fall into three main categories; structured, semi-structured and un-structured. Structured interviews are very formal and all interviews are the same with the questions asked in the same order and without the opportunity to develop themes as they occur. Structured interviews appear to be similar to a survey, but they allow for a narrative response. Semi-structured interviews start from a structure, but allow for the development of themes and explanations of questions. Occasionally the researcher may remove or add questions or ask them in a different order, but they are primarily allowing space for unanticipated themes to emerge and develop. The un-structured interview allows the person being interviewed to present his or her own narrative within the loose boundaries of the topic.

Powney and Watts (1987) prefer to use the terms ‘respondent interviews’ and ‘informant interviews’. These terms are used to identify if the respondent or the informant remains in control. Recognising that it is possible for either the respondent or informant to be in control is an interesting observation, especially when we consider that a weakness of interviews as a method of gathering data, is in the partiality of the interviewer (Robson, 2002). Partiality has two sides though, as it can bring a degree of insight or ‘connoisseurship’ to the interview that would not be possible by the impartial interviewer. I will discuss the matter of connoisseurship
in more detail later.

Given the strengths and weaknesses of the range of interview styles, it was considered that the ‘semi-structured’ or ‘respondent interview’ style was the most appropriate approach for the second part of this inquiry. A semi-structured approach would bring a degree of consistency between the interviews, which was more likely to help identify relationships and patterns, but allowed space to develop unanticipated themes as they emerge.

In practice the interviews were structured around the five process outcomes mentioned earlier, but with a different focus. Rather than observing the application of the problem solving framework in constructed situations, such as those used during the training programme, data was gathered about what young people actually did in their homes, schools and communities. The parents, teachers and social workers were asked questions such as, have you seen the young person improve their ability to identify outcomes in advance? Or, have you seen the young person improve their ability to generate useful options? Those interviewed were asked to give examples of any improvements they identified.

3.4. Sampling

Before looking at the rationale for sampling, it is worth reiterating what section of the population that the samples for this research were drawn from. Detail of this has already been given in a previous chapter, but we should remember that programme participants were selected because there were issues with, some or all, of the following:

- Disrupted family life (Juby & Farrington, 2001; Whyte, 2003)
• Harsh or inconsistent family discipline (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Audit commission, 1996; Farrington, 1996)

• Early criminality (Rutter et al. 1998)

• Disaffection with School (poor attendance and achievement) (Graham, 1998)

• Associating with criminal others (Sutherland & Cressey, 1970).

• Abuse of drugs and/or alcohol (Loucks, Powers, Swanson & Chambers, 2000)

Sampling for the initial phase of the data collection (process) was straightforward. All course participants for the period of the inquiry were selected. Initial data were collated as outlined above and some statistical assumptions could be drawn from that data. Sample selection for the second phase of data collection was more complex. For practical reasons it was not possible to interview all programme participants and it was considered likely that ‘saturation’ (i.e. the point at which further data collection will add little or nothing to what you have learned (Morse, 2000)) would be reached long before this point.

Therefore, a method of sampling had to be decided upon. It seemed desirable to capture those who had been successful in the process stage. Identifying those who had scored well in the process measures would ensure that we were only examining those who had demonstrated that they had understood the problem solving approach being taught. This, therefore, pointed towards a non-probability sample. In order to achieve this a purposive sample was used for the selection of the young people in the second phase of the data collection.

Selecting using a purposeful approach did mean though, that it restricted the ability of the inquiry
to draw too many generalisations from this population (Robson, 2002). The logical inference is that it can only comment on the ‘outcome ability’ of those who performed well in the process phase.

3.5. The researcher

As in any research, the role the researcher plays in the area of inquiry, and the competencies of the researcher, will influence many factors in the construction of the study. This will include the design, degree to which the inquiry can be emergent and the partiality of the findings. The inquiry being evaluated was conducted as practitioner research and as such, there are a number of possible intended and unintended consequences of the researcher’s influence.

Robson (2002, p. 534-535) comments on the pros and cons of the practitioner research approach. He argues that practitioner researchers have little time, expertise, and confidence and suffer from ‘insider’ problems such as preconceptions about issues or solutions. Additionally, he talks about the phenomenon of being a prophet in your own country. By this he means colleagues who know your work well not recognising the value of your comments. I can identify with most of these as I attempted to fulfil my role as a practitioner researcher.

Alternatively, a number of commentators also point to the benefits of this approach (Bell, 1987; Brown & McIntyre, 1981; Cohen & Manion, 1994; Eisner, 1976; 1991; 1994; Robson, 2002). They argue that insider research can bring many benefits to an inquiry such as ‘insider’ opportunities, ‘practitioner’ opportunities, ‘practitioner research synergy’ and ‘connoisseurship’. These ‘opportunities’ are alluding to the possibility of the practitioner researcher having previous
knowledge of the subject and of having existing contacts in the area of research. Being part of
the project that the inquiry is considering ensures a degree of relevant pre-existing knowledge.
In addition, it creates openings that will reduce problems with access to data and resources and is
likely to facilitate easier access to the chosen sample of young people. The concept of
connoisseurship though, deserves some further explanation.

The concept of connoisseurship in research is one that was first explored by Eisner. He draws on
ideas used to assess and critique visual and performing arts. Eisner (1976; 1991; 1994) argues
that the practices involved in education are more art than science. He argues that, in
connoisseurship, the researcher seeks to discover the relevant qualities of the research subject
and explore its significance. To be an effective educational connoisseur, one must possess
experience as well as perceptivity to differentiate between subtle and complex qualities of an
educational environment (Eisner, 1994). The educational researcher, who can perceive and
appreciate these kinds of distinctions, and the relationships between these qualities, is a
connoisseur. Connoisseurship can be defined as the ‘art of appreciation’ (Eisner, 1998, p. 63).

While I may not accept the extent to which Eisner (1998) argues that education is art, there is, I
believe, an advantage to someone knowledgeable in the field observing the working practice. It
would seem to me that they are likely to make more subtle observations or insights, therefore
detecting some issues that a researcher less knowledgeable in the field being observed, may miss.
Eisner sums up educational connoisseurship as using antecedent knowledge of an educational
issue to develop a deeper understanding of its application.
In addition to connoisseurship, and as with much practitioner-research (Bell, 1987), I was able to bring an action research approach to this inquiry. There are many definitions of action research, but Cohen and Manion (1994, p. 192) are helpful when they describe it as essentially an ‘on the spot’ procedure designed to deal with a concrete problem located in an immediate situation. This means that, ideally, the step-by-step process is constantly monitored over varying periods of time and by a variety of mechanisms (questionnaires, diaries, interviews and case studies, for example). Therefore, the ensuing feedback may be translated into modifications, adjustments, directional changes, redefinitions, as necessary, so as to bring about lasting benefit to the ongoing process itself rather than to some future occasion (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 192).

The project that is the subject of this inquiry was approaching eighteen months into a three-year funding round. Much of the obvious observations had already been made, through the initial pilot evaluations and further reviews. The programme was at a phase where it would benefit from more in depth research, and the time scale would allow for changes to be applied for the last year of the programme. As Cohen and Manion point out, ‘the point of this type of research is to bring change to the process itself’ (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 192); this was the desired outcome of this inquiry.

As mentioned earlier, this inquiry was about testing an existing hypothesis regarding the programme’s ability to teach problem solving. It is worth mentioning that the process of creating hypotheses, and then reviewing them, is ongoing. As an action researcher, it was the intention of this research to generate fresh hypotheses. Brown and McIntyre (1981) explain this well.

The research questions arise from analyses of the problems of the practitioner and the
situation and the immediate aim then becomes that of understanding those problems. The researcher/actor, at an early stage, formulates speculative, tentative, general principles in relation to the problems that have been identified: from these principles, hypotheses may then be generated about what action is likely to lead to the desired improvements in practice. Such action will then be tried out to revise the earlier hypotheses and identify more appropriate action that reflects a modification of the general principles, and so on as we move towards greater understanding and improvement of practice. This implies a continuous process of research and the worth of the work is judged by the understanding of, and desirable change in, the practice that is achieved. (p. 245)

As can be seen, insider research or practitioner research has the potential to bring much to the process of an inquiry like this one. While acknowledging the difficulties of this approach, as outlined above, it was felt that these were considerably outweighed by the benefits.

3. 6. Ethics

As with most inquiries of this nature, a number of ethical issues had to be considered when choosing the methods that would be most suitable. Two bodies had codes of ethics, which were relevant and helpful at the design phase: The American Psychological Association (2003) and the British Association of Social Workers (2003). While both of these codes cover ethical issues in general for their respective professions, they both have significant sections on research.

The intention was to work within the guidelines given by these two organisations, but as Cohen and Manion (1994,) point out ‘no contract, protocol or code of practice can resolve all problems’
(p. 381). They did consider, though, that ‘a code of ethical practice makes researchers aware of their obligations’ (p. 381). In addition, as with most topics concerning ethics, values or morals, the devil is in the detail. Therefore detailed consideration had to be given to a number of topics.

The first consideration that required attention was in relation to the choice of topic. While a traditional or positive view of research would suggest that science was ‘value-free’ or ‘value-neutral’ and the task of the researcher is simply to describe ‘what is’ in an objective manner (Robson, 2002, p. 66) this is not the reality of practitioner research. Attention is generally only given to an area of promise. Robson (2002) puts this quite bluntly when he says

It is highly likely that we start with the premise that this looks like a good thing, probably an improvement on what is currently on offer. **Life – your own and the participants – is too short to waste it on something which does not appear to have this prima facie value.** (p. 66) Emphasis added.

This was true of this inquiry, and as such, brings with it the risk of a degree of researcher bias. The risk of researcher bias does have to be balanced against the benefits of insider research and connoisseurship as discussed above, in this light, it was considered that the benefits outweighed the risks.

There were a number of areas where consideration had to be given to potential bias. Two that are worth mentioning were in the choice of school and ‘sexism over generalisation’.

The initial choice of which programme delivered in which school should be involved in the
research was simple in the early (process) phase of data collection, as all the programmes were used. In the next phase, though, it initially looked like a specific school had to be chosen. The choice of a school raised the question of whether to ‘choose the fertile soil of a friendly, innovative school, or the stony ground of a setting where there is probably a greater, though unacknowledged, need for something new’ (Robson, 2002, p. 67)? In order to address this it was decided to use the scores earned by the participants as the criteria for choosing the sample for the outcome phase of data collection. This meant that it was not ease of access to a school or the ‘friendliness’ of a school that dictated the sample, but a cohort of similar young people. This unfortunately meant that young people were drawn from a range of schools and youth justice services, some of which were friendly and some less accommodating. It also increased the administration in terms of permission from the head of establishments.

Over generalisation in terms of the gender (Eichler, 1988) of the study was a real risk. By far the majority of programme participants were male and none of the female participants met the criteria for selection to the ‘outcome phase’ sample. The fact that only young men took part in the outcome phase of the research is significant, and therefore any conclusions can only be applied to young men.

Many commentators on research ethics point to the researcher’s responsibility to protect individuals participating in the inquiry (American Psychological Association, 2003; Bell, 1987; Bolton, 2003; Cohen & Manion, 1994; Edwards & Talbot, 1994; Robson, 2002). Programme participants and colleagues had the potential to be harmed by this inquiry, therefore consideration had to be given to ways in which this could happen. For both groups, concerns
about confidentiality were obvious. In order to ensure this, the names of students and colleagues from within schools are not given in the dissertation, and neither is the name of the school.

Gaining consent from participants was more problematic. It was decided that no consent was required of those taking part in the process phase of the data collection as no data attributable to an individual was collected. For those who were interviewed for the outcome phase, full informed consent was requested. No attempt was made to conceal or deceive participants regarding the purpose of the inquiry. For those under the age of consent, parental permission was also sought. As the inquiry involved young people attending school, permission was also gained from the Local Authority Education Service. In addition, the head teacher of the school had to consent to the inquiry being carried out in their school.

In order to ensure that participants were aware of what they were getting into, a written version of the questions were sent in advance of the interview. Using written questions also had the added benefit of allowing the participants to reflect on their answers before being interviewed. Commitments were made to the Local Authority to provide a copy of the final dissertation.

Those whose consent was sought, were advised that the paper is only intended to be assessed by The University of Edinburgh, but if the issue of publication were to come up at a later date, and it was not be possible to seek additional permission the report may be published without further consent.

3. 7. Pilot interviews
Pilot interviews were carried out in order to detect any problems with the content or structure of the interview session. An interview with a programme participant and an interview with the young person’s Social Worker were carried out. Consent for these was obtained as if they were not pilot interviews, although both participants were notified that we would not be using any data gained from these interviews. Pilot interviews were a very worthwhile exercise as it identified some practical problems with recording and the use of additional microphones, but more importantly, it brought to attention some ethical issues.

During the pre-interview discussion with the young person, where confidentiality was being discussed, it occurred to me that, as an employee of Glasgow City Council, I could not promise confidentiality. Policy within the Council on issues relating to Child Protection states that I am obliged to act on information received from a young person, or vulnerable adult, that indicates matters that are harmful to them or others. The judgment on what thresholds apply here are very difficult. For example, if a young person discloses information about illicit drug use to the researcher (in this case me), the researcher’s views on drug use would inform the judgment on whether or not this was harmful. Miles and Huberman (1994) discussed these dilemmas, where under the title of Intervention and Advocacy they explore what moral or ethical duty the researcher has towards those being researched, or even to those affected by the people being researched. They did not come to any conclusions, but point out the potential dilemmas. These judgments were not necessary at the pilot interview stage, but changes were made to the consent form to reflect the limits of confidentiality that is actually available.

Additional changes were made to the consent forms to ensure that those being interviewed
understood that the interview would be tape recorded and then transcribed. In one of the pilot interviews the young person had not realised that a tape recorder would be used, this had almost resulted in him withdrawing his consent to be interviewed.

3. 8. Data Analyses

As mentioned earlier, the collection of data was carried out in two phases. First there was a quantitative review of the observed problem solving abilities of programme participants, while they were attending the programme. Following the quantitative review interviews were carried out with a sample of the young people who completed the course and two associated adults (chosen from their parents, teachers or social workers). The analysis of the quantitative data was reasonably straightforward. The data was tabulated and presented in a way that expressed what the researcher perceived as the relevant information. It was, of course, possible that I, as the researcher, would miss some of the relevant information that required presenting. In order to safeguard this as much as possible a review of the quantitative data was added to the colleague auditing process discussed below.

The analysis of the qualitative data was more complex. Robson (2002, p. 459) makes it clear that the reliability and validity of your interpretation is a serious concern and therefore you need to be able to demonstrate how you got from your data to your conclusions.

Writers in the field have suggested a number of approaches to analysing qualitative data. Consideration was give to the ideas of Tesch (1990) and Crabtree and Miller (1992). Both of these approaches constitute a progression from more to less structured and formal
The more formal approaches (quasi-statistical and characteristics of language) attempt to convert qualitative data into quantitative data. The less formal approaches (immersion and reflection) are particularly resistant to any systemisation of the analysis process. They were at first quite attractive, and initially seemed to be more in tune with the connoisseurship ideas discussed earlier. After consideration, they were discounted for two reasons. As the enquiry being carried out is practitioner research, it was felt that these approaches would not provide the degree of accountability that was required to validate this type of research. Secondly, I, as the researcher was inexperienced at collating qualitative data. It was therefore felt that a method that offered some structure to support the interpretation of the data, would be more beneficial.

Given the above, a middle ground approach was adopted. The interviews were transcribed and the process suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 9) was followed.

1. Give codes to the initial set of materials obtained from interviews.
2. Add comments, reflections (memos).
3. Go through the material and try to identify similar phrases, patterns, themes, relationships, sequences, differences between sub groups etc.
4. Take these patterns and themes out to the field to help focus the next wave of data collection. (This was not carried out in this research, as the data were not transcribed until after all interviews were carried out).
5. Gradually elaborate a small set of generalisations that cover the consistencies discerned in the data.
6. Link these generalisations to a formal body of knowledge in the form of constructs or theories.
Achieving meaning from the data was a long process that seemed to require long fallow periods that allowed for the consolidation of emerging patterns and ideas. Evaluating the data was, in this case, more problematic because of the sequence adopted. All the interviews were conducted and then transcribed. It was only then that the process of data analysis was commenced. Following this sequence did not allow for the possibility of checking some of the initial findings in further interviews. With hindsight, I believe this was an error and if carrying out this type of research again I would integrate the process of interviewing and data analysis to allow them to feed off each other.

Caution had been exercised in terms of what commitments were made to participants regarding allowing them to verify their comments and in offering copies of the final report to all those interviewed. Bell (1987, p. 42) suggests that both of these may not be attainable. As the interviews had been recorded, though, it was possible to verify the words spoken and confusion over the intended message did not appear to be a significant issue.

One nagging doubt remained at the end of this process. Was I too close to the project being researched to impartially decipher the available data? The deficiencies of the human as analyst are well recorded (Sadler, 1981; Robson, 2002). In order to test this it was decided to carry out a colleague audit (Robson, 2002). Two colleagues, with experience of managing the delivery of group-based intervention/diversion programmes to young people who offend, were asked to review the findings. They were sent a written copy in advance, one then took part in a short semi-structured interview, and the other provided written feedback. The point of this was to
establish whether the findings sat comfortably with them, were unusual but understandable or they were surprised and found it difficult to accept the findings. Carrying out a colleague audit provided valuable feedback and added validity to the findings.
4. Findings

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will review the data collected and summarise the findings that they produced. First, I will look at the findings generated by the staff of the Outdoor Resource Centre through the use of the problem solving scores. These were obtained from their observations of the young people during the seven weeks that they took part in the programme. An examination of the problem solving scores allocated to each of the young people will be used. In addition, it will also draw on the comments made in the ‘end of programme’ reports.

In the latter part of the chapter I will explore the comments made by the young people and the two significant adults chosen from their parents, teachers and social workers that took part in semi-structured interviews. It will also include input from the other professionals that took part in the colleague audit.

4.2. Attendance and completion

Before getting into ‘the meat’ of the observations made by the ORC staff, it is worth looking quickly at some basic data collected by them such as, the completion and attendance data. The programme is based on the principle of being voluntary. Attendance on voluntary programmes designed to work with young people on issues of behaviour can be enormously problematic. As stated earlier, the capacity for the period being researched was 30 young people. A total of 29 young people were recruited by the start of the programmes (one school withdrew a participant at the last moment without offering a substitute). Of the 29 who started, 26 (89%) completed the
programme and graduated. Of the three who failed to complete the programme, one asked to not continue after the first week, stating that it conflicted with other commitments, and the other two were asked to leave the programme. The two who were asked to leave, were asked do so because they were not adhering to their contract. The contract is described in an earlier chapter (p. 4).

Of those who completed the programme the average attendance was 81%. This percentage was actually brought down by a small proportion of the participants. Interestingly, 80.7% of those who completed had 100% attendance. The attendance statistics compares with a similar (although not identical) programme delivered without the ‘Outdoor Education’ approach, by Glasgow City Council. In contrast, the comparative project achieved an average attendance of 50% and an average completion rate of 49% in the programmes they had run over the past three years (Programmes Team, 2005).

4.3. Process measures

D’Zurilla and Nezu (1999) described researching problem solving as being divided into two areas known as process and outcome measures. The process segment is a measure of whether the programme participants have learned the component parts of the problem solving model, and the outcome is whether this is applied in practice. We will initially explore the process measures.

As discussed in the methods chapter, a six-stage observation based scale derived from a skill acquisition concept first proposed by Fitts and Posner (1968), was developed. The scale was
used to measure the extent to which the young people had acquired problem solving skills (Appendix ‘B’). The scale was developed over the previous year and was tested for consistency between staff. The following results were produced during the period examined.

Programme participants, in the period being examined, were selected on the basis that they had a score of one (early cognitive). As a starting point this was considered to represent an impoverished level of problem solving ability. Impoverished problem solving was generally reflected in the lives of the young people. One of the criteria for referral was that the young people were often making decisions based on an approach similar to the one identified in the scale as early cognitive (appendix ‘B’), and this was causing them problems either in school, at home or in the community.

Of those who completed the programme, one young person (3.88%) was observed to have not changed from this score. On reflection, it was considered that this young person might not have had the cognitive capacity to take part in this programme. A previous programme delivered to a group with mild learning disabilities had been quite unsuccessful. The delivery and style of the programme, as it is currently provided, requires a degree of cognitive ability. If the programme were to be delivered to a population with low cognitive ability, then the approach and delivery would need to be reconsidered because, as shown here, it is not effective with this group of people in its current format.

Six young people (23.2%) progressed, by the end of the programme, to a score of two (late cognitive). A score of two was a slight improvement on their initial score given at the beginning
of the programme. With this group of young people the ‘end of programme’ reports seemed to suggest an emerging theme. There appeared to be a lack of willingness to engage with the programme beyond taking part in the activities. This manifested itself in a resistance to the problem solving component of the programme. Most of these young people enjoyed the activities, but the improvement in their ability to solve problems was only slight, although an improvement of one point is not insignificant in terms of improved problem solving.

One of the ‘colleague auditors’ suggested that there might be a lack of a shared agenda between the tutors and this group of young people (McCreadie, 2006). The suggestion being that the young people had consciously agreed to take part in the activities, but may have either sub-consciously or unconsciously, decided that they did not want to take part in the problem solving part of the programme. They may even have gone as far as unconsciously removing permission for the tutor to engage in social problem solving training. Ringer (1999a; 1999b; 2002) has written much about the unconscious processes that take place within groups, and would appear to support this possibility. If there were not actually an agreement to participate in social problem solving training, it would result in a lack of engagement with the learning process.

Lack of consent to problem solving training from the participants seems partially congruent with the situation with this group of young people, but we have to remember there was some improvement in their problem solving score. It is possible that some engagement may have been achieved through the extrinsic motivation of the tutor, but with improved engagement it may be possible to improve this. McLean (2003) supports the idea that extrinsic motivation can achieve this, but through improved engagement with the learning process an increase in intrinsic
motivation will enhance the learning possibilities. Further investigation in to the possible ways of improving engagement, and therefore intrinsic motivation, is required in order to improve the effectiveness of the programme for this group of young people.

A further six (23.2%) young people progressed to a score of three (early associative). At this stage young people understand the model being proposed and are beginning to use it independently. Achieving this is significant for young people who started off with impoverished problem solving skills. At this stage they are beginning to apply problem solving independently. They may still need help, or at least prompting, at times. The young people will be identifying problems as they arise, and applying the problem solving model, in situations such as what equipment to carry on outdoor trips. They may still have some difficulty with more abstract issues such as; if I behave in a certain way what reaction will that elicit from others?

Eleven (42.3%) of the young people achieved a score of four (late associative). At this stage the young people have become reasonably skilled problem solvers. On occasion, they are observed choosing to purposefully use the problem solving model and apply the decisions without any prompting. More importantly, they are beginning to acknowledge the relevance of it in a range of circumstances. Those who reach this stage will be demonstrating the ability to contribute to some complex decisions, such as deciding on a passage plan for a two-day sail cruising trip (with technical support). They will also be beginning to understand that they have choices in terms of their behaviour, and as such, there are consequences to how they interact with others. In addition, they will be beginning to realise that it is possible for them to influence these outcomes, although this might still be quite difficult for them. At this stage some of the young people will
start to grasp how effective problem solving can empower them. This would concur with the findings of Lazarus (1966) and McGrath (1970). In relation to reductions in stress and depression, they noted increases in locus of control generated by improved problem solving abilities.

As, at this stage, consistency is being achieved in most of the processes this is significant in Fitts and Posner’s (1968) skill acquisition model. When consistency of performance is achieved, transference to another setting becomes more likely. The inference is that skills learned in one setting can be applied in another. This does not happen, according to their model, more reliably, until a score of five or six is achieved, but they do expect it at this stage.

A further two young people (7.76%) achieved a score of five (early autonomous). Five is an extremely high score for young people who started out with impoverished problem solving. It is worth pointing out that although this research is only examining the data from a single term, these data are actually collected for all programmes, and that a score of five has not been recorded before or since. For this reason it is considered to be not representative, and as such, in line with Miles and Huberman’s (1994) advice on checking for representativeness, these findings are not elaborated on. It may be that the young people in question were not appropriate referrals to this programme, as they may have started off with a score of more than one and the referral process had failed to identify this.
4. 4. Outcome measures

The intention of this segment of the research was to establish outcome measures by observing how the young people dealt with actual life problems they were experiencing at that time. Significant adults around them (chosen from parents, teachers and social workers) made these observations. Through these observations it was established whether or not they actually applied the problem solving strategies they had learned on the programme. As mentioned earlier, semi-structured interviews were used with the young people and the associated adults in order to generate this data.

The same questions were asked of the young people and the adults. In order to avoid the use of complex sentences in the following paragraphs to accommodate the different questions given to the young people and the adults, they are described below as they were asked to the adults. These should be considered to have asked ‘did you’ instead of ‘have you observed’ when applied to the young people. Eight separate interviews were carried out with three young people and six adults. The adults comprised of two pastoral care teachers, one member of Social Work staff and three parents (two parents were interviewed simultaneously). The interviews were carried out three months after completion of the programme. The questions are discussed under the five headings of the problem solving model (Appendix ‘A’)

4. 5. What do they want to achieve?
The interviewees were asked if, when presented with a decision/problem, had they observed any indication of the young person thinking in advance about what they would like to achieve. The young people generally answered that they had not consciously considered this, but they all went on to give examples of using problem solving to a greater or lesser extent, which involved planning a desired outcome.

The pastoral care teachers found this difficult to answer, observing that most of their contact with the young person would be after young people had failed to use problem solving adequately or, some other crisis had arisen. What could be established was, that contact between the pastoral care department and the young person had decreased, although the teachers had not noticed this until records were checked. In one case the young person had gone from four exclusions in the term before the programme to none in the term following the programme.

The member of Social Work staff interviewed was clearer. They had observed the young person (pupil ‘B’) starting to think much more about what he wanted to achieve and attributed this change to his attendance on the programme.

The parents also found this quite a difficult question. Although they could clearly observe other aspects of the problem solving process, they found it difficult to confirm whether their child had been forward planning in the way described by the interviewer. One parent though, did comment:

‘He could go two ways about it, he could jump in and do what he’s gonna do, whatever comes to his mind first, he can jump in and do it. Where as now, he can stand back and
go and think about it, whit he is doin, and work it out, and getting the right decisions’.

4. 6. Creating Options

The interviewees were asked if they had seen any indication that the young person was considering a range of options when faced with a decision. The young people found this fairly straightforward to answer and could give a number of examples of applying this in their lives since the end of the programme. The young people seemed more likely to use this in home situations or the community than in school.

For example:

   Interviewer: ‘So what options did you come up with’?

   Pupil ‘A’: ‘Jist, start hitten ma wee brother, or just leave it and go and tell ma ma and ma da (my mum and dad)’.

   Interviewer: ‘Had this been an option in the past’?

   Pupil ‘A’: ‘Naw’ (No).

At a separate interview his parents are referring to the same situation.

   Pupil ‘A’s mother: ‘He’ll still be goin mad. He’s shoutin and ballin and stuff, but he kin walk away without hurting him (his brother). Ballin, but at least he can walk away without doin it. So that’s an improvement wi him’.

Again the teachers found it hard to comment, but one of the teachers commenting on pupil ‘A’ could not see any changes in his ability to generate options. This would seem to support the pupil’s suggestion that they do not use it in school.
4. 7. What will be the outcome of each option?

Understanding the possible outcomes of each option is a crucial stage in social problem solving, and one with which most of the young people referred to the programme, have real difficulties. It is associated with consequential thinking. It was hoped that during the programme young people would be able to start considering the consequences of their actions for both themselves, and eventually, others. The interviewees were asked if they had seen any evidence of those who took part in the programme being able to make a connection between their actions and the consequences of those actions.

Both teachers were doubtful about the ability of the pupils to make these connections and thought that it was still as significant a problem for the pupils in question, as it had been before the programme. They were sure that both pupils were capable of making these connections, but often failed to do so in advance. One teacher felt that their pupil was able to make these connections after an event, but they felt that they had been able to do this prior to the programme.

The member of Social Work staff was quite enthusiastic about the improvements that had been made in the area of making connections between actions and consequences. She felt that this was an area of important change for the young person she worked with.

SW Staff: ‘I can see more of that in pupil ‘B’ (making connections)’.

Interviewer: ‘Do you think that has just come with maturity’?
SW Staff: ‘Well I don’t know, because I think it’s actually, I’ve noticed a bit, in a quite short space of time, so that, I don’t think he would be able to mature, or make decisions in such a, quite significant way in a short time, other than having some other involvement in that, and that would be this problem solving’.

The young people acknowledged that they now thought more about these connections than before. In one case, the young person had used this to decide that his poor attendance was counterproductive to him (my words) and had resolved to improve his attendance. He had achieved this for the previous three months.

Parents also found a change in this area.

   Father of pupil ‘A’: ‘Just yesterday his sister told us that some wee boy had been annoying him at school. Any other time he would have went and fought the wee boy, he never, he went and said to the teacher ‘listen miss the young lads annoying me’. He would never have done that, never done it before. He’s obviously stepped back and went and telt the teacher and its brilliant, he would usually have flipped and ended up suspended too, but now he’s usin the programme and goin, I’m gonna get into trouble here, whits the use of me getin into trouble’.

It is worth saying that these changes are not total, and parents comment that there are still times when, if they have made a connection, they do not behave as if they have.
4. 8. Choose the outcome

Choosing which option to apply should be based on the outcomes associated with the choices available as compared with the desired outcome. Before a question was asked, it was discussed with the interviewees the difference between coming up with a theoretical solution and actually applying one. The interviewees were then asked if they had any evidence of course participants applying solutions they had created. Again, the teachers had not observed significant changes in this area. Parents continued to be enthusiastic, pointing to the same examples already mentioned. They pointed out times when the young people had created responses beyond the first one to come to their mind, and then had successfully applied these to resolve the problem they were facing.

Choosing a suitable outcome did not appear to be a difficult stage for the young people. Once they understood the consequences of each of their options, and had decided on which option they wanted to apply, they seemed to have little difficulty in applying it.

4. 9. Is it working?

Examining whether a solution was working or not was more difficult for everyone. Interviewees were asked if they had seen any evidence of the young person evaluating their course of action in terms of its effect on themselves or others? There were no examples given by anyone interviewed of young people changing or reconsidering their choices after reviewing the action they had taken. The fact that there were no examples, of course, does not mean that they were not reviewing their actions. It does raise the possibility that this was maybe a weak area of the programme delivery, as there appears to be no evidence of the course participants applying any
kind of evaluation to their problem solving.

4. 10. Summary

The process measures were fairly straightforward to grasp and elicit meaning from. They suggest that this is an effective way of teaching the concept of applying a framework to improve impoverished problem solving. The programme would also seem to be very effective in attracting and retaining a population that would normally be very difficult to reach.

The outcome measures data is more complex and therefore more difficult to extract meaningful findings from. As they are presented as narrative, rather than numerically, they seem less persuasive. Having said that, there is a strong message that the problem solving framework is applied in most situations by young people who have completed the course. The objective in measuring outcome measures was to establish whether any skills learned were actually applied. The findings would suggest that the problem solving skills are applied, although, there are some concerns about whether or not this occurs in the classroom.

The success of the outcomes would tend to support the literature reviewed earlier in this paper that programmes are more likely to be successful if they are community based (McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte, 2003), use a participative and experiential delivery approach (Andrews, 1995; Raynor, 2000; Holin, 2000), employ a skills oriented methodology (Lipsey, 1995; Weissberg & Caplin, 1994) and use methods drawn from cognitive behavioural sources (Utting & Vennard, 2000; Whyte, 2003).
5. Conclusions

5.1. Introduction

While the previous chapter identified the data that were obtained from this research, this chapter will draw out some conclusions and meaning from the data. Many of the topics were anticipated in the literature review, but a number of topics ‘emerged’ as the process of analysing the data proceeded. Where a connection with the literature review exists this is explored, but where the topic was not covered by the original review, new literature was sought to support the conclusions.

The findings, in terms of process measures, are given in detail in the previous chapter, but an analysis of them would seem to support other writers view that a cognitive understanding of the various stages of problem solving can be taught quite effectively (Andrews, 1995; D’Zurila, 1999; D’Zurila & Maydeu-Olivaries, 2002; Gladwin, 1967; Ross & Fabiano, 1985; Trotter, 1999; 2001). In order for this to have an impact on offending behaviour these skills then need to be applied in practice (Andrews, 1995; Lipsey, 1995; McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Ross & Fabiano, 2001; Trotter, 1985; 1999; Utting & Vennard, 2000). As this was the stated objective of the programme evaluated, it is the issues around implementing problem solving, in practice, that will be considered in this chapter.

5.2. Transference of problem solving skills

While the sample for testing the outcome measures was small, it does seem to show that the problem solving approach is adopted by the young people in their home lives and in the community, but with more reservation in school. As this research only tested this with young
people who scored over three in the process measures, we can only assume this for those young people who achieved that score or above.

As noted in the literature review, a previous Scottish study (Biggam & Power, 2002) had shown an improvement in offender’s problem solving ability within a specific context (prison). They suggested that further studies should consider whether this transfers into the community setting. Some transference would appear to have occurred with this programme. The limits of this are discussed in a following paragraph, but the importance of transference was highlighted in their study

...the goal of training should not be to teach problem solving in relation to specific problems associated with a specific context (e.g. prison) but to teach and appraise a general strategy that the individual would be encouraged to apply in any context.

(Biggam & Power, 2002 p. 692)

Successful transference of problem solving skills to a home or community setting would also support the use of this approach as a preventative method. The use of problem solving as a preventative approach has been used with other clinical groups (D'Zurila, 1999; Heppner & Hillerbrand, 1991) and was a fundamental principle in the design of this programme.

The use of ‘social’ problem solving methods, as described in the literature review and the introductory chapter, went some way to reducing the problems that Biggam and Powers (2002) had in their study. They found that those who completed their programme had very little improvement in what they called ‘solution implementation’ and the ‘verification element’. In
this research we would refer to these as the ‘choosing’ stage and the ‘reviewing’ stage. Similar difficulties were experienced in this programme with the reviewing stage, but not with the choosing stage. As shown in the previous chapter this transferred to the home and community settings quite successfully. Biggam and Powers (2002) suspected the difficulties in solution implementation were due to the fact that their programme focused entirely on the cognitive elements of the problem solving process and paid little attention to the social skills competence of the participants. Ross and Fabiano (1985, 1990) would support this; they argue that successful intervention programmes must be complex – not unlike the offenders they are aimed at. This is supported in other similar areas of study, where approaches such as addressing impulsive behaviour as an isolated variable for treatment are unlikely to be successful (Harris & Rice, 1994). For this reason the programme had adopted a cognitive behavioural approach as explained in an earlier chapter. This approach would seem to have improved the solution implementation, or choosing outcomes, in terms of the young people’s ability to transfer these skills to a variety of settings.

While it was anticipated that young people would transfer these skills, and use them in day-to-day situations, it was not clear if they would use them in significant life decisions. In practice there was evidence that the young people could apply these skills to more important decisions. Two of the three young people interviewed described using the problem solving approach to help them make important life decisions. One young person explained stopping a particular offence that he had consistently taken part in prior to the programme. Another had used the approach to decide to remain in his ‘alternative to care’ service and not return to school.
5. 3. Reviewing

The final stage of the problem solving model used is ‘review’. The idea here is to consider the solution you are applying in the light of what you set out to achieve. If what you are achieving is as close to what you set out to accomplish as possible, then that is success. If not, you should return to stage two and reconsider your options, or if the situation has changed, generate new options (Ross & Hilborn, 2002). Little evidence could be seen, in terms of outcome measures, of this stage being attempted by the young people. The cause of this failing may be linked to the observation mentioned in the previous paragraph. As Biggam and Powers (2003) had observed, their programme was too cognitively focused, this may have been true of the review part of this programme. If this stage is considered important then a review of how this is approached during the training is required.

5. 4. Buying into the programme

Teachers, Social Work staff, parents and the young people themselves; all commented at some stage how much the participants had enjoyed the activities in the programme.

Pupil ‘A’’s father: ‘He came home from the programme every week, he absolutely loved it, there was nothing better. Sunday night he wiz getting himself up and getting his clothes ready, ‘I’m gon mountain biking, I’m gon canoeing and then I’m gon eh gorge walking’ he loved it, he loved it’.

Pupil ‘C’’s mother: ‘He was up out his bed and into school on the days of the programme. Every other day I have to drag him out of bed’.
This enjoyment seemed to manifest itself in high levels of attendance and engagement. Favourable attendance was expected of the programme because of the activity options that were integral to its delivery. These activities were seen as attractive to young people, and were therefore expected to play a part in encouraging engagement with the programme participants. The activities therefore, in addition to their main purpose of creating opportunities to problem solve, also functioned as a significant ‘hook’ to encourage attendance and engagement with the programme. As stated in the previous chapter, the programme was aimed at a population of young people that are traditionally difficult to reach and may even be considered ‘involuntary’ (Trotter, 1999). It is therefore worth briefly exploring some of the possible motivations for the high levels of attendance on the programme.

Behavioural theories argue that motivation is governed by a ‘stimulus – response’ mechanism (McLean, 2003). This can be seen most clearly in the carrot and stick approach. The reward and punishment approach has been very popular within education (McLean, 2003) and it is a deeply held assumption that this is what drives motivation. A behavioural component was explicitly adopted in this programme. This was part of the cognitive behavioural methodology that underpinned the way in which the staff engaged with the programme participants. It may be too simplistic an understanding of motivation to suggest that it is only about rewards and punishment. In the last 20 years a more complex definition of motivation has begun to emerge (Bandura, 1989; Covington, 1998; Eccles, Wigfield & Schiefele, 1998). The essence of the change in the way we understand motivation, is that it is now more commonly conceded that internal processes are the drivers to motivation as opposed to environmental factors. How we
view our ‘self’ is fundamental to what motivates us (McLean, 2003). Seeking out circumstances and situations that encourage us to feel competent, autonomous and loved by others (Deci & Ryan, 1985) dictate the motivation we have to participate in events. This manifests itself as ‘seeking out areas and experiences that offer a high chance of success; discounting the importance of and withdrawing from areas that produce failure’ (McLean, 2003 p. 8).

The delivery of the activities, in the programme being evaluated, in a way that anticipates success while still retaining a degree of challenge, may have tapped into this motivational model. Not getting to the top of a mountain was not presented or perceived as failure, as this was not a traditional outdoor ‘pursuits’ course where success or failure was conceptualised as successfully completing a predetermined task, such as climbing a rock face or paddling a stretch of river. Success was overtly and consistently conceptualised as creating opportunities to practice social problem solving. In addition, the removal of academic measures of success and the inclusion of social measures of success (Juvonen & Wentzel, 1996) may have resulted in an increased motivation, or willingness, to participate in the programme.

5.5. Dis-empowered Students?

The data indicated a lack of outcome measures for the use of problem solving within the classroom. At first, it was thought that the teachers were under-reporting the use of problem solving in school for some reason. Under reporting seemed to make sense, as the lack of the application of problem solving in the classroom did not seem consistent with what was being observed in the home or in the community. However, the emerging data were consistent and therefore it was concluded that this was an accurate observation.
If this were so, why would this be? A more detailed look at what had been said, showed that the young people were actually using problem solving in the school, only not in their relationships with some teaching staff. Not using problem solving was continuing to cause them difficulties in the classroom. One possible explanation is that they felt dis-empowered in the classroom to the point where they saw no value in attempting to apply a problem solving approach.

This was not an issue anticipated in the original literature review and subsequent design of the programme, but the idea of disempowerment would seem to have some support from elsewhere. McLean (2003) suggests that classroom pupils are intrinsically motivated to meet their needs for stimulation and self-determination, which he describes as empowerment. He goes on to suggest that this is only possible under certain classroom circumstances. These would involve a culture that was high on affirmation and low in the use of power. In addition, he suggests that affirmation leading to an empowerment dimension can create a sense of competency (McLean, 2003).

Sullivan and King (1998) describe empowerment within the classroom as existing when an atmosphere exists where students are supported, by the classroom community, to take responsibility for their lives within the learning setting. Additionally, other writers have commented that empowerment has an interpersonal (Brunson & Vogt, 1996; Kriesberg, 1992; Paz, 1990) and an intrapersonal dimension (Ashcroft, 1987). Interpersonal empowerment occurs when individuals or groups work with each other to meet their needs. Intrapersonal empowerment occurs when someone has belief in his or her ability or capability to act. Given, in
particular, Ashcroft’s (1987) ideas about intrapersonal empowerment, it would seem to make sense that if the programme participants did not feel ‘able or capable’ to use the problem solving approach in the classroom, where they did in other environments, something in the classroom was dis-empowering them. It would be easy to lay the blame for this at the feet of the classroom teacher, but as noted above the whole classroom community creates empowerment. Having said that, Kirby, Wimpelberg and Keaster (1992) noted that if empowerment is not carefully, cautiously and patiently massaged by the school it will fade. They go on to identify that the composition of the perceptions of staff, the personality and characteristics of the principal and the managerial expectations of the school district, will all be key influences in the empowerment of pupils in the classroom. The point being though, it would seem that young people do not feel sufficiently empowered to apply their newly learned problem solving skills in the classroom setting. Disempowerment in the classroom is offered as a possible reason for the findings in this research that would seem to fit with the data. This needs to be treated with caution, as the data collected was not intended to measure empowerment in the classroom. It does seem to be a topic worthy of further investigation.

5.6. Pluralistic evaluation

The observations by teachers that the problem solving was not applied in the classroom raised another important issue. Smith and Cantley (2001) refer to this as ‘pluralistic evaluation’. They argue that success is not a unitary measure; different interest groups will have different criteria for success. Simplistically, in relation to the programme being evaluated, teachers could be more concerned with conflict in the classroom, than with offending in the community. Conversely, youth justice staff may be more concerned about reductions in offending than reducing conflict
between teachers and pupils. Teachers may therefore have not reported significant changes for
the young people that they had contact with, because it did not impact on their area of concern
(i.e. conflict within the classroom). Re-examining the transcripts of the teacher’s interviews
would appear to support this, as what they actually reported was no reduction in classroom
conflict. Only reporting changes when they impact on the reporter’s area of concern has
implications for research of this kind, where a range of agencies are working in partnership.

5. 7. Gentle nudges

It became apparent, fairly early on in the process of analysing the data, that an important theme
was emerging. Where, after the programme had finished, a young person continued to have
contact with an adult who understood the programme content; there were improved outcome
measures. It seems that the adults were reminding the young person to use the problem solving
framework and this significantly improved the outcome measures. The reminder seemed to be
achieved mainly by the adults using ‘gentle nudges’. The use of gentle nudges had the effect of
reminding the young people about problem solving. There were two cases where the
effectiveness of gentle nudges was most notable. One parent, who had attended the graduation,
(all parents are invited, usually about 30% – 40 % attend) had taken away literature on the model
and continued to use it in the home. In the other case, the member of Social Work staff who co-
delivered the programme with the ORC staff, continued to have significant contact with the
young person. Both adults reported using ‘gentle nudges’ to remind the young people of the
problem solving process to great effect. Both adults noted that the need to do this declined with
time and was replaced by habitual use of the model by the young person.
Leberman and Martin (2004) support this concept when they argue that time is crucial in the experiential learning framework. They consider that often after the delivery of an experiential programme time allows for a quality of reflection. Moon (2000) supports this concept when he suggests that programme participants move through a sequence of ‘noticing’, ‘making sense’, ‘making meaning’, ‘working with meaning’ and in some cases ‘transformative learning’ (p. 146). The evidence, in this case, would suggest that this process continues after the programme has ended, with more effect, when there is someone there to encourage programme participants to continue to reflect on the processes of problem solving.

It would seem then, that the programme could be enhanced if there were adults around the young people who were able to continue to support and encourage the young people by the use of ‘gentle nudges’. Providing these gentle nudges would require that these adults were familiar with the concepts used in the programme, but it would appear that this would be a worthwhile investment.

5. 8. Final comments

Some caution needs to be exercised in terms of these results. We need to be careful about claims that ‘Outdoor Education’ *per se*, improves problem solving skills. This research shows that a programme delivered, as described above, was able to achieve an improvement in impoverished social problem solving.

A number of issues relating to the design of the research suggest that some prudence be exercised in the interpretation of the data. The sample size in the evaluation of outcome
measures was small, we therefore need to be careful about over generalisation. The findings were consistent though, so it is reasonable to claim that they are an indication of the effectiveness of this programme, but additional work would be required to generalise this to other similar programmes. In addition, as noted in the methods chapter, the sampling for the outcome measures restricted the interviews to those who had scored over three in the process measures and to males. Therefore, in terms of outcome measures, we can only suggest that the programme was effective for that group.

Taking into account the above caveats, the ability of the programme to improve impoverished social problem solving, would seem to be considerable. Demonstrable improvements were achieved in the social problem solving abilities of young people who took part. This impoverished problem solving was causing them problems in their home, school and community. As shown, there is strong evidence to support the belief that a reduction in offending can be expected. In addition, the increased locus of control will bring mental health benefits such as a reduction in anxiety and depression.

A programme, of the type researched, appears to be a point where ‘Youth Justice’ and ‘Outdoor Education’ can meet to great effect. There are many other possible places for these two fields to meet, and if Outdoor Education is to contribute to the improvement of ‘life chances’ for many of the most disadvantaged young people in our society, and create genuine, lasting opportunities for them, it would seem that further exploration of these possible ‘meeting places’ is an area worthy of further investigation.
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Appendix 1

Problem Solving Model

1. What do I want to **achieve**?

2. Create options

3. What will be the outcome of each option?

4. Choose the outcome that closest matches what I want to achieve

5. Is it working?

No. back to 2

Yes
## Appendix 2

### Decision Making Observation (process measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early cognitive</td>
<td>• No working model for decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficulty in accepting that a decision is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not believe that they can influence the outcome of a problematic situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No concept of creating choices or associating consequences with these choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing strategies involve using the first solution that comes to mind and then applying this irrespective of the effectiveness of solution or the harm that it is doing to themselves or others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late cognitive</td>
<td>• Have been introduced to a Decision Making model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cannot consistently define a what decision needs to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can some times recite the stages, but will normally need crib cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can only generate a list of useful options with support and prompting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finds the process of identifying consequences difficult even with support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finds the process of evaluation difficult even with support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Early Associative</td>
<td>Late Associative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | • Accepts that a decision needs to be made when prompted. With help can define the decision.  
• Can recite consistently the stages of the model.  
• Can generate options sometimes, but they are not always helpful or realistic.  
• Have difficulty identifying realistic consequences of options, will need prompting to complete this stage.  
• Can sometimes make the connections between abstract ideas about options and consequences and applying them.  
• With prompting will apply chosen option.  
• Evaluates when prompted, can find it difficult to reconsider option chosen if required.  
| 4     | • Is beginning to show consistency in independently identifying that a problem exists and defining it.  
• Becoming more consistent and skilled at generating options and being aware of the consequences associated with the options.  
• Becoming more consistent at applying the options.  
• Shows some ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the options applied.  
• Occasionally applies the model independently and without assistance.  
• Can see how Decision Making model can be relevant in other situations.  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Autonomous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can normally independently identify that a problem exists and accept this as normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Generates options independently and clear about the consequences of these options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Applies the option without support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluates effectively and reconsiders and reapplies options when required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can apply Decision Making model in a range of situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Late Autonomous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistently recognises problems as they occur and accepts that they are normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Generates options imaginatively and creatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Skilled and astute at evaluating the probable consequences of actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluates constantly and consistently, applies subtle changes to actions seamlessly and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can apply Decision Making in a range of situations and can manage group Decision Making sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Contract

Young Person/provider Contract

Name…………………………………

1. I agree to attend the ‘Active Decision Making’ programme for its duration.

2. I agree to be ready and available for agreed pick up times.

3. I agree to participate as far as I can in the group work programme and contribute to any discussions during my participation in the programme.

4. I understand that I will not be allowed to attend the group if I am under the influence of drugs/ alcohol.

5. I agree that if I do not keep my side of this agreement, I may have to re-negotiate my attendance on the programme.

6. I agree to keep confidential information I will hear about other young people involved in the group.

7. During the activities I agree to show respect for;
   • Myself
   • Others
   • Property
   • The environment

Signed: ………………………………………………Young Person

Date: …………………………………………………

In return the programme providers agrees to provide:

• A programme aimed at developing problem solving/decision making skills and demonstrating its relevance.

• A safe, enjoyable and active programme of activities.

• To be positive and supportive in our relationships with programme participants.

Signed: ………………………………………………Staff