MASTERS BY RESEARCH

Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales

Pritchard, Danielle

Award date:
2022

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

Link to publication

Bangor University

MASTERS BY RESEARCH

Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales

Pritchard, Danielle

Award date:
2022

Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales

March 2021

This summary has been produced by Danielle Pritchard, MA by Research student

School of History, Philosophy and Social Sciences, Bangor University

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. All other sources are acknowledged by bibliographic references. This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree unless, as agreed by the University, for approved dual awards.

Signed:D.Pritchard

Date: 01.01.2022

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Martina Feilzer and Prof. Stefan Machura for their guidance throughout this project. I would also like to thank NWP, the PCC and the navigators working for Checkpoint Cymru for their participation in this project.

As a young, single mother, it is important that I dedicate my thesis to my daughter Hallie (age four). From the day she was born, she has inspired me to push myself in order to give her the life she deserves and in order to show her we can always surpass expectation.

I would also like to dedicate this thesis to my granddad, Edward Terrance Pritchard, who has hugely supported my academic career. Thank you for all your support.

Contents

Abstract

Background: The evidence demonstrates the need to study diversion from policy custody. For clarity, police custody diversion is a process where offenders are diverted away from being charged or prosecuted and receive support to diminish the risk of recidivism.

Method: The original plan was to conduct a process evaluation of the implementation of Checkpoint Cymru using a mixed methods design. Due to the coronavirus pandemic, it was not possible to achieve the original aims and objectives. A new plan was implemented, and the researcher evaluated the implementation process through the experience of those facilitating, managing, and advising Checkpoint Cymru.

Results: The results from the research project indicated Checkpoint Cymru had a positive impact on recidivism and life change from a professional view. However, this was overshadowed by the navigator's frustrations and several organizational issues posing risk to employee wellbeing, the long-term success of the scheme and requiring attention. The wider findings relate most to the impacts of organizational conflict, the importance of effective communication and several take-home lessons for future research.

Conclusion: This thesis offers an honest and rare insight to the complexities of conducting research between two major organizations during a global pandemic. It demonstrates how things can go wrong when a partnership is fractured with minimal desire to acknowledge and deal with identified barriers.

Limitations: Methodological limitations inhibited the project achieving its initial aims and objectives. However, this was not detrimental to the project. In fact, this gave the researcher more scope to explore professional experience, producing important findings which otherwise may have remained undisclosed.

Introduction

This thesis reports on a fascinating research project conducting a process evaluation of Checkpoint Cymru, a diversion scheme to support vulnerable offenders and remove them from police custody in North Wales. The research adopted an inductive approach and was conducted without expectation or hypothesis. Instead, the research had one objective, to evaluate checkpoint from as many viewpoints as possible and to let the raw data determine the research focus. Although the pandemic caused several elements to change, the original objective was achieved, and the finished article offers a rare and candid account of the professional's experience of Checkpoint Cymru. Particularly, the barriers to implementation and the complex partnership between North Wales Police and the PCC. The purpose of this thesis is two tailed. On one hand the primary objective is to present the findings from the research project as intended but on the other, it aims to provide an independent place for some important truths to be heard. The aim is not to place blame on either organisation nor to aggravate already fractured relationships, but to encourage all involved to acknowledge wrongdoings and take the necessary steps to improve practise and diminish the risks posed to employee wellbeing and the longevity of a very promising scheme.

It begins with the original aims and objectives of the research project along with a summary of how the coronavirus pandemic changed the course of the project. This is important to clarify what was intended, what had to change and why. Next, there is a brief introduction to the diversion scheme evaluated in the research project to clearly outline what it is, who it is for and how it came to be operationalized in North Wales. Next, there is a review of the most relevant literature to demonstrate the project in a wider research context.

This review is split into two halves. Part one focuses on the empirical evidence and the need to shift away from formal sentencing structures and towards police custody diversion schemes and part two focuses on some prevalent research barriers affecting research in this domain. Once complete, the researcher's rationale behind the methodology is depicted alongside a detailed explanation about how covid-19 inhibited the original plan. Once complete, the findings from the project will be presented and discussed against the literature and later summarized in several concluding remarks. These remarks will depict the wider project findings along with the researcher's recommendations moving forward.

The research

In 2019, an independent research student from Bangor University was chosen by North Wales Police to evaluate the implementation process. This process was intended to take one year, starting in October 2019, and ending October 2020. The researcher was tasked with two primary duties. The first was to observe the implementation of Checkpoint Cymru and provide regular feedback to North Wales Police (NWP) and The Police and Crime Commissioners Office (PCC) regarding any issues, barriers, or concerns to implementation. The second duty was to evaluate the implementation of Checkpoint Cymru and present the research findings in a thesis at the end of the first year. In return, the researcher was paid via a stipend and received a Master of Research degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice under scholarship from Bangor University.

The researcher was able to plan and execute the project as they saw fit. The initial aim was to approach the project without hypothesis and/or expectation. Instead, using an inductive approach to allow the data determine the research focus. The researcher chose this approach for two reasons: 1) to reduce the risk of external influence and/or organisational bias, 2) to allow the research approach to evolve as and when required (Soiferman, 2010). Next the researcher chose to use a mixed methods approach. The aim was to combine

qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate checkpoint from different viewpoints (Kumar, 2018). For the qualitative data, the researcher planned to collect observation and interview data. The plan was to start with observation and use the early findings to inform the PCC and NWP of any issues, barriers and/or concerns surrounding implementation. Next, the plan was to conduct a series of interviews, starting with the professionals most involved with Checkpoint and rippling out to explore the experience of less involved professionals, service users and if time permitted, victims and/or families. In theory, this approach would enable a panoramic view of Checkpoint at different stages of implementation (Jewitt, 2012). To collect quantitative data, the plan was for the researcher to attend the police headquarters and/or research facility and access police data to monitor referral and evaluate the impact of Checkpoint Cymru on recidivism rates.

However, in March 2020, the coronavirus situation changed the course of the project and the research was unable to access data and achieve the original aims and objectives. All face-to-face research activity had to cease with immediate effect and only virtual and/or remote research could resume for the foreseeable future. The researcher had to decide whether to abandon the project or merely re-design it. Fortunately, the researcher had collected five months of rich observation data before the covid outbreak. Moreover, the researcher had already completed one face-to-face interview and this data was rich. However, alone, this data was not sufficient for a Master of Research Project. To proceed, the researcher had to consider alternative methods to generate new data and complete the project on time. Since quantitative analysis was no longer an option, the researcher decided to change the design to a qualitative approach. The new plan was to use the pre-existing observational data for context and to continue the interview process remotely. There is a full depiction of this later in the methodology section, but it is summarized here for clarity since this change enabled the project to survive.

The next section includes an introduction to the police custody diversion scheme evaluated in the research project. This section is important because it describes its prior use and success which encouraged its introduction in North Wales. Most of the information was collated from Gillian Porters paper "A Protocol and Experimental Trial: The Checkpoint Desistance Programme in Durham" (2015) since this is one of few available sources reviewing the initial trials.

What is Checkpoint?

Checkpoint was first introduced in 2015 and was created by a team of researchers from Cambridge University. Their objective was to conduct a radical policing experiment to see whether an alternative to formal prosecution could limit crime (Porter, 2016). Broadly speaking, Checkpoint was created on the premise of out of court disposals and offender management principles. More specifically, it is a four-month police custody diversion scheme which aims to address the underlying causes of offender behaviour such as mental health issues, adverse childhood experiences and substance misuse and/or abuse. The voluntary scheme uses a legally binding contract as means to deter clients from reoffending. Based on theories of deterrence and desistence, the contract includes several conditions tailored to meet the needs of the individual offender, their victim and/or society. In signing the contract, the offender agrees to complete the project adhering to the contract conditions and without reoffending. If the offender fails to adhere to the contract conditions, they are prosecuted in the traditional way. For those who complete Checkpoint successfully, they can bypass traditional prosecution. Subsequently, avoid a criminal record and have a second chance to live a better life away from the ramifications of crime.

In 2015, researchers from Cambridge University approached Durham Constabulary with aim trial Checkpoint under their authority. Durham Constabulary agreed to be the first force to operationalise Checkpoint. More than 2000 offenders from Durham and Darlington

agreed to take part in the initial trials. After two years, initial analysis found 90% of Checkpoint clients had successfully completed the programme without reoffending. Further, checkpoint clients demonstrated significantly lower recidivism rates (13.9%) than comparable out of court disposal cohorts. The early findings saw Checkpoint depicted as the most promising deferred prosecution scheme England had seen in a long time. In 2019, Durham Constabulary won the prestigious global Goldstein award for problem solving in policing and this influenced several different Constabularies to try and implement replicate schemes.

In 2019, North Wales Police and The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner joined forces to launch a version of Checkpoint in North Wales. They coined their version Checkpoint Cymru and aimed to offer support to offenders in both the Welsh and English language. North Wales Police employed nine specialist navigators to prepare, coordinate and deliver the Checkpoint contracts. A representative from the PCC was chosen to line manage the navigators and an Inspector from North Wales Police was employed to monitor and advise the implementation process. As North Wales is quite large, the plan was to introduce the scheme in three areas: St Asaph, Llay, and Caernarfon. To be eligible for Checkpoint Cymru, the offender must live local to the scheme and be over the age of 18. They must also be suitable for an out of court disposal and must not be subject to a court order or be on police or court bail.

Checkpoint Cymru also demands an admission of guilt and a sufficient level of evidence to proceed with traditional prosecution if needs must. Key decision makers are responsible for the identification of eligible offenders. Usually, this is the professional providing the first point of contact following the offence. In most cases, decision makers are police officers and/or custodial sergeants employed by North Wales Police. The decision to refer to Checkpoint exists at the professional's discretion. Subsequently, referral depends on

the decision makers knowledge of Checkpoint, the eligibility criteria, and the referral process. After a referral is made, it must be accepted by the line manager from the PCC. Once approved, the line manager allocates the case to a specialist 'navigator' who meets with the offender to draw up the Checkpoint contract. The navigator uses a carefully designed assessment tool to identify the criminogenic needs of each offender. At the end of the assessment, the navigator must review the answers to identify the most appropriate pathway for intervention and support. Once the assessment is complete, female offenders are referred to an external organization called Women's Pathfinders as a matter of routine. The specialist organization was commissioned by North Wales Police in 2014 and it provides tailored support to women in the criminal justice system. Male clients remain under the care of Checkpoint and it is the navigator's duty to monitor their progress until the end of the contract. If a client reaches the end of the contract without reoffending, they are discharged without further action. If they fail to complete, the client receives the original charge for the offence.

The next section includes a literature review to put the project in its wider context. As previously explained, the literature review is split into two halves and is comprised of the most relevant empirical evidence. Part one focuses on the need to shift away from formal arrest, charge, and prosecution and towards police custody diversion where the needs of offenders can be addressed. It goes on to explore the current evidence base for police custody diversion schemes to highlight what seems effective and ineffective with regards to diminishing recidivism, harm reduction and victim satisfaction. Conversely, part two is brief but addresses some research barriers related to custody diversion research and between organization work. Reviewing this literature is not only an important part of the researcher's preparation but will also be useful to reflect upon during the post implementation evaluation.

Literature review

This literature review starts broadly with the reason diversion was introduced. In 2018, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary proposed a national mental health crisis, stating police bodies were having to support mentally vulnerable individuals more than they should. The Constabulary declared officers were overwhelmed and overstretched by "a broken mental health system" that fails to support those in need before they deteriorate and become a danger to themselves and/or commit a minor crime (Charette, Crocker, & Billette, 2014). They stated forces are unable to respond proportionately and appropriately to vulnerable individuals in crisis and in most cases, they are arrested, remanded in custody, and criminalized unnecessarily (McKinnon, Thomas, Noga & Senior, 2016). Subsequently, they're problems only expand, and they fail to receive the support they need. In the United Kingdom, the number of interactions between the police and those in crisis has risen by 41% in the last five years, with an estimated 40% of incidents involving a mental health element (Bird & Shemilt, 2019; Livingston, 2016; Home Affairs Select Committee, 2015). The estimated economic cost of arresting, convicting and/or supervising people with mental health issues in the criminal justice system amounts to £1.6 billion criminal justice per year (Corner, Jones, & Honeyman, 2007). Arguably a disproportionate cost to pay for those who would better benefit from early intervention.

Several years prior (in 2009), Bradley published an incredibly influential report that looked at how people with mental health problems and/or special educational needs were dealt with in the criminal justice system (Home Affairs Select Committee, 2015). In the report he made a total of 82 recommendations to improve police interactions with vulnerable individuals (Lord Bradley, 2009; Prison Reform Trust, 2021; Durcan, Saunders, Gadsby & Hazard, 2014). The recommendation most relevant to this thesis being, the need for officers

to identify and divert low level/vulnerable offenders away from arrest, formal sentencing, and police custody and instead, towards assessment and treatment services.

Of course, the ability to divert offenders away from the criminal justice system depends upon the severity of the crime committed and the perceived degree of risk (DeMatteo, LaDuke, Locklair & Heilbrun, 2013). If appropriate, Bradley proposed pre arrest diversion could be used as an alternative to formal disposal to improve access to mental health support, reduce recidivism and save money (Heilbrun et al, 2012; Kane, Evans & Shokraneh, 2018). Interestingly, The Prison Reform Trust and the government accepted most of Bradley's recommendations (78 to be exact) and committed £50 million to a development programme to prioritise the evolution and introduction of diversion schemes (Durcan, Saunders, Gadsby and Hazard, 2014; Prison Reform Trust, 2021). However, as you may expect, there is little evidence to suggest Bradley's recommendations have influenced actual police practice (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2018). In fact, research suggests 39% of custody suites in Wales and England are occupied by vulnerable individuals suffering from a mental health issues and/or learning difficulties (Royal college of Psychiatrists, 2020; Committee on the Science of Changing Behavioural Health Social Norms; Board on Behavioural, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, 2016; HIMC, 2015). That is despite knowledge of the negative impacts on their health and wellbeing (HIMC, 2015).

If that was not concerning enough, an investigation by HMIC (2015) reported several inconsistencies in procedure and practice in police custody (both between and within forces), suggesting vulnerable adults had been subject to "poor treatment". The report stated custodial officers had removed clothing and used restraints (body belts or handcuffs) on vulnerable individuals as means to reduce harm and risk to the detainees. That is despite guidelines stating such restraints should only be used for individuals acting with violent intentions and should not be used on those experiencing mental distress (College of Policing, 2013). After

all, studies suggest misusing this equipment exasperates a detainee's mental state and in severe cases, this can be and has been fatal (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2015). Understandably, this report encouraged policy makers and governing officials to revisit Bradley's recommendations to improve the identification of vulnerable individuals prior to arrest, with aim to divert them away from the criminal justice system and towards support (Disley et al, 2016; Disley & Liddle, 2016).

The next section starts with the recommendations for identifying vulnerable people for diversion and the associated barriers. It then looks at the target demographic for Checkpoint Cymru. This is important to demonstrate how people should be identified for Checkpoint Cymru and who the clients are likely to be.

Improving Identification of vulnerable people: The Guidelines

Guidelines state police officers are responsible for the identification of vulnerable and/or eligible offenders (The Home Office, 2009). When a vulnerable adult is correctly identified by decision maker two responses could be considered appropriate. Should an individual meet the criteria set by the Mental Health Act 1983, a section II can be used as a community resolution, to divert a vulnerable individual into hospital admission (Department of Health, 2021). Where the individual falls short of the criteria, custody diversion presents as the most appropriate response to access support. However, the available literature suggests the identification and referral to diversion schemes is often inhibited by decision makers negative perceptions of diversion schemes.

One early study found professionals working in the criminal justice system (chief probation officers, clerks to justices, managers of mental health units and purchasers of mental health services) felt negatively towards diversion schemes because of poor transport arrangements, difficulties in hospital admissions and an overdependence on key people

(Blumenthal & Wessley, 1992). A more recent study found professionals felt custody diversion schemes were "positive in theory" but less effective in practice due to the increasing demand for them and resource limitations (Tyrrell, Bond, Manning & Dogaru, 2017). Another study by Meijer (2017) found professionals felt more negatively towards diversion schemes if they had worked in the criminal justice system for a longer period, demonstrating a resistance to move away from formal prosecution and punishment (Meijer, 2017). Arguably, this is because many of those working within this sector begin with the intention to punish those who commit crimes (Maculan & Gil Gil, 2020; Disley et al, 2016). CPS also voiced their scepticism of custody diversion schemes due to an adverse net monetary effect and fear of financial loss (Disley et al, 2016). The implementation of the National Model (2014) can be used to demonstrate the scale of this impact for CPS, as the number of cases diverted away from the criminal justice system and towards custody diversion schemes almost doubled per 1,000 arrests (Disley et al, 2016; Durcan, Saunders, Gadsby & Hazard, 2014). This resulted in a significant decrease in the demand for court use and an increased risk court closure. However, in attempt to avoid damage to the criminal justice system and courts, diversion schemes incorporate legal binding contracts, whereby an offender is redirected through postal requisition, should they fail to meet the demands of the agreement. Professional perceptions of diversion are important to consider in relation to the implementation of Checkpoint, for professional resistance towards the program seems likely and it may create a barrier to referral.

In the next section, the literature is used to review the target demographic. With aim to demonstrate the type of offender officers eligible for referral.

Low level, vulnerable and eligible offenders

For clarity, to be eligible for Checkpoint Cymru an offender must meet the following criteria:

1. The offender must be over 18

2. The offender must live in North Wales

3. The offence must have taken place within North Wales

4. The offence must be suitable for an out of court disposal

5. The offender must not be subject to a court order or be on bail

6. There must be an admission of guilt or sufficient evidence to charge

7. The subject must agree to participate.

Besides the above criteria, there is limited amount of information about the type of offender Checkpoint targets. Further, in general, there also a limited amount of research which has specifically explored first time and/or low-level offenders as most research focuses on severe criminality post sanction (Clark et al, 2016; Duwe, 2017; Cullen. Johnson and Nagin, 2011). Due to this, it is a relatively ambiguous domain and most of what we know comes from out of court disposals and prearrest diversion studies.

In most cases, out of court and prearrest diversion cohorts are made up of first-time offenders. A first-time offender is someone with no previous convictions who enters the criminal justice system as an adult (Prison Reform Trust, 2019; Motz et al, 2019). In most cases, this type of offender poses minimal risk to society and their crime was most likely unplanned. Rather, their offence is likely the by-product of poor decision making or a "one off" influenced by alcohol, substance misuse and/or strong emotion. If provided with an opportunity, first time offenders are likely to demonstrate remorse for their crime, take

responsibility and are unlikely to offend again (GOV, 2015). Still, if arrested, these offenders are criminalised, charged, and/or likely to receive a criminal record for their crime. Many consider this to be a disproportionate response to the crime, as criminal convictions change the direction of offender's lives by limiting life and job opportunities (Polaschek, 2012). Police custody diversion schemes were created with these individuals in mind and aim to offer them a second chance to learn from their mistakes, change their behaviour and lead a life without the ramifications of a criminal record.

Alternatively, some guidance permits the use of out of court disposal for low-level, habitual offenders, if proportionate to the crime (Dadashazar, 2017). This type of offender is likely to have a different set of needs to the average first time offender and their delinquency most likely started in adolescence as a by-product of trauma and/or adverse childhood experiences. To be clear, adverse childhood experiences include (but are not exclusive to) physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction. Developmental research suggests the impact of childhood adversity on the brain's development and how trauma is associated with a higher resting level of proactive and reactive criminal thinking alongside impulsive decision-making. Studies suggest this is often a stress response fuelled by heightened cortisol levels which means these individuals live in a state of fear or threat, causing them to act in aggressive and/or antisocial ways. Because of this, they are considered more vulnerable to mental health issues, substance misuse disorders and less likely to have access to support and intervention. Subsequently, they are more likely to engage in a criminality as a by-product of their life circumstances and/or dependencies.

Studies have found these low level, habitual offenders account for much of the 'repeat business' in police stations and courts, but often fall in the gaps between services. In most cases, their individual needs fall below individual service thresholds, particularly those of secondary mental health care. Left unsupported, their difficulties can often escalate leading

them to a succession of episodes in and out of the criminal justice system building up significant additional costs for the public purse. Checkpoint aims to offer low-level habitual offenders the rare opportunity for life change, to access support, intervention and have the chance to address previous trauma which otherwise would main unaddressed. Although it is unclear how many first time and/or habitual offenders will be accepted on Checkpoint Cymru, it is probable both types of offenders will be referred to the scheme.

However, the evaluation of The National Liaison and Diversion model (2014) could be used to gauge a possible proportion of offender type and need. For example, in the trial phase, most people referred to the scheme had committed theft, public order offences, violence against a person and/or a sexual offence. This is an interesting finding as sexual offences are not considered eligible for an out of court disposal and/or Checkpoint Cymru. Although, studies suggest ineligible cases often slip through the net at officers' discretion. Nonetheless, they also found some interesting data about the needs of those referred. They found 90% of people referred had at least one vulnerability, three quarters (71%) had a mental health need, over half (52%) had experienced substance and/or alcohol misuse and 26% reported having no previous contact with support services. Additionally, they found people with substance use vulnerabilities were most likely to decline referral and/or intervention.

The next section takes a closer look at Out of Court disposals as they were an important stepping-stone to police custody diversion. After this, there is a review of prearrest diversion and police custody diversion schemes, to demonstrate the knowledge of what works and what doesn't, pre–Checkpoint Cymru.

Out of Court Disposals

       This section is split into two halves. It begins with a summary of what an out of court

disposal is and how it is operationalized in practice. The second half explores the limitations

of Out of Court Disposals and these challenges influenced the decision to introduce police

custody diversion schemes in Wales.

What is an OOCD?

       Out of Court disposals were introduced as an alternative to prosecution (Ames,

Antonio, Hitchcock & Webster, 2018; Neyroud, 2018). They were intended to benefit police

practice by simplifying decision making and improving the flow of information and

transparency, to provide the best overall service to the public (Glen, 2017). They were also

intended to create a gateway to criminal courts to ensure the right cases were sent to court

and the less serious cases could be managed effectively away from court, constituting the

most appropriate disposal for the offence, offender, and victim (CPS, 2017; Ministry of

Justice, 2020). The introduction of OOCDs was accepted by Governments and

Constabulary's as a cost efficient, proportionate, and effective response to low-level

offending (Gibson, 2021). Traditionally, there are six types of OOCDs available: community

resolutions; cannabis/khat warnings; Fixed Penalty Notices; Penalty Notices for Disorder;

simple cautions; and conditional cautions (National Police Chief's Council, 2017). However,

in 2015, the Ministry of Justice, College of Policing and National Police Chiefs' Council

(NPCC) developed a new two-tier system to replace and/or simplify the current model

(NPCC, 2018). The two-tiered approach retained fixed penalty notices but limited the other

options to a community resolution (for less serious offending/offenders with limited

offending histories) and a conditional caution (for more serious offending/offenders with

more significant offending histories) (Ames, Antonio, Hitchcock, & Webster, 2018). Along

with this simplified framework, both disposals allowed the police to attach rehabilitative conditions and involve the victim in decision-making. The aim of this was to support vulnerable people in society through providing 'rehabilitative opportunities to offenders to turn their life around at the earliest opportunity' (NPCC, 2018).

Further, it was intended as a solution to help manage cases without requiring the cost of court time (NPCC, 2018). The new framework was not mandatory and the NPCC encouraged police forces to implement it at their convenience and when it was operationally viable for them to do so (NPCC, 2018). In 2020 it was adopted by 11 forces, North Wales Police included. A review of the framework suggested professionals preferred the simplified framework, victims appreciated the increased clarity during communication and the opportunity to be involved in the intervention process. Moreover, partner agencies reportedly felt the new framework had a more positive impact on offender's lives and desistance (Ames, Antonio, Hitchcock & Webster, 2018). However, as it was not mandatory, it could be argued the forces who implemented the new framework are more likely to have a biased opinion of its efficacy. After all, independent reviews found there was no difference between the efficacy of the old and new framework and both frameworks appeared equally meaningful and appropriate therefore to low level crime (Glen, 2014).

How out of court disposals influenced police custody diversion

The consensus seems to be, Out of Court disposals were an important steppingstone towards custody diversion. Remarkably, there were no experimental trials conducted before 2011 to explore the effectiveness of Out of Court Disposals against prosecution in England or Wales. Since then, the research is still quite limited and a lot of it comes from outside the United Kingdom and exclusively focuses on juvenile offenders. Nonetheless, most of the data suggests out of court disposals are more effective than formal processing, particularly if

elements of restorative justice were included in the conditions. For instance, one systemic

review of 19 studies found diversion to intervention reduced criminal recidivism, drug use

and improved psychological functioning. Further, it was considered most effective in older

individuals (i.e., closer to adulthood) (Harvey et al, 2007). Moreover, an evaluation by the

Victoria Crime statistics agency explored the efficacy of police led diversion in drug users

and found a significant reduction in reoffending levels compared to formal sentencing

(Coughlan, Sutherland & Millsteed, 2016). Even more, some studies suggested interventions

that incorporate elements of cognitive behavioural therapy were effective for anger issues,

substance misuse disorders drug and in all psychoeducational schemes targeting general

offending. There is also some evidence to suggest education and employment support benefit

offenders' lives. For example, Sampson and Laub (1993) found having a job was one of the

most important elements to encourage someone to desist from crime. Moreover, most of the

evidence suggests drug treatment can be effective. Although it is less clear what interventions

work best for different drug users.

     Whilst OOCDs provide some possible benefits, there were several pitfalls to be learnt

from. The main concerns include whether appropriate decisions are made, whether the use of

OOCDs results in net widening and up-tariffing, and whether there is consistent decision-

making in their use between and within police forces. For instance, a joint inspection of Out

of court disposals by the police, the Crown prosecutors, and the joint Criminal Justice

Inspectorate (Neyroud, 2016) found officers overuse OOCDs to meet performance targets

and implementation is varied and at times, inappropriate. Moreover, as there is a lack of legal

legislation to guide the use of OOCD's in practice (there are brief guidelines) they can be

flexibly used or not used at the decision maker's discretion (Hucklesby & Wahidin, 2013;

Ministry of Justice, 2020). Different forces were found to use OOCD's at different

frequencies, dependent upon operational and financial viability, their knowledge of the

framework and the associated benefits (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2011).

Even more, there were some latter concerns about the use of Out of Court Disposals for

women and the use of out of court disposals for domestic violence and hate crimes. For

example, two studies found Out of court disposals were not appropriately tailored to the

needs of women and that custodial officers felt untrained and unprepared to handle the

complexity of the disposal conditions for female offenders. Further, another study found it

was more effective to divert female offenders to a specialist women's center to address their

criminogenic needs opposed to formal processing (Brennan et al, 2016). To be clear, this

meant replacing an out of court disposal (arrest and police custody visit) with tailored

intervention and they found this reduced recidivism in comparison to a cohort processed

through the criminal justice system. Alternatively, National guidance discourages the use of

OOCDs for domestic violence and/or hate crimes yet research suggests misuse often occurs

"under the radar". One study by Westmarland et al (2017) found there was regular and

widespread use of OOCDs for domestic abuse in the UK despite studies suggesting diversion

intervention is not effective for domestically violent offenders. Unaddressed, these concerns

posed a risk to public confidence and this influenced several compelling arguments to explore

other a less formal alternative to pre-court diversion (Gibbons, 2021).

The next section explores the less formal disposal method of diversion.

General diversion: What is it?

To be clear, the term 'diversion' covers a wide range of models across the criminal

justice system, from initiatives that seek to keep 'at risk' individuals out of the criminal

justice system altogether to those that provide an alternative to custody. The concept of

diversion stems from two theoretical ideas. The first, labelling theory (Becker 1963)

suggested processing people through the criminal justice system does more harm than good,

because it inadvertently stigmatizes and ostracizes people for having committed relatively minor acts that can be dealt with outside the formal system. The second, differential association theory (Cressy 1952; Sutherland 1974), suggested unnecessary exposure to the criminal justice system causes antisocial attitudes and behaviours modelled by delinquent peers. Although diversion is delivered outside of criminal courts, it still requires offenders to be accountable for their behaviour (Mackin et al, 2010; Beck et al. 2006). It also offers offenders the rare opportunity to address the root cause of their offender behavior via broader community service alternatives (Harris et al, 2011; Leve & Chamberlain 2005; Osgood & Weichselbaum, 1984).

Historically, diversion schemes in the United Kingdom were reserved for the juvenile offenders. The decision to trial diversion in an adult offender demographic was considered a crucial turning point for the criminal justice system yet the roll out of diversion in this demographic has been slow (Kelly & Armintage, 2015; Birmingham, 2001; Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2009). To date only half of England and Wales have access to some type of diversion scheme (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2018). Additionally, it is notoriously difficult to study the impact of diversion in real world settings and most studies are inhibited by methodological challenges (Compton, Bahora, Watson, & Oliva, 2008: Parker et al, 2018). Subsequently, there is a limited amount of reliable research- conducted in the UK- assessing the efficacy of diversion. Having said that, internationally, there is strong evidence to suggest general pre-court diversion reduces reoffending, improves victim satisfaction, and reduces the costs to the criminal justice system. Further, there is promising wider evidence to suggest pre-court diversion is particularly effective for vulnerable women, young adults, and individuals with substance misuse and mental health illnesses. Scholars from the Centre of Justice Innovation reviewed the international evidence and created a

number of 'promising principles' intended to guide ongoing trials in the UK. The principles state diversion should aim to:

- Deliver timely needs-based interventions based on individual risk levels and to address the cause of the offender's behaviour.

- Reduce net widening as research suggests this frees up resources and improves systemic effectiveness and public safety.

- Adopt a broad eligibility criterion to avoid unnecessarily low referral numbers and to ensure all suitable offenders have access to support.

- Consider how remorse and a formal admission of guilt may depend on subjective trust in the criminal justice system and be mindful of this when assessing individual eligibility.

- Ensure the referral process is quick and simple to build compliance and encourage police officers and/or other decision makers to make a referral to the scheme.

- Make victim satisfaction and procedural fairness a priority to maintain and/or improve public trust

- Avoid 'overdosing' offenders with intense interventions which some may struggle to complete

- Ensure partnerships are strong and that all the agencies involved share the aims of the scheme and a vision of how it should be delivered.

Collectively, the recommendations offer some insight to what works broadly in diversion. Although the international research can not be directly applied to a UK setting. The next section takes a closer look at the specific evidence base for police custody diversion schemes as already stated, diversion is broad, and it is important to focus on the literature most relevant to Checkpoint Cymru.

Police Custody diversion schemes in the UK: what do we know?

To be clear, police custody diversions scheme -like Checkpoint Cymru- aim to divert low level offenders away from the criminal justice system entirely. Rather, providing eligible offenders with the chance to receive support from community support services. Unfortunately, there is not yet a large enough evidence base to demonstrate the efficacy of police custody diversion on recidivism rates. This is because most UK trials are ongoing, and evaluations are yet to be complete. Nonetheless, the general early evidence for this domain is positive and suggests police custody diversion schemes increase the likelihood of desistence and reduce offender behaviour (Webster, 2018). Further, by allowing offenders to avoid the criminal justice system altogether offenders bypass self and societal labelling effects known to reinforce criminal identities (Wilson & Hoge, 2012; Wilson, Brennan & Olaghere, 2018). Research also shows individuals who take part in police custody diversion schemes are less likely to struggle with severe mental health issues in the future and less likely to be held The Mental health Act in comparison to offenders punished via formal prosecution (Prison Reform Trust, 2021). However, due to the challenges of conducting research in this area, some studies have produced conflicting results. For instance, Schwalbe et al (2012) initial analysis found the impact of police custody diversion to not be significant. However, a latter review of the evidence suggested police custody diversion scheme was effective, particularly if family and restorative justice elements were used. The evaluation of The National Model (2014) was also inhibited by methodological limitations in a similar way. For example, The National Model (2014) was implemented in ten trial sites in April 2014. Each site was evaluated against a comparative site with no available diversion services. However, it was not

possible to devise a robust evaluation of the model because there was an issue obtaining a sufficient level of qualitative data across certain geographical locations, in particularly where access to L&D services was lacking (Disley, 2016).

Subsequently, comparison was only possible at four out of ten trial sites (Disley, 2016). In addition to this, there was an issue obtaining data relating to the impact of the model on mental health outcomes, substance misuse issues and other vulnerabilities covered by L&D services. This was because several sites had L&D services prior to the model's introduction, thus support was already available. Many others have experienced a similar issue whereby studies exploring the efficacy of diversion is inhibited by inconsistencies in design, aims, content, program delivery and the nature of comparison groups (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2018; Little & McGovern, 2014; Adler et al, 2016).

However, two recent evaluations of new police custody diversion schemes demonstrated more success and were less inhibited by methodological limitations. Although still in the early stages of implementation, Operation Turning Point and Checkpoint Durham have shown early signs of promise regarding their impact on recidivism and victim satisfaction. The next section includes a brief review of these evaluations to explore what worked.

Operation Turning Point (OTP) is a randomised controlled trial based in Birmingham. It was created by a team of scholars from Cambridge University, and it was operationalized by West Midland's Police. Much like Checkpoint Cymru, the scheme aims to "compare the relative effectiveness and cost benefit of police prosecuting low harm offenders with treatment and a turning point contract, which combines a deferred prosecution with a set of conditions agreed with the offender, which are intended to support desistance" (Neyroud, 2018; Coutts, 2018). The evaluation of Operation Turning point has been ongoing for five years and the early findings suggested the scheme reduced recidivism rates and improved

victim satisfaction by 43%. On this basis, the researcher team offered several recommendations in terms of early achievements and areas for improvement. These included the importance of treatment plans, using measurable conditions, attainability, and elements of restorative justice (Robin-D'Cruz & Whitehead, n.d.). The researchers also noted an organisational reluctance to refer eligible cases to the scheme. Decision makers (custodial officers, police officers and other relevant professionals) were found to reallocate eligible cases away from the scheme despite acknowledging the offender met the referral criteria. A barrier to bear in mind during the evaluation of Checkpoint Cymru.

Comprised off the recommendations of OTP and based on theories of deterrence and desistence, Checkpoint was implemented in Durham Constabulary in 2015. Like Operation Turning Point, Checkpoint is a voluntary deferred prosecution scheme that offers an alternative route to criminal justice proceedings (Marder, 2018). Through a mutually agreed contract, individuals must comply with a set of contract conditions with the added 'Sword of Damocles' that state 'should an offender fail to comply with the contract conditions, they will be formally prosecuted (Weir, Routledge & Kilili, 2019). To ensure the individual remains eligible for postal requisition, the checkpoint contract must be completed within a period of four months. The implementation phase was reviewed by a team of researchers from Cambridge University, with intent to found out if Checkpoint offers a more effective alternative to criminal justice process. The early findings offered some evidence that Checkpoint reduces the level of re-arrests, reoffending, harm, and cost to police (Weir, Routledge & Kilili, 2019). For example, re-offending rates for checkpoint clients who completed the initiative dropped to 4%, in comparison to clients who failed to complete the initiative (19%). Further, checkpoint participants exhibited a greater reduction in the severity of reoffending offences opposed to a comparative OOCD cohort (Checkpoint (94) V OOCD (106)). What this means is that on average, someone who reoffends from the OOCD cohort

incurs 12 more days of custodial sentence than someone from the Checkpoint cohort. Therefore, to put it simply, it appears, to some degree, Checkpoint Durham works.

Durham Constabulary (2016) also reported a cost saving of £160,000 in the first year of implementation. However, some argue Checkpoint Durham was likely to produce more positive outcomes because it is a voluntary diversion scheme. Studies show offenders who are motivated, engaged, and ready to change, are more likely to accept a voluntary referral to Checkpoint and desist (Claes & Shapland, 2019; Lauwaert & Aersten, 2015). Therefore, Checkpoint's success may, to some degree, be mediated by the Checkpoint client prototype. Additionally, although considered successful, Weir's (2019) evaluation suggested methodological limitations were still inhibitory to some degree, particularly around the projects design. For instance, as a quasi-experimental methodology was used the sample size was small and this meant there were no random allocation to conditions. This means the impact of individual difference was more likely and we cannot yet confirm that Checkpoint has the potential to diminish recidivism and harm posed to victims on a mass scale (Neyroud, 2017). Still, the early success of the scheme was recognised at a global level for its effort to break the negative cycle of crime and punishment and Checkpoint Durham won a National Award from The Howard League for Penal Reform for diminishing reoffending rates, reducing police and court time, and giving offenders the chance to avoid a criminal record or identity. Further, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC) reviewed the scheme hailing Durham Constabulary the "Best force in the Country" with special mention to Checkpoint as a 'revolutionary way to deal with low level offenders' (Durham Constabulary, 2015). Still, the potential impact of methodological limitations is something to consider when evaluating Checkpoint Cymru as although improvements have been made, limitations remain noted.

Now the evidence base has been explored, the next section takes a brief look at some issues which may or may not affect the current project. These issues are most relevant to partnership work and may be used for reflection at the end of the project.

Part two

Part two includes a summary of some limitations related to conducting research within a criminal justice context. To be more specific, it starts with the challenges associated with partnership work and then it explores the replication crisis.

Since the literature related to partnership work is rather limited, this section is shorter. Still, it was important to include this section to demonstrate the researcher's knowledge of some potential barriers which may or may not inhibit the project.

The Challenges associated with Partnership projects

This section begins with a brief review of the reason partnership work was introduced, before exploring research recommendations to reduce the risk of partnership challenges. In the last few decades, police organizations have had to adjust to a new way of working to combat rising crime rates, increasing demands from stakeholders, and diminishing public resources (The House of Commons, 2018). Governing officials introduced partnership projects to combine resources, skills, and knowledge to achieve better results in managing problems more effectively and efficiently (Lasker, Weiss, & Miller, 2001). However, research suggests the outcomes of partnership work are less successful in practice. Academics report it is often difficult to conduct research in the criminal justice environment due to the nature of police culture (NPCC, 2015). For example, the core values of police loyalty, hierarchical organizational structures and the use of discretion can make it difficult for researchers to obtain truthful data and this reduces data quality and the likelihood of

organizational change (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; NPCC, 2015). Although little is known

about the exact factors which contribute most to this issue, some scholars have made

recommendations based on personal research experience. The recommendations used in this

thesis were made by Jenny Wise (2010) and were included as they felt most relevant to the

current project.

Recommendations

- Researchers should remind the partner organization of their shared stake in the

  project. Additionally, that their aim is to intent help the organization without

  judgement or placing blame. Instead, to rectify problems and work towards best

  practice. This is important to reduce the negative impacts associated with

  external evaluation but also build rapport. Research suggests police

  organizations prefer working with researchers who want to help and improving

  their agency, as well as researchers who demonstrate they value the knowledge

  of police officers.

- Researchers should also emphasize partnership work is mutually beneficial and

  can be a two- way exchange. For example, reminding the police organizations

  that they can benefit from a fresh research perspective and utilize the researchers

  experience with statistical analyses, survey designs, sampling, data quality

  control and/or evaluation designs. Additionally, the researcher should remind

  the organization of their right to challenge the researcher if they challenge the

  traditional assumptions of the organization. Reiterate discussions are welcome

  and they are welcome to question how ideas could be implemented and what

  impact they would have in their specific setting (Rynes, Bartunek, & Daft,

  2001). If comfort can be found in this dynamic, it is likely project will benefit

  from empirical research with agency experience.

- The researcher may also find it helpful to remind the partner organization of the value of honest, independent research and how findings can be used to improve practice and project outcomes. In line with this, the researcher can remind the organization that partnership work improves third party credibility which provides an internal utility to agencies and improves trust with stakeholders and the public. This may improve their perception of the cost/benefit related to being observed.

- It is also important for the researcher to be empathetic and supportive towards the partner organization as it can be difficult to be observed and receive constructive feedback from an outsider.

- Research also suggests both sides of the partnership should commit to effectively managing interpersonal relationships. To be clear, this involves building trust between partnership members and establishing effective and ongoing communication about expectations, roles, and long-term goals for the project. Both police organizations and researchers will need to feel comfortable with the state of the working relationship.

- Additionally, the organization should attempt to limit turnover rates as this can create a barrier to the projects development. This is because change requires new members to be brought up to speed, buy in must be re established and interpersonal relationships must be renewed and improved. Thus, during the first year of implementation, too much change should be avoided.

- Scholars also suggest the importance of geographical proximity. They found organizations preferred researchers located in or near their community. This proximity allowed for a higher level of researcher involvement and interaction.

- Researchers should also be aware of the institutional Demands for Both Partners and how this can influence project outcomes. For example, the police organization exists in an agency whilst the researcher resides in an institution. Subsequently, an academic institution carries a broader set of rules and regulations which can result in agency concerns, or the concerns of legal representatives. This can create difficulty in the sharing of data with researchers due to confidentiality, data control issues, and potential liability.

- It is also imperative for the organization partner to communicate what they expect and/or want expected from the researcher, and the researcher must explain what is needed from the agency to conduct the research. This communication includes discussing the various roles for all participants, procedures for accomplishing the project, and the work products that will result.

- It is important for both partners to inform each other about issues, changes, and progress. The most successful partnerships involve partners who have mutual respect and genuinely like each other.

- It is important for the law enforcement executives and officers to trust the researcher as it relates to the project, it is more important for the researcher to be trusted as a person. The researcher's motives for engaging in a partnership are central to this trust, with concern about whether the researcher enters with objectivity or bias and whether the researcher will exploit the relationship for personal gain. In addition, addressing these concerns and forming a strong relationship is not only the key to establishing the partnership, but it is necessary to sustain one. One study found successful partnerships were mediated by the level of trust built between partnership organizations and the external researchers. Where trust was achieved, the data was more transparent and easier

to collate but where trust was absent, partnerships were found to be less successful and the data more ambiguous. To build trust, research suggests factors such as grant funding and the geographical proximity of partners can be used to influence the success of the partnership and the quality of data. If achieved, studies suggest there is a higher level of researcher involvement and interaction, which the practitioners preferred and viewed as facilitating the interpersonal relationship between partners.

- Scholars note it is best to adopt a narrative approach to data reporting and analysis. This is because it offers an opportunity for researchers to reflect not only on the personal experiences described by participants in a qualitative study, but also on their own research process. Bell (2002) found that the narrative approach could highlight the unexpected impact of the research or learning process on the researcher.

- Some researcher suggests practical difficulties occur even where official permission to conduct research has been granted. These problems include fear and suspicion about what the research was examining and fear of reprisal from senior colleagues about what was said to the researcher. This fear led to some participants declining to answer certain questions, or when they did answer, using ambiguous responses.

Prior to the start of the project, the researcher reviewed these recommendations and used them to prepare for any obstacles. However, unlike the traditional partnerships depicted (between a police organization and an external researcher) the partnership in the current project is a little bit more complex. It is comprised of three separate organizations (North

Wales Police, The PCC, and an external researcher). Therefore, it is unclear to what extend this will heighten or defuse some of the issues mentioned.

The replication crisis

Interventions that are successful in promoting behaviour change typically influence attempts to replicate (Bell, Bhana, McKay & Peterson, 2007). There is often an expectation that successful interventions, like Checkpoint Durham, should be replicable and able to be "scaled up" for much wider use. However, this is rarely the case. In fact, most of the empirical evidence suggests successful intervention outcomes become less effective or completely ineffective upon replication (FitzGerald, Martin, Berner & Hurst, 2019; Carroll et al, 2017). In fact, only one third of all psychological studies published in premier journals demonstrate successful replication (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2021). Scholars coined this issue 'The replication crisis' whereby most behavioural science studies are unlikely to be replicable (Hillary & Medaglia, 2020; Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2021). Academics created several theories to try and explain why this issue exists. The most prevalent theories are explored.

Some early studies inferred that social priming inhibits replication (Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg, 1998; O'Donnell et al, 2018). For clarity, priming is "the process by which a recent reference (often a subtle, subconscious cue) can increase the accessibility of a trait" (Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2021. Pp.1). However, latter studies failed to replicate the impact of priming on replication and subsequently, belief in this theory was diminished (Shanks et al 2013). Other theorists offered a more defensive and accusatory explanation for this issue, blaming a minority of unskilled professionals who attempt to replicate original findings and,

in some cases, even falsify data. For example, several well-known psychologists (Marc Hauser and Karen Ruggerio) admitted to faking their results on a number of occasions to demonstrate successful replication (Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2021; Roediger, 2012). This theory was problematic for psychological science, for it led many to question the credibility of psychological research (Laraway, Syncerski, Pradhan & Huitema, 2019). Conversely, others suggested small sample sizes inhibit successful replication for results may be the result of chance and less to do with an accurate representation of an entire population (Vasileiou, Barnett, Thorpe & Young, 2018; Faber & Fonseca, 2014). Others argue the 'quality of replication' influences replication outcomes, stating new interventions fail to follow the original procedures closely enough and substantive changes are often made to adapt the intervention to a new site, to keep them up-to-date, or to tailor them to a new population (Davis et al, 2015). In this case, scholars query, "under what conditions can we expect an intervention of demonstrated efficacy to continue to be efficacious; how far, or in what dimensions, can we change an intervention and still be confident that it is the same intervention, and will have the same effects" (Hillary and Medaglia, 2020; Earp & Trafimow, 2015).

Other theorists argue the replication crisis reflects poor levels of control, standardisation, and resource differences (Oberauer & Lewandowsky, 2019). For example, several studies found successful replication, even if replicated by the same person, is often unachievable due to the issue of time, individual difference and issues surrounding fidelity (Stroebe & Strack, 2014; Barnow & Greenberg, 2013; Zwann, Etz, Lucas & Donnellan, 2019). This is because time impacts replication, as there is always a change to the original environment because the exact moment in time is not a replicable thing (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2021; Fidler, 2018). Additionally, individual differences in new or old participants (mood changes, tiredness, life factors etc.) mean replication can be inhibited (Stults-

Kolehmainen & Sinha, 2014; Troy et al, 2018). However, large sample sizes can arguably diminish the impact of this (Kaplan, Chambers & Glasgow, 2018).

A more recent discovery surrounds the suiting of the intervention to the cultural context of participants (Howarth et al, 2016). Research suggests this inhibits the strict fidelity of replication, which for years was considered the gold standard recipe for successful replication (Earp & Trafimox, 2015). For clarity, scholars used to advocate strict fidelity to the content and procedures of the original project underpinned success (Hagger & Weed, 2019). However, more research has suggested that interventions with strict fidelity are still not likely to reproduce the same results for uncontrollable factors mean interventions may be a replicate of the original but without the same essence (Morrison et al, 2009). Scholars have explored this issue as a 'tension between fidelity and adaptation' and state that is not an easily resolved issue nor is it yet clear. Others refute this suggesting successful replication depends upon the exact replication of a set of core elements underpinning an interventions success (Deaton & Cartwright, 2018; Dallery, Cassidy & Raife, 2013). Yet studies infer it is often unclear which core elements (most often design, methods and content) are most importance for successful replication, making replication difficult (Losel, 2018). An important issue to highlight for the analysis of Checkpoint Durham remains incomplete.

Nonetheless, it is important to reflect upon these theories during the post implementation evaluation, to review whether Checkpoint Cymru fell victim to this replication issue in any way and if changes in time, environment, cultural context and differences in application variables (methods, designs and context) impacted the implementation outcomes.

Methods Section

The methods section is structured to reflect the exact evolution of the project plan, before and after the covid-19 outbreak. At the start of the project, there were several aims and objectives. Then due to covid most of the research aims could not be achieved. To complete the project, the researcher had to come up with an alternative plan to maximize pre-existing data and continue to evaluate Checkpoint remotely. The aim of this methods section is to clearly outline the research journey as intended and achieved. It starts with the research aims, approach and plan for data collection and then explores what was achieved before covid struck. It then explores the researcher's thoughts behind the amendments chosen, to clearly outline the shift towards a new project plan.

Pre covid methodology

Before covid, the researcher approached the project without hypothesis and/or expectation. Instead, using an inductive approach to allow the data determine the research focus. This approach was chosen because it is flexible and considered an effective way to reduce the risk of organisational influence and bias. Further, it is considered an effective way to condense extensive data into a concise report (Thomas, 2003; Aspers & Corte, 2019). However, the researcher was asked to identify any issues, barriers, or concerns surrounding implementation. Arguably, this might have caused the researcher to pay closer attention to negative findings. Nonetheless, neither the stated aims nor research approach changed following the covid-19 outbreak. In fact, the flexibility of the research approach was fundamental in the survival of the project. This was because the new restrictions meant several elements had to change (depicted later in this section) and had a more stoic approach been chosen, the project might not have survived.

The next section explores the original research design and plan for data collection. Both of which were amended due to covid-19 yet declared for transparency.

Original research design

Before covid, the original plan was to adopt a mixed methods approach and combine rich qualitative data with quantifiable statistics. The researcher reviewed the empirical evidence and felt this was the most holistic approach to evaluate the implementation process and research outcomes with integrity. The plan was to collect data from three different sources to fulfil three separate aims, as listed: observation for context, interviews to represent rich, subjective experience and quantitative data to measure the dose, scale, and impact of Checkpoint on recidivism (across one year).

Data source one: Observation approach

From the start, the plan was to start with observation and continue to observe the participants in their natural environment and/or context until the end of the year (October 2019-October 2020). The plan was to gather as much rich and/or raw data as possible to help the PCC and NWP identify and overcome barriers to implementation. The researcher intended to make notes and create observation transcripts and/or reports to present to both organizations and to include in the final thesis. For clarity, the researcher managed to complete five months of observations before covid-19 struck. Subsequently, this aspect of the original plan was achieved as intended.

During the five months of observation, the researcher adopted a naturalistic approach, observing behaviour within its natural context. The researcher felt this was the best way to let raw data generate new theory, without manipulating or controlling the environment. They researcher felt this would make the data more ecologically valid than if it was to be observed within an unnatural clinical environment.

To be clear, the observation data used in the final project only focuses on the navigators, the line manager and the advisor from NWP. This is the case because covid-19 inhibited the researchers access to other professionals, service users and/or other people of interest. Nonetheless, it is important to depict the original target demographic as was it was intended.

The original plan was for the navigators to be the core focus of the observations and to take a phased approach to explore their interactions with other people of interest across the year. The researcher chose this approach for several reasons, including they were most involved in the day to day facilitating of Checkpoint Cymru, they were the first professionals in post, and they are the only cohort which interacts with all the other people of interest (line manager, advisor, NWP professionals, third sector workers, clients and so on). Subsequently, the researcher felt it was important to shadow this group of professionals and build a strong rapport with them, to enhance access to participants who might be busy, difficult to reach and/or difficult to engage with.

Additionally, the researcher adopted a strategic plan to approach the observations in stages. Essentially, starting with internal professionals and rippling out to explore the view of external participants. The exact protocol is depicted below:

- Phase 1: the researcher should start by observing all aspects of the navigators training, gather as much data as possible and provide regular feedback.
- Phase 2: Once the navigators are trained and in post, the researcher should follow the navigators into their day-to-day role (as much as clearance and/or research restrictions allowed).

- Phase 3: The researcher should then begin to observe the navigator's interactions with their line manager from the PCC and the advisor from NWP, in both formal and informal settings.

- Phase 4: Next, the researcher should begin to utilize their rapport with the navigators to speak with and observe their interactions with other relevant professionals (for example custodial sergeants, officers, or police officers).

- Phase 5: then the researcher should begin to observe the navigator's interactions with service users, third sector organizations and other people of interest.

During the first five months, the researcher managed to complete phase 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the original protocol. Ideally, the researcher would have repeated the observations across the year, but this was inhibited by covid.

The next section depicts the original plan for the researchers position during the observations. This position was not compromised by covid although made difficult by extraneous variables.

Research position for Observation

The researcher decided to overtly participate in the observation sessions because the empirical evidence suggests overt participation improves trust, rapport and the quality of the data obtained (Thomas, 2016). It is also an ethically considerate approach as there is no deception involved and participants can provide informed consent to participate (Lugosi, 2006; Pols, 2017). Additionally, the researcher felt this approach was the best way to observe behaviour in a closer proximity, making it is less likely desirable behaviours would be missed (McLeod, 2015; Crilly & Cardoso, 2017; Carston, Tracy-Bronson & MacLeod, 2015). However, the researcher remained mindful direct observation increases the risk of Hawthorne

effects and social related bias (McCambridge, Witton & Elbourne, 2014). To diminish the risk of bias, the researcher took precautionary measures and told the participants the data would be anonymized. This meant telling participants all behaviours would be recorded without identifiable markers and the focus was to observe the general behaviour of the entire group. Moreover, the researcher chose to flexibly transition between an inside and outside research position, to gain the best insight to the scheme but also to maintain professional boundaries and distance (Duwyer & Buckle, 2009). Again, no part of the research position was compromised by covid-19.

The next section depicts how the researcher recorded the observation data. This is important to enable replication but also to identify potential strengths and limitations.

Recording the observation data

The researcher reviewed the literature to determine the most appropriate way to document behaviour in alignment with an inductive approach. The researcher felt it was best to adopt an unstructured approach and record all relevant and/or interesting behaviour without too much structure or system (Austin & Sutton, 2014). This approach was chosen as it allowed the research focus to be guided by behaviour without external (conscious or subliminal) influence and/or bias. The plan was to record behaviours of interest in note like form (mostly bullet points) for ease of recording and to be discrete. The researcher planned to convert the notes into in-depth, reports the same day or the day after the observation had taken place. The researcher decided to adhere to this approach to enable the most accurate recall but also to ensure recall was not inhibited by burn out. After all, some of the observation sessions exceeded typically nine to five hours (if travel was included). Moreover, the researcher felt this slight flexibility would allow them to add additional observations, notes, or reflections the following day, for narrative context. This was particularly beneficial

post covid-19 outbreak since more observation data was required to make up for the loss of quantitative data. Although observation was mostly unstructured, the researcher created a brief protocol/ set of guidelines to follow for their safe practice and to enable replication.

The researcher followed this protocol during each observation session carried out pre covid:

- North Wales Police and professionals from the PCC are responsible for providing the researcher with all relevant information and/or schedules to enable observation.

- Ideally, the researcher should be given the relevant information with at least one weeks notice to ensure they can attend and to plan travel. This is important because of the naturalistic approach and since the navigator's train and work across North Wales (mostly across Llay to Caernarfon).

- The researcher must try to observe as much as possible across the year of implementation and consistently commit to objective observation- this means adjusting the research position if the researcher feels their objectivity is becoming compromised.

- The researcher must agree to withdraw from the observation sessions or miss a session if they feel inhibited by fatigue or if the researcher feels their objectivity is compromised and the research position can not be amended. This should be documented in observation notes and/or reflective dairies.

- To ensure best and safe practise, the researcher must not engage in observation sessions which exceed six hours.

- The researcher should try and prioritise observation sessions and limit them to four per week. This is important to ensure notes can be written up without affected recall or fatigue.

- During observations, the researcher must take regular five-to-ten-minute breaks at the end of each hour, to eat, drink or get some air. This is important to avoid fatigue and/or adverse affects to attention or focus.

- Before each observation session, the researcher should remind the participants they will be observed and inform them of their right to withdraw their data from the observation notes. Alternatively, that they can ask to be excluded from the observations altogether as it is not a condition of their working contract.

- The researcher should regularly inform the participants that they are being observed as a cohort and the interest is general themes of behaviour. This is important to highlight the researcher is not directly observing individual behaviour.

- The researcher should keep all notes confidentially without identifiable marls and convert the notes into anonymous detailed reports after the session or the following day.

- Ideally, all observations notes should be recorded on a laptop and written up using Microsoft word. However, if a laptop is not accessible or appropriate, the observation notes can be made on paper and then shredded once written up (as depicted above)

- None of the data should contain identifiable information, including sex and/or gender.

The researcher followed this protocol during the first five months of observation. Limitations of this approach are discussed in the post implementation evaluation. The next section depicts how the researcher interpreted and reported the observation data.

Reporting the Observation data: a narrative approach

Due to the subjective nature of observation, the initial aim was to use a narrative approach and include the data in the final project for context only. This approach was chosen because it does not compromise the quality and transparency of this project, yet it respects the importance of the researcher's experience and/or reflections (Jahan, Naveed, Zeshan & Tahir, 2016). Additionally, it is considered a good way to synthesise and interpret a lot of data into perceivable and enlightening report which represents behaviour within its social and cultural context (Moen, 2006; Sharp, Bye & Cusick, 2019). It is important to note, this approach was chosen before covid and was used in the final project. The reporting approach is mentioned briefly here as it was a part of the original plan, but a more detailed depiction of can be reviewed later in the final revised design.

The next section introduces the original plan to collect interview data. Arguably, the primary data source in this project.

Data source two: The interviews

For clarity, the interviews account for most of the data used in the final project. However, the methods used to acquire the data remains one of the most affected elements of the research project. Before the covid outbreak, the researcher managed to complete one interview using the original data collection plan. The rest of the interview data was collated post covid using alternative methods. Still, it is important to be clear about the original plan and to explain how the first interview was carried out.

Broadly, the original plan was to conduct regular interviews using a semi structured interview schedule. The researcher chose a semi structured approach as it is flexible enough to explore avenues of interest but also structured enough to keep the interviews on track and diminish unhelpful rumination on one subject. The plan was to begin the interview process a few months after the observations had began and use the observation data to create an

interview schedule. The plan was to include set questions to obtain more information about what we already observed but also to keep that flexibility to explore new avenues or areas of interest. Further, the researcher planned to incorporate some questions about the impact of Checkpoint on recidivism and life change. This was important to gauge if Checkpoint was achieving its aim from an internal or external view. The researcher planned to continually review the interview plan and adjust the structure if required. Further, the plan was to update the interview schedule every few months to reflect the stage of implementation, the most current issues and to explore if any planned changes occurred.

The aim was to use a phased approach to the interview process, starting internally and rippling out towards those on the receiving end of Checkpoint. In align with this, phase one would explore the experience of the navigators, the line manager and the advisor from NWP. The researcher felt it was best to start with this cohort as they are most involved with the day-to-day delivery of Checkpoint and subsequently likely to offer the most accurate insight. Then the plan was to start phase two and interview the professionals less involved but still relevant to the scheme. These professionals include police officers, custody sergeants, the PCC, the Chief Constable and external third sector organizations. The aim was to use phase two to explore an external professional view of Checkpoint and get a new angle of what works and what doesn't. In the third phase, the researcher intended to explore the service users experience to understand if they felt the service was effective if it met their needs and how it could improve. Lastly, if time permitted, phase four and five would be used to explore the experience of victims and family members. This would allow an understanding of the schemes impact on their sense of safety and/or desire for revenge.

In theory, all five phases would enable the most well-rounded view of Checkpoint Cymru. However, if time was an issue, the researcher planned to focus on the first three phases as this still enables a look at Checkpoint from different viewpoints. Once complete,

the plan was to repeat the interviews every few months to explore and/or monitor any issues and/or changes in experience. However, covid inhibited this approach and the final interviews were restricted to accounts by the navigators, the line manager and the advisor from the PCC.

Additionally, it is important to note that due to the literature review, the researcher remained mindful that conducting in-depth interviews, in a criminal justice context, can be challenging. This is because police and political organizations are largely closed organizations who are resistant to externally based research. Although it is unclear if these issues will inhibit the current project, it is important to document.

The next section introduces the original protocol for the face-to-face interviews.

Original Interview protocol: face to face interviews

The researcher created an interview protocol for consistency. The researcher planned to review the interview protocol (depicted below) before each interview to ensure the same format was used for all.

- All face-to-face interviews should take place in a confidential room.
- Each interview should follow the semi structured interview schedule without time restriction.
- All new points of interest should be explored. The participant must read the information sheet and provide consent to participate.
- The researcher must explain the interviews will be recorded on a secure, password protected recording device, used to create anonymous transcripts, and then deleted.
- The researcher should inform the participants of their right to withdraw from the project during and/ or after cessation.

- The researcher should then start the recording device stating the date, phase, and job role of the participant.

- No identifiable information beyond this should be given. The researcher will then complete the interview schedule.

- At the end of the interview, the researcher should ask the participant if they have any questions and provide them with a debrief sheet.

- The researcher should thank the participant and end the recording.

- The interviews should be transcribed within 5 days of the interview using Microsoft word.

- Once transcribed, the original recording should be destroyed to protect the anonymity of the navigator.

As already stated, this protocol was followed for one face to face interview completed before the covid outbreak. It is merely included for transparency and to enable replication should restrictions lift in the future. The next section introduces the approach chosen to analyse the interview data.

Analysing the interview data

The researcher reviewed the literature and chose to analyse the interview data using Braun & Clarke six phase (2006) model. It uses an inductive approach to thematic analysis and enables the data to determine the research focus by generating key themes of interest. Although many elements of the original plan changed after the covid outbreak, the approach to interview analysis remained the same. The exact process used is depicted later in conjunction with the revised project plan. It is merely mentioned here to demonstrate how this approach was part of the original plan.

The next section introduces the original plan to collect quantitative data. Although inhibited by covid and clearance restrictions, the plan is included for transparency.

Data source three: Quantitative data

The quantitative data was most reliant upon access to external research facilities and specific security clearance. At the start of the project (October 2019), the researcher completed the appropriate paperwork and applied to North Wales Police for the appropriate clearance to attend the police research facility and access the RMS database. The researcher was informed approval may be subject to delays of up to six months, as approval was prioritized per protocol and/or police system. This matter was outside the researcher's control. Due to police recruitment and ambiguous delays, the researcher did not receive full clearance until March 2019 which corresponded with the outbreak of covid-19. Subsequently the researcher was unable to attend the police research facility to access the RMS database and/or conduct quantitative analysis as planned. Still, the research plan is depicted to be clear about what was intended.

The researcher planned to approach the data with an open mind as until access was granted it was not clear which type or how much data they could have access to. At the start of the project, the researcher met with a statistician from North Wales Police and discussed some areas they could start to look at once clearance was approved. Because of the nature of Checkpoint and police interest, the researcher and the statistician agreed it would be appropriate to monitor the dose and scale of Checkpoint to evaluate the schemes impact on recidivism rates. The advisor from NWP also expressed they were keen for the researcher to compare the outcomes of Checkpoint Cymru with an OOCD and/or Checkpoint Durham cohort to see how they compare. Additionally, the advisor wanted to researcher to explore the characteristics of some of the offenders. After all, there is little information about this demographic. Separately, the researcher was interested in how the police data could be used

to track referral rates across the year and how the police data could be combined with qualitative reports to identify and remove barriers to the referral process and/or service user engagement. However, as previously stated, this was not possible due to the covid outbreak.

The plans to collect quantitative data are explored in greater detail during the post implementation evaluation, to infer what we might have learnt from this data under different circumstances.

To ensure the reader has clarity, the next section briefly summaries all the elements achieved from the original plan and taken forward into the final project. As already depicted in part, this is important to avoid confusion.

What was achieved from the original plan?

From the original plan, the following was achieved:

- The researcher completed the first five months of the observation plan and collected rich observation data focused on the navigators, the line manager, the advisor, and some other police-based professionals.

- The researcher also managed to complete one face-to-face interview with a navigator in the week prior to covid. Although alone, the interview transcript was not sufficient, it provided an hour-long transcript which could be and was utilized moving forward.

- The researcher also managed to partially complete the first research duty and used the observation data to provide feedback to the PCC and NWP regarding barriers to implementation. However, it is important to note, the efficacy of the feedback sessions was inhibited by several governance issues, particularly an ambiguous power imbalance between NWP and the PCC. It seemed further aggravated by the PCC's discomfort with negative findings. However, this matter is thoroughly reviewed in the

results, discussion and concluding remarks section for it is a small part of a much wider issue.

The next section attempts to clearly outline the reasons elements from the original plan had to change and the researchers thought process behind the choices made.

What had to change and why?

Once covid struck, the first step was for the researcher to assess the new research context and understand what had to be abandoned with immediate effect. The first decision was to abandon the quantitative aspect of the project and change the design from a mixed method to a qualitative approach. This decision was influenced by three factors: 1) initial vetting delays inhibited data collection for the first few months, 2) covid prevented the researcher from attending the police facility to access RMS and collect police data, 3) the advisor from NWP was redeployed to deal with covid and was unable to help the researcher explore alternative avenues for quantitative data analysis. Subsequently, there was no way to obtain a quantifiable measurement of referral or recidivism to compare the outcomes against an OOCD/Checkpoint Durham cohort.

The next logical decision was to cease all observations and any further face-to-face interviews to prevent the spread of covid. The researcher carefully reviewed what had already been achieved (one interview transcript) and how to proceed. As stated in the previous section, the researcher had five months of rich observation data and one lengthy interview transcript, therefore it made sense to find a way to maximize the pre-existing data and obtain more. The researcher knew direct observation was not going to be an option for a long time thus had to consider the best way to obtain more interview data remotely (virtual interviews V written responses).

The researcher explored the possibility of conducting virtual interviews over zoom, attend anywhere or Microsoft teams. However, the researcher felt this was not the best way to proceed since the participants were working from home and this meant other members of their family or household may be present. Subsequently, this may have compromised their confidentiality and been disruptive or distracting. Even more, the researcher felt the virtual interviews might be unhelpful, as both the participants and the researcher were adjusting to a new kind of social isolation and subsequently, felt the interviews may be misused as means to socialize. Because of this, the researcher felt it was best to provide the interview questions in writing as this seemed to be the most appropriate way to keep the interviews focused on Checkpoint opposed to the effects of the pandemic.

The researcher was aware this approach has its limitations relating to structure flexibility/data quality control and these will be discussed in the final limitations section. However, at the time, it felt like the most ethical and considerate option since the professionals were adapting to a new way of life and they could complete the interviews at their convenience (Fox, 2006). Additionally, the researcher was aware the navigators were wanting to use the interviews as means to formally document some ongoing issues with the line manager from the PCC and their general dissatisfaction in post. By providing set questions in writing, the research felt this might limit unhelpful ranting and instead, give the participants time to focus on each question and think about their response to ensure they got their point across. The researcher also tried to encourage the participants to open and up and provide as much detail as possible by including prompts at the end of each question. The researcher also created a contingency plan to follow up any answers which might benefit from further explanation.

Therefore, the new simplified interview protocol was:

- The researcher will provide the interview questions over email and ask the professionals to return their answers (and consent forms) within two weeks.

- The new interview schedule should include the same 18 questions intended for the face-to-face interviews with the addition of prompts for elaboration or examples.

The next section depicts the exact procedure to enable direct replication.

Exact procedure for remote interview data collection

The researcher sent ten interview packs via university email to eight of the navigators, the line manager from the PCC and the advisor from NWP. The professionals were asked to start by reading the information sheet (Appendix C) and then complete the consent form (Appendix B). They were then asked to complete the interview schedule and provide as much detail as possible (Appendix D). Once complete, the participants were asked to read the debrief sheet and to contact the researcher if they had any questions (Appendix F). The participants were asked to return their responses and consent forms within two weeks via email. Once the data was received, the protocol was to anonymize the data and remove all identifiable markers, including gender and/or sex references. The researcher should compile the data into one document and begin to read, code, analyze and interpret the data using Microsoft Word (to view an example of a coded transcript see appendix E). As depicted earlier, the researcher followed the original plan and used the same approach to analyze and interpret the qualitative data. To clarify, the observation data was written up using the original plan to take narrative approach and the interview data was reviewed and interpreted using Braun and Clarks (2006) thematic analysis model.

Analysing and reporting the interview data

For note, the covid-19 restrictions did not affect or change the original plan for the analysis and reporting of the interview data. As planned, the researcher used Braun & Clarke (2006) model and adopted an inductive approach to thematic analysis. This approach was chosen as it provides a flexible and trustworthy approach to analysis by generating new theory from raw data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Nowell, Norris, White and Moules, 2017; Gabriel, 2013). The researcher followed Braun & Clarke's (2006) six-phase process. In phase one, the researcher became familiar with the interview data. In phase two, the researcher generated initial codes and systematically coded data using an inductive approach. In phase three, the researcher reviewed the codes to identify the most prevalent themes and subthemes across the data. In phase four, the researcher reviewed the themes and identified four key themes. These were comprised of multiple sub-themes (see full thematic map in Appendix). In phase five, the researcher used a thematic map to define and refine the themes with regards to the essence of meaning. In phase six, the researcher reformulated the data into a detailed report, using the empirical evidence to explore each theme and subtheme in context.

Insufficient data collection

Two months after the first round of interviews, the researcher attempted to obtain more interview data in a second round of interviews. A new interview package was created and distributed to nine navigators, one line manager and the advisor from NWP. The interview package was comprised of a new set of 6 questions related to the Covid-19 situation and how this was impacting the implementation process. Participants were asked to return written responses within four weeks. Only 3 limited responses were returned, and the data was considered insufficient for analysis. For this reason, this data is not included in this thesis as it does not add to what we already knew. Still, the attempt to obtain more data is declared for transparency.

What next?

The next step was to decide how to bring the data together to evaluate the entire implementation process. The aim was to conduct a post implementation evaluation to determine whether the project was delivered as intended, to highlight mediators of impact and to ensure the project was credible. Theoretically, this approach would give the researcher a good insight to what extent outcomes may have been different, how issues and/or barriers could be improved and why certain interventions can work for some populations but not others (Leask et al, 2019; Clarke, 2019). This design also allows the researcher to use the experience of the professionals to better comprehend their understanding of the components of the intervention to ensure structures are clear and service users needs are met (Bee, Brooks, Fraser & Lovell, 2015). The current guidelines depicted by The Medical Research Council (MRC) state, process evaluations should "assess the fidelity, dose, amendments, reach and quality of implementation" to thoroughly evaluate the implementation process (Limbani et al, 2019). Therefore, this framework will be used during the post implementation evaluation.

The next section clearly outlines the participants involved in the final project and the ethical considerations and commitments made before the project began.

Participants

Participants were recruited using a purposive sampling method (Palinkas et al, 2015). In the final project, 11 participants took part. Due to the small number of participants, all identifiable markers beyond a job title and/or previous experience have been removed from the thesis. They are removed to protect the participants anonymity and for confidentiality purposes. The participants include the navigators who facilitate the scheme, the line manager from the PCC and an advisor from North Wales Police. Throughout, the participants are

referred to using their job titles for example "a navigator said" or "the line manger felt". For transparency, the line manager and the advisor may be identifiable to stakeholders, other professionals, service users or peers involved with the scheme. This is unavoidable because of the nature of their roles. However, the researcher followed the ethical guidelines depicted in the next section to ensure safe practice and to ensure the psychological safety of all involved.

Ethical considerations

This section demonstrates the steps taken to conduct an ethical project and protect the participants and the researcher.

Prior to starting the project, ethical approval was sought after and obtained from the Ethics Board at Bangor University (Appendix A). The researcher followed BPS guidelines and committed to conducting ethical and valid research (British Psychological Society, 2014).

The researcher reviewed the risks posed to the participants and considered them to be minimal because there was no deception used, the participants were informed of the research aims and each participant had the choice to participant or disengage from observation and interview. Although the risks were minimal, several ethical considerations were made to protect the participants from harm.

The participants were informed of their right to withdraw from participating at any point. They were told they could withdraw from observation and interview at any time without having to provide reason. In the case of distress, the participants would be given external agency details (Samaritans) to access additional support. To protect the identity of participants, the researcher removed all identifiable markers from the observation reports, interview data and final thesis. No line and/or page numbers are used in the transcripts to

heighten the anonymity. Following BPS guidelines, navigator's names are replaced with their job title (for example: a navigator, the line manager and the advisor from NWP) and no gender or sex references are included in the thesis. However, the line manager from the PCC and the advisor from NWP may be identifiable to those working for or in partnership with Checkpoint Cymru. This is declared for transparency purposes.

There were several ethical risks to consider for the researcher due to the length and nature of observation and the fact it is a partnership project. The risks include but are not exclusive to the risk of fatigue, emotional stress, disruption, and professional boundaries. To counter the risks, the researcher committed to taking regular breaks at the end of every hour, kept a reflective journal to monitor the emotional impact of the observations and/or project on their wellbeing and consulted with their mentor at Bangor University on a regular basis for support. The researcher purposeful chose to transition between an insider and outsider research position to make sure they could maintain professional boundaries.

Now the research methods have been outlined, the next section includes the project findings via narrative and thematic analysis.

Results and Discussion

There were no pre-existing expectations or hypotheses used in the final project. The researcher used an inductive approach and decided to let the data determine the research focus. As the researcher was chosen to conduct a process evaluation of the implementation of Checkpoint Cymru to inform the PCC and NWP of any issues, barriers and concerns surrounding implementation, it could be argued the researcher was, to some degree, subliminally influenced to pay closer attention to the barriers inhibiting the project. However,

the researcher made a conscious effort to let the raw data from the narrative and thematic analysis speak for itself.

The results section begins with the observation narrative to put the project in context. Once depicted, the most prevalent themes and subthemes from the thematic analysis are identified and explored in alignment with the empirical evidence. Later, the researcher makes several concluding remarks related to some wider research findings (based on both data sources). After this, the research embarks on a post implementation evaluation intended to demonstrate whether the scheme and/or research project was delivered as intended.

Observation: narrative analysis

The observation sessions took place during the first five months of implementation (October 2019-March 2020). All observations were made before covid-19 and due to this, no social distancing measures or face coverings were required. The observation data has been constructed into a narrative which adopts a chronological structure. This reflects the exact order the participants behaviour was observed.

Training

Before the launch of Checkpoint, the navigators embarked on a training package that intended to prepare them for their role. The training programs included in the package ranged from practical elements of working in a police context such as training on RMS and in first aid to specific skills and program training such as ACEs (Adverse Childhood Experiences), Drug and Alcohol Awareness, Restorative Justice, Cocaine Misuse (not delivered to all navigators) and Female Offender training. Parts of the training package were delivered by NWP and other aspects of the training were delivered using external training agencies such as Rockpool and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service. The researcher felt the initial training package was disorganized and inhibited by last minute communication of changes to

the training timetable which left the navigators feeling frustrated. Reviews relating to the efficacy of the training were mixed, particularly reviews of training quality and the extent to which the navigators felt their training would be used in practice. The ACES training provided by Rockpool and the First aid training provided by NWP received glowing reports whilst HMP's training on females in the criminal justice system was considered less successful. Anecdotal evidence infers the training sessions had little relevance to the navigator's role or skill required in practice. Conversely, it was several weeks before cases began to be referred to the initiative. On this basis, it is likely the navigators may have lost the skills and knowledge gained in the training and this may impact use of the training in practice.

Recommendation: Review the efficacy of the training package. Assess training alternatives and review what sessions would better suit to the actual role of the navigators. Should this be available, refresher training should be considered.

Implementation and structure (prelaunch): Delays, job roles and early tensions

The initiative was intended to launch its service in October 2019. However, due to several unanticipated delays (undisclosed) the start date was delayed until December 2019. During this period, nine motivated professionals (the navigators) were recruited and embarked on a training program set up by NWP and the PCC. The navigator cohort included a varied set of professionals with a breadth of experience, ranging from assistant psychologists to ex-prison and probation officers. These professionals were used to thriving in fast paced, busy working environments and juggling high case loads. However, at the start, they experienced a lack of work and no clear expectation of what to do with their time. This significantly inhibited their motivation and enthusiasm in post, leaving some of the

navigators feeling they were de-skilling and questioning whether they had made the right decision to leave their previous job.

The Checkpoint manager was appointed by the PCC and held responsibility for the coordination of the navigators. A custody diversion Inspector, appointed by North Wales Police, was there to provide guidance, liaise with and advise the navigators and the line manager at the start of the project. The navigators and line manager lent on the advisor for RMS support. This appeared most beneficial to the line manager from the PCC, who had limited knowledge of police process and technology. The advisor's post was temporary and was subject to review in March 2020. In March 2020, the Custody Diversion Inspector started to withdraw day-to-day support to focus on supporting the research project. However, the navigators struggled to accept this change as the advisor played an important role in defusing rising tensions and/or conflict between the navigators and their line manager. They also seemed to prefer the advisor's management style and approach to communication.

Post launch observation: referral, location, promotion

Referral to Checkpoint depended upon North Wales Police, as policing professionals are responsible for the identification of eligible offenders and referral. Referral seemed mediated by professional's knowledge of the scheme and knowledge appeared varied across different locations. Referral also came via custody sergeants, although the scheme prefers referral via voluntary attendance to avoid booking into custody. The navigators are based in the three custody suites in Caernarvon, Llay, and St Asaph. Between these locations, knowledge of the initiative seemed high. This is because the navigators spent a lot of time without work at their base, thus had time to build up relationships with custody sergeants and visiting officers. The navigators in Caernarvon appeared to have an additional advantage of familial relations that seemed to benefit networks in the custodial setting.

The initial communication and promotion of the Checkpoint scheme to North Wales Police staff came from the line manager from the PCC via e-mail. Anecdotal evidence inferred the reach of this approach was limited and not well received by many policing professionals who were too busy to read their emails. This resulted in a slow onset of case referrals, which created frustration amongst the navigators. Some of the navigators used their personal contacts within the criminal justice system to attend morning briefings and this improved awareness of the scheme and willingness to refer. However, the navigators felt the line manager was reluctant to pass the promotion responsibility over to them, despite indication of positive effects. Reasons for this seemed unclear. Withal, this made the navigators feel they were being micromanaged by their line manager. They felt their line manager did not feel comfortable with them leaving their base and/or using their own connections with police professionals. They felt this was because the line manager was to some degree threatened by their connections within the police.

Recommendation: review the navigator's approach to attending briefings and increasing awareness of Checkpoint with intent to improve the flow of referral and reach of the scheme.

Referral issues, Checkpoint Casework and shifting criteria

The remit of Checkpoint was kept under review in the early stages of the scheme, and it was revisited several times due to low numbers of referrals. A small number of inappropriate referrals have been reported and it seems the current referral process and the process of case allocation to individual navigators remains unclear – to the navigators, some police representatives, and the researcher.

Upon referral to the scheme, navigators conduct a needs assessment with all new clients. Navigators work directly with some clients for the duration of the checkpoint contract

and refer others to program delivered by third sector organizations. This is the case for female clients who are referred to the Women's Pathfinder program. An initiative funded by North Wales Police, providing support to females in the criminal justice system. Several concerns have been expressed with regards to the referral process, particularly regarding delays in referrals by North Wales Police and some referrals being missed by the navigators due to poor communication. A key issue with this process appears to be the navigators and Checkpoint managers struggle with RMS, which seemingly causes delays. Moreover, other concerns have been expressed about referrals from Checkpoint to the Women's Pathfinder program. There was anecdotal evidence of one female client who reportedly 'failed' the scheme as she re-offended while waiting for engagement with a Women's Pathfinder caseworker in her area. This resulted in the female being remanded in custody and attempting to hang herself. There was no further information provided on this matter. Timely referrals and engagement with clients are considered key to ensure clients take up the opportunities provided and have maximum chance of successful engagement and completion.

Low numbers of referrals and shifting referral criteria suggests there is a problem with suitable cases coming forward, which has led to a discussion of widening referral criteria to higher risk cases, e.g., the inclusion of some domestic violence offenders. However, an active plan to implement these amendments remains unclear to the navigators and the researcher. To clarify this, the researcher proposed the need to review the referral process, to provide a revised visual process map and ensure the referral pathway is clearly communicated to all police staff, navigators, and other relevant professionals. However, this never came to fruition and whether these changes were made remains unclear. Nonetheless, the navigators reported concerns related to these amendments. The navigators felt uneasy about supporting domestic violence perpetrators on the scheme. The navigators felt this was because of previous experience working with perpetrators of DV or no experience at all, and the fear the training

package did not provide the necessary skills to help them deal with or sufficiently monitor perpetrators of domestic violence. It seemed the navigator's concerns were overlooked by the line manager and the advisor.

Recommendation:

- Review communication and engagement. Support from the navigators towards female clients may be a suitable avenue to explore during the referral to WPF, to avoid disengagement and recidivism.

- Develop a clear map of planned amendments for the clarity of the navigators, policing professionals, and the researcher

- Review the planned amendments to widen the eligibility, in alignment with the training provided. Consider providing more training to increase the navigator's knowledge around handling and monitoring DV offenders.

Governance

The governance of Checkpoint Cymru is ambiguous and complicated. Checkpoint Cymru was funded by the PCC and the Checkpoint line manager is employed by the PCC. The Custody Diversion Inspector (the advisor) is employed by NWP and provided some early managerial support to the navigators and the line manager and acted as a liaison to North Wales Police staff. In turn, the navigators are employed by North Wales Police, but line managed by the Checkpoint Manager, someone outside their employing organization. The governance and line management processes are complicated by the involvement of these two separate organizational entities. From the start, there have been tensions between navigators and the line manager and the navigators often turned to the advisor for support and advice. The confusing governance structure has left navigators feeling a lack of support and clear sense of organizational belonging. This matter is further complicated as the second line

manager was employed by the PCC, despite the navigator's desires for the second line

manager to be from NWP. Additionally, communication received from the NWP advisor and

the line manager is conflicted at times causing further confusion and concern. Navigators

reported not knowing who to listen to and felt unclear on "who outranks who". As the

program progressed and as Covid-19 situation developed, the involvement of NWP, even as

an advisory source, reduced. Anecdotal evidence suggests this made the navigators feel

abandoned by NWP, for they relied on the advisor for support.

Recommendation: Review the governance of the program and consider ways to

increase the degree of support from NWP to diminish the impact on the navigators.

Navigator experience

At the start, the navigators had a great deal of experience, motivation, and enthusiasm.

As a group they bonded well and those with prior experience of working in criminal justice

mentored those less experienced in the field. However, poor training, a lack of work, and

some communication problems with the line manager had a detrimental effect on the

navigators' morale and engagement with the organization. Further, as there was a slow onset

of referral and low caseloads, the navigators were not busy and had more time to ruminate in

their dissatisfaction. This seemed to further inhibit morale. The impact of this seemed to

differ between bases. For instance, Caernarvon seemed to ruminate less, have more work and

be happier in post. Llay appeared to ruminate a little yet had low but steady case referrals and

St Asaph seemed to ruminate the most, experience low case loads and low referral rates and

struggle the most with communication with the manager- although this seemed to be a by-

product of one of the navigators feeling targeted by the line manager following an extension

of a probationary period (this was later dismissed). Across the bases, many of the navigators

expressed their frustrations around being unable to bring their experience and skills onto the

Checkpoint program. They felt doing so would benefit and promote the initiative across North Wales. There have been many reports of feeling untrusted, micromanaged and concerns related to de-skilling. Further, some of the navigators talked openly about searching for new employment and some of the navigators reported feeling regretful they left their previous post. It was unclear how widespread the intent to act was or if this was gossip, rumination or merely a discussion.

Conversely, the tensions between some of the navigators and line management appeared to further develop over time having a significant effect on navigator wellbeing. The researcher used early implementation reports to highlight the impact of the tensions on the navigators. NWP acknowledged the impact and expressed concern, but they seemed unable to implement change and/or elevate some of the pressure. However, the navigators' commitment to the principles of the Checkpoint program and working with the clients remained strong.

Recommendation: Management may consider a feedback or mediation session to address some concerns about program management and reduce rumination, dissatisfaction, and impact on their wellbeing.

Meetings: informal and formal

There were several informal and formal meetings that took place throughout the five-month observation period. The researcher observed some of the interactions between the navigators and the advisor from NWP and on one occasion, a meeting with their line manager from the PCC.

During navigator meetings, the strength of the rapport was evident. There appeared to be a great degree of support and balance between professionals, and this created a friendly

and informal environment. Their openness, honesty, and trust to disclose information to the researcher was also clear and it seemed the navigators wanted to use the meetings with the researcher to have their experiences recorded. The navigator's experiences with their line manager were primarily negative and many of them reported feeling unheard, micromanaged, distrusted and without organizational belonging. Many of them took the time to share anecdotes of how the conflict with management was inhibiting their home life and personal wellbeing, although to protect the confidentiality and privacy of the participants, this information is not included in this report.

Meetings between the navigators and advisor from NWP appeared harmonious. The navigators used their time with the advisor to express their concerns relating to how the line manager from the PCC was treating them. The advisor from NWP was very supportive and this appeared to provide initial reassurance to the navigators. However, over time, the navigators felt the advisor failed to act as promised and this created a degree of distrust between them, hindering their professional relationship.

Moreover, the meeting between the navigators and the line manager from the PCC also appeared harmonious. It appeared structural issues were well addressed, and the line manager seemed open to explore the navigator's opinion. The line manager asked the navigators if they had any additional issues to discuss there were no additional comments made. This was interesting because the navigators were usually very open about their issues or concerns about the line manager's management style. After the meeting, the navigators approached the researcher and reported they did not feel comfortable addressing their concerns and/or issues with line management. They said they would only feel comfortable to disclose their concerns if an independent third party was present due to low trust and fears of loss of employment. Several of the navigators reported instances where they have tried to

address their issues with the line manager and said they were dismissed quite abruptly without review. They reported that because of this, they adopted a 'put up and shut up approach' and would not address issues moving forward.

Recommendations: To improve honest communication and for the navigators to feel comfortable enough to be open about their experience, it is recommended that - during monthly meetings, a third party, that has no affiliation with the PCC should be present.

This marks the end of the narrative analysis. The next section is comprised of the most prevalent themes and subthemes from the thematic analysis based on the interview data.

Thematic analysis

In this section, the results from the thematic analysis are explored, presenting the most prevalent themes and subthemes in alignment with the empirical evidence. Due to the scope of this project, more prevalent and/or interesting themes are explored in greater detail. Each theme is presented with a few examples from the transcripts to represent the professionals experience in their own words. All quotes are intentionally included without numeric, page or line markers to ensure the highest level of anonymity for the participants. This is important to diminish the risk of the reader being able to guess who might have said what. The data collated from the interviews represents subjective experience reported by the navigators, the line manager and the advisor from the PCC. Subsequently, the results are not affiliated with the view of the researcher. The reader should also remain mindful that the results may be most representative of the navigators experience due to the imbalance between the number of

navigators (11) and the number of managers (2). From the analysis, four primary themes emerged, and each theme is explored separately. The themes are: Professional feedback, Early issues, Practical barriers, and Improvement information.

Theme 1: Professional Feedback

Professional feedback was the most prevalent theme to emerge from the thematic analysis. It is comprised of five subthemes: Initial perception, Checkpoint as a hard option, Re-offending, Professional experience, and rapport. Each theme is made up of several subthemes and these alternate between the navigators, the line managers and the advisor's perspective.

Subtheme 1: Initial perception

This subtheme explores the navigator's initial perception of Checkpoint. It is comprised of three further subthemes: Initial support, diminishing support and perceived client benefit.

Initial support

This subtheme focuses on the reasons the navigators felt supportive of Checkpoint at the start, for they felt the ethos of Checkpoint aligned with their own personal ethos, core principles and values, "I feel supportive of the programme", "The principles of the program are ones that I value and agree with", "The basic principles that founded Checkpoint and its ethos work well", "The appeal of doing something new and trying to turn a negative situation into a potentially very positive one in the long run is huge". The examples infer the navigators were attracted to the initiative because of what it stands for and the chance to be involved in something that turns a negative action into a chance for change.

The empirical evidence suggests professionals who seek employment in initiatives for moral reason are intrinsically motivated individuals who seek work associated with long-term fulfilment and increased satisfaction (Raza, Husnain & Ahkatar, 2015; Bergstrom and Martinez, 2016; Järnström & Sällström, 2012). This is best depicted as the experience of intrinsic reward, a psychological experience, sub-served by the dopaminergic system and sought from meaningful work, delivered well (Domenico & Ryan, 2014; Van Wingerden & Van der Stoep, 2018). The experience of intrinsic reward is considered to have positive effects on employees and organizational outcomes, improving drive, innovation, psychological wellness, and enthusiasm in post (Fischer, Malcha & Schafmann, 2019). Further, studies show working for an initiative which doesn't compromise your personal values is associated with better personal and professional development, increased interconnectedness and improved health and wellbeing outcomes (Zwetsloot, 2013). Subsequently, it seems this cohort of intrinsically motivated individuals, responsible for the delivery of Checkpoint, could seek benefits to their own wellbeing and benefit organizational outcomes. However, it is important to remain mindful that external reward, autonomy, feeling ineffective and unanticipated adverse events pose a significant risk the intrinsic motivation of employees (Domenico & Ryan, 2014).

Diminishing Support

The second subtheme explores how the navigator support for Checkpoint and motivation in post began to diminish as their employment progressed, "My enthusiasm was there on day one however from the lack of structure I felt less supportive of Checkpoint as I wasn't confident, they knew how Checkpoint was going to work", "Some elements have changed – such as a shift in focus to the Drug Education Program rather than the needs assessment stage. I see this as a potential pitfall as we could miss opportunities to support individuals to our full abilities, as well as making it more difficult for those individuals to

come forward and express their needs to us", "I believe the program was misleading to what the role would entail…the current manager has no clear plan about how things should be done and regularly changes processes by simply sending an email or telling us verbally". The examples demonstrate how the changing elements and poor structure inhibited the navigator's enthusiasm and confidence in checkpoint management. To be specific, it seems the navigators felt negatively about the changes introduced, for they felt they opposed the initiatives core goals and objectives, and this posed an unanticipated risk to their intrinsic motivation. They appeared disappointed and like they weren't supported through change. But they also seemed to feel mislead with regards to what they were told their employment would entail.

The literature acknowledges change is disruptive and resistance to change amongst intrinsically motivated employees is common (Jalaget, 2016; Fors, 2017). This is because unanticipated change, considered disruptive to the core principles, morals and aims of the employee, creates a negative behavioral response (a resistance), fueled by fear, anxiety, and apprehension about uncertain outcomes (White & Cameron, 2000; Wortler, Van Yperen, Mascaerono & Barelds, 2020; Wisse & Sleebos, 2016). The American Psychological Association (APA) published a report in 2017 to demonstrate the adverse impact of change on employee health, wellbeing, and the wider organization. They found change accounted for 45% of turnover rates, a 34% reduction in trust towards an employer and one out of two employees suffered from chronic stress because of ineffective change management (APA, 2017). Moreover, studies infer employee's who negatively experience change at an early point of their employment, adopt a resistance to change in the future (Rafferty & Jimmieson, 2016). Therefore, NWP and the PCC should try and increase support and effective management of change in the future to mediate resistance. There are several empirically evidenced change models (for example: McKinsey 7-S Model, Lewin's change Management

71

Model or Kotter's change management theory) available to guide future implementation of change. Such models are considered to diminish anxiety, uncertainty employee frustration and reduce resistance (Stouton, Rousseau & De Cremer, 2018).

Perceived Client Benefit

This subtheme explores the professional view, Checkpoint benefits the livelihood of clients because it provides a rare opportunity for change. An opportunity which otherwise might not be available and/or accessible. It is comprised of three further subthemes: navigator perspective, case type frustrations and management perspective.

Navigator perspective

The first subtheme explores the navigator's reports that Checkpoint provides an exciting opportunity for life change and how the scheme could improve available opportunities. "I believe it will improve people's lives", "Checkpoint is a positive as it means she will not have a criminal record for a mistake that she has made", "For those who are entering the criminal justice system for the first time, this can have a huge positive effect and serve as a stern warning, but also a second chance", "If they had not had this opportunity the offence may have had a negative impact on their lives if they had received a charge for the offences in relation to further educational, employment or travel opportunities". The navigators also go on to highlight how Checkpoint provides an opportunity for clients to address issues that have previously or would usually remain unaddressed in the criminal justice system, "Many participants may not have had the opportunity to talk about underlying issues which is or has affected them in some way or other…brilliant opportunity for them to receive support", "There are individuals who have been on my caseload that have made lifestyle changes since coming onto Checkpoint e.g. a client of mine who had smoked

cannabis for years to help with mental health has completely quit and another client who has been on various courses and been given a safe space to talk through the difficulties she had been experiencing reports that it has significantly improved her life". Collectively, the examples demonstrate the professional view that Checkpoint improves life opportunities and access to otherwise unavailable support. Further, the anecdotes demonstrate how Checkpoint helped one client cease long-term drug use which improved their mental health outcomes.

The empirical evidence supports the notion that diversion schemes serve as a second chance and offer a rare opportunity for life change (Brown, 2018). This is because, as previously disclosed, the needs of low-level offenders are largely overlooked within the criminal justice system due to resource limitations (Sherman, 2013; Evans, 2016: Wooditch, Tang & Taxman, 2014). Additionally, research shows the offender population is typically made of up of people from more disadvantaged backgrounds in low socioeconomic areas, where access to therapeutic resources within the general community is also lacking (Clark, 2018; Cook, Swartz & Kaslow, 2017). Subsequently, without Checkpoint, some clients might struggle to access support and may be more likely to reoffend. This means for many, Checkpoint may provide the first opportunity to talk about mental health issues, substance misuse disorders and life issues and/or trauma (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2018).

The empirical evidence also supports the adverse relationship between a criminal conviction and opportunities for housing, employment, and travel (Pager & Western, 2009). Studies show employers, landlords and governing officials typically adopt a risk-averse approach to employment, housing, and travel, pre-emptively excluding ex offenders at a much higher rate (Heydon & Naylor, 2018; Minor, Persico & Weiss, 2018). Arguably, this issue is most prevalent in careers not covered by the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (1974), for instance supporting vulnerable people, children and/or working with confidential sources of data, as persons with a conviction become ineligible (McIntyre, 2017). Therefore, the

opportunity to take part in Checkpoint and avoid the ramifications associated with a conviction, eradicates the risk of the associated stigma and clients get the best chance to move forward from their mistakes without falling victim to offender discrimination (an issue particularly inhibiting members of the Black and Ethnic Minority communities) (Radford, Sturgeon, Cuomo & Lucas, 2018).

Even more, there is a plethora of evidence that demonstrates the efficacy of talking therapy and intervention for mental health issues, substance misuse disorders and unidentified adverse childhood experiences, particularly in the offender population (van Duin et al, 2018; Stevens, 2019; Cannon & Hsi, 2016; Turner, 2020). Where mental health and substance misuse disorders improve as a by-product of intervention, studies have shown there is an increased likelihood of life change, desistance, and positive organizational outcomes (Wooditch, Tang & Taxman, 2014). This is because interventions focus less upon blaming offenders for their crime and instead, they focus on helping offenders understand the reasons they offend and intern, it is easier for them to be accountable and they are more likely to take responsibility for any harm caused (Pickard, 2014). When you consider this in alignment with the voluntary nature of Checkpoint, research suggests clients are more likely to be engaged and motivated to make a change, improving intervention outcomes (Hardcastle et al, 2015). Much like that reported, research shows engaged, and motivated offenders demonstrate better intervention outcomes including better management of emotions, lower levels of impulsivity, improved relationships, increased life achievements and diminished likelihood of recidivism, post intervention (Maguire et al, 2019). However, despite early signs of promise for one individual, the anecdote represents subjective experience and at present, the ability to generalize this finding, across a wider population, is limited.

Case type frustrations

The first subtheme explores the navigator's frustrations around the type of offender referred to Checkpoint and how they feel there is a 'missed opportunity' to use the scheme to benefit more entrenched offenders. "I personally haven't had a case where I think I have changed their life", "None of the cases I have been allocated have been on the cusp of being repeat offenders so therefore need little help", "We should also be making efforts to focus on working with persons who have real potential to ruin their lives by being involved in criminality and this |I feel has been a missed opportunity", "I feel like we need to support individuals who are more vulnerable and higher risk if we are to make a real change as the vast majority of cases are working full time, have no major health issues, physically or mentally and have been caught committing a very low level offence". The examples indicate the navigator's personal frustration in having to support clients who have little to no need.

This seems to negatively impact the personal agenda of these professionals, who are keen to positively affect life change, benefit service users and seek intrinsic reward.

Research shows dissatisfaction at work is associated with reduced motivation, an increased risk of turnover, low levels of engagement, poor communication, and diminished productivity (Khamisa, Oldenburg, Peltzer & Llic, 2015; Rajgopal, 2010). Arguably, this is most inhibitory for intrinsically motivated employees, who require intrinsic reward to feel content in role and engaged with the wider organization (Bergstrom and Martinez, 2016; Singh. 2016). In this case, it could be argued the navigator's frustrations are mediated by their prior knowledge of the offender population, awareness of a greater need elsewhere and desire to feel like they are making more of a difference (Pemberton, Balderston & Long, 2019). Studies infer more experienced professionals, particularly those with previous work experience in the criminal justice system or prison and probation service, may be less satisfied supporting those with minimal need, for they have experienced or are simply more

aware of the potential intrinsic reward that could come from helping more serious offenders, with an increased need (Marsh, McKay, Pelly & Cereda, 2019; Sirdfield & Brooker, 2020). An understandable frustration when you consider potential knowledge of the cyclical relationship between mental health, substance misuse, resource limitations, high caseloads, overcrowding problems and recidivism in the more serious offender population (Prison Reform Trust, 2019). However, it is important to note, that irrespective of personal desire to experience greater intrinsic reward, the potential benefits of Checkpoint to more serious offenders or the navigators prior experience, Checkpoint currently aims to target low-level or first-time offenders. Therefore, clarification of this and the probability of helping more serious offenders in the future may be required to reduce rumination and speculation. Future research may want to explore the relationship between the increased experience of some of the navigators and how this manifest into an increased need for intrinsic reward. Moreover, how this may mediate motivation and engagement in the face of dissatisfaction.

Management perception of life change

This subtheme explores the reports from the line manager (PCC) and the advisor (NWP) and their perspective of the possibility of life change post Checkpoint. It is comprised of two further subthemes: PCC perspective and NWP perspective.

PCC Perspective

This subtheme explores the line manager's view of the possibility for life change. The manager replied "Indeed" when asked whether they believed the program would change people's lives. The line manager went on to explain, "A big part of this is harm reduction for substance users. In addition, it's also a form of CBT in terms of addressing underlying needs and the thinking patterns behind someone's offending, their triggers, and their ability to understand consequential thinking. All of these can only help toward reduction or abstinence

in substances and an improved insight into life, consequences and aspirations in addition to working on traumas they have had to endure in life that may have not been addressed". The response shows the line manager believes Checkpoint has the potential to change lives. Further, it seems that in their opinion, providing support to substance users through CBT based intervention is the most important component for life change.

Many studies have shown line managers have a major influence on intervention outcomes, although many failed to uncover the role of the line manager during implementation and how they are influenced by the context of intervention at different levels, (Christensen et al, 2019; Tafvelin, Schwarz, Nielson & Hasson, 2018). Still, most agree, the line manager's support and belief in an interventions potential to influence life change is an essential component for success (Stouten, Rousseau & De Cremer, 2018; Christensen et al, 2019). However, the literature neither supports nor refutes the line manager's belief, substance misuse intervention is the most important component of Checkpoint regarding life change. This is because most of the data exploring the impact of diversion schemes on harm reduction and substance misuse disorders has produced mixed results (May et al, 2019; Hawk et al, 2017; Pemberton, Balderston & Long, 2019). Still, there is a good amount of evidence available to justify the belief that providing support to substance misusers is important, for studies on youth offenders have demonstrated a small but significant impact of diversion-based intervention on substance misuse and quality-adjusted years of life (Substance abuse and mental health services administration, 2016). With that said, recent reviews suggest data in this domain is not completely reliable, for it is often inhibited by poor methodological quality (sample size issues, no random allocations to conditions, limited follow ups, retrospective data collection and a high attrition rate) and publication bias (Speith et al, 2016; Viswanathan, 2017; Kennedy et al, 2019). Subsequently, knowledge of the long-term benefits

of diversion for drug users remains unclear and this inhibits comprehension of how important it will be regarding life change.

However, the line manager was keen to highlight the benefits of using CBT components in the drugs education program. CBT is one of the most empirically supported forms of therapy used to treat substance misuse disorders and criminality because it is considered an effective tool to target the 'criminal thinking' that underpins criminality (Carrol & Kiluk, 2017). This is because it teaches offenders to understand the thought processes and choices that precede their criminal behaviour and substance misuse (Chandler, Fletcher & Volkow, 2010). However, it remains unclear whether the line manager is aware that the efficacy of CBT on substance misuse in criminality is mediated by the intensity and duration of treatment (McHugh, Hearon & Otto, 2010). After all, the DEP incorporating components of CBT intervention is delivered over one to two sessions. Arguably, as Checkpoint targets low-level offenders and as the navigators reported most drug users have minimal need perhaps one or two sessions of CBT intervention can be sufficient (Hoffman et al, 2012). Withal, without further exploration, this remains ambiguous. To remove this ambiguity, future research should conduct a longitudinal study to explore the long-term impacts of the DEP with regards to the relationship between the duration of sessions and future drug use, cessation of use and life change.

NWP Perspective

This subtheme explores the perspective of the advisor from NWP and their view of the possibility of life change, "I certainly think it should change peoples lives. Early, professional, intervention for those most at need is essential. The introduction of the ACEs recovery toolkit is something that has not been introduced elsewhere in the UK – there is a plethora of scientific research into ACEs that this presents us with an opportunity to address

not just the here and now, but a generation of families. For lives to be improved there needs

to be rapid intervention and association with professional bodies within the health and social

sectors, early access to these specialist services is key". The example demonstrates the

advisor shares the belief Checkpoint has the potential to change client's lives. However,

unlike the line manager, the advisor feels the ACES toolkit is the most important component

for life change and that it is essential to unpick the adverse childhood experiences of

offenders to encourage desistance.

Exploring this view, the literature supports the importance of addressing childhood

adversity (ACES) when attempting to reduce recidivism, for many studies indicate a strong

relationship between those reporting ACES and an increased engagement in the risk-taking

behaviours involved with criminality (Reavis, Looman, Franco & Rojas, 2013; Hughes,

Lowey, Quigg & Bellis, 2016). Studies show exposure to adversity in childhood disrupts

health and neurological development and this can cause emotional and conduct problems in

adulthood (Levenson et al, 2016). In many cases, this manifests in substance and alcohol

abuse, deprivation, poor educational attainment, mental health problems and subsequently,

criminality (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015; Mcllean, 2017). Studies have

shown trauma informed approaches and ACES awareness during offender rehabilitation

significantly improved life outcomes and resulted in actual behavioural change (Bradley,

2017). Moreover, The Welsh ACES study (2015) found those within the welsh criminal

justice system reported four or more ACES and were 15 times more likely to perpetrate crime

and 20 times more likely to serve time in prison (Welsh Government, 2021). Therefore, the

advisors desire to focus on ACE'S, as a key component for life change, appears empirically

supported.

With that said, the contextual evidence infers there is little to no observed use of the

ACES toolkit in practice. One of the navigators also touched upon this, reporting, "The

ACES training, although it was some of our best training… we've never spoken about it and its highly unlikely we are ever going to run a course…there is no even inkling that we can, no one has discussed logistics with us". Therefore, despite need, the empirically supported impact on behavioural change and the support of the NWP advisor, the ACES toolkit is not used. It could be argued the discrepancy between the agenda of the PCC and NWP underpins this, for the line manager felt Checkpoint was best used for drug rehabilitation and the NWP advisor see it best for ACES support. The literature suggests this discrepancy is a common challenge identified in partnership projects or during multi organization collaboration, if a shared agenda is not agreed at the start (Johnston, Goldsmith & Finegood, 2020). The term the 'dark side' is used within the literature to refer to a variety of adverse impacts these types of discrepancies can cause, such as ill-intended behaviours, unethical practice, biased preference and organization dysfunction or failure (Oliveira & Lumineau, 2018). Therefore, perhaps PCC and NWP could come together to review this evidence and consider ways to create a shared agenda and incorporate the ACES alongside the DEP.

Subtheme 2: Checkpoint the 'hard option'

This subtheme is comprised of two further subthemes: 'A harder option' and 'Restorative Justice'.

A 'harder option'

This subtheme explores the professional view (across navigators, line management and advisor) Checkpoint serves as a 'harder option' in comparison to formal prosecution. This is discussed in relation to how Checkpoint requires an offender to be accountable for their actions and how the needs assessment can be intrusive, "Checkpoint is not a soft option", "Much easier to take a caution or a fine in Court, bury your head in the sand and change nothing", "I feel having to take accountability for what you've done and address the

underlying issues behind those decisions can be quite profound in its effects", "Checkpoint is not a soft option. It requires participants to discuss very personal details with their Navigator…and requires them to answer each question honestly. This can be quite intrusive", "Having to take accountability for what you've done and address the underlying issues behind those decisions can be quite profound in its effects". The examples demonstrate the professionals believe custody diversion is much harder than formal prosecution due to the increased focus on accountability.

At first glance, this finding does not appear supported by most of the literature, for most studies suggest professionals consider custody diversion to be a soft alternative to formal prosecution (Kelly & Armitage, 2015; Blumenthal & Wessley, 1992; Tyrrell, Bond, Manning & Dogaru, 2018; Meijer, 2017; Maculan & Gil Gil, 2020; Disley et al, 2016). However, upon closer inspection, most of these studies interviewed professionals not affiliated or actively involved in the delivery of such schemes (i.e., police, custody officers or other professionals relevant to formal prosecution and punishment). Subsequently, it could be argued these professionals were more likely to offer a less positive, biased view of diversion, for the premise of it opposes the premise of their day-to-day role, to enforce, assist or implement punishment (Marsh, McKay, Pelly & Cereda, 2019). Still, most studies in this domain indirectly agree with the premise of the Checkpoint, components of restorative justice and the benefits associated with accountability (Jacobson & Fair, 2017; McCartan et al, 2014; Clarke, Brown & Vollm, 2015). For example, several criminal justices' system-based studies show being accountable, for any degree of harm caused to others, is a painful yet effective process that yields positive effects for the individual and society but also requires a great deal of support and hope for societal acceptance (Alm, 2019; Sherman & Strang, 2007; Rakovec-Felser, 2014). To be specific, being accountable, demonstrating remorse and in some cases, taking action to repair harm caused yields potential for personal growth, moral development

and diminishes the risks of repeat offending (Garrigan, Adlam & Langdon, 2018). Academics also suggest the importance of a co-dependent relationship between support and accountability, with some even suggesting support without accountability leads to moral weakness and accountability without support is a form of cruelty (Mkandawire, 2010). Therefore, it seems the difference between perspectives is perhaps about a resistance to move away from formal punishment, for most people working in the criminal justice system seem to consider offender accountability essential.

Conversely, one of the navigators also felt the intrusive nature of the need's assessment made custody diversion more difficult for clients than formal prosecution. However, there is a lack of research exploring the intrusive nature of diversion assessments in comparison to formal prosecution, inhibiting direct comparison. However, it could be argued custodial methods like strip searches and the use of unnecessary physical restraints are far more intrusive and more difficult for vulnerable adults than a list of personal questions (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2015). Withal, the nature of a need's assessment is to draw out essential information or experiences that fuel offender behaviour and in more vulnerable adults, with adverse childhood experiences or those with learning difficulties, recalling difficult experiences can evoke stress, flashbacks, and adverse physical and mental health symptoms (Centre for Substance Misuse Treatment, 2014; Hayes, VanElzakker & Shin, 2021). Because of this, Bradley's (2009) proposed all professionals delivering needs assessments in custody diversion schemes should have specialized mental health and learning disability training, for without this the professional may lack awareness and handle the needs assessment in an unintentionally harmful way. However, reviews of the use of Bradley's (2009) recommendations in practice suggest very few schemes do so. Thus, perhaps NWP and the PCC could review and consider a trauma informed approach to conducting needs assessments to counter these risks (Champine et al, 2020). However, at present, there are no

recorded professional reports of distress as a by-product of the need's assessment process. Therefore, future research should review this through a service users' perspective to increase comprehension.

Restorative Justice

This subtheme focuses on the cases that involved elements of restorative justice. It explores the navigator view that there is an increased benefit associated with having to make an apology to the victim and how this process makes recidivism less likely. "Where restorative justice is required, even if this only occurs in the form of a letter where appropriate. I have found that individuals on my case load have as a rule of thumb felt great shame and regret where a victim has been involved, and their willingness to engage with restorative justice where possible has been plentiful", "He was required to apologize to the victim, something that he may have not been required to do had he not come on to Checkpoint. I feel that apologizing and admitting when you've done wrong can be much harder at times than it is to face punishment". Although there were only two reports exploring RJ cases, the examples show eligible clients were very willing to engage and apologies to their victim. However, the act of making an apology appeared difficult for it seemed to evoke, shame, regret, and remorse.

The empirical evidence supports the significance of making an apology, but it does so with caution because the efficacy of restorative justice is mediated by forgiveness (Lloyd & Borril, 2020). Shapland (2016) produced a report exploring this in detail, suggesting restorative justice can be a complicated process whereby forgiveness exists on multiple levels and is not always guaranteed. For many, an apology needs to be extended to the victim and the State, whilst forgiveness is both internal (self) and external (victim, State, families, and society). Where an apology is sincere and considered proportionate to the crime, as in the case of custody diversion schemes, research suggests an apology is related to constantly

lower recidivism rates (Boriboontha, 2006). To be specific, a review of most of the existing literature, across the UK, America, and Australia, found those who apologize to their victim were significantly less likely to reoffend over two years than those who do not participate (Wilson, Brennan & Olaghere, 2018; College of Policing, 2015; Strang et al, 2013). This was because interacting with a victim inhibits an offender's ability to justify their crimes or deny impacts on their victim and this enables morale development. However, the impact of restorative justice on each offender was found to be subjective and the likelihood of recidivism varied across studies (between 7% to 45%). Still, the benefits of restorative justice extend beyond the offender. Research shows victims who take part in restorative justice and receive a sincere apology, demonstrate a diminished desire for revenge in comparison to those who do not receive an apology (Sherman & Strang, 2007). Further, several studies found victims who receive a sincere apology feel more secure and more satisfied with the process of achieving justice (Bennett, 2006; Hayes, 2006). However, it is important to note, restorative justice is a voluntary process and because of this, the data available for review is limited by a self-selection bias, for those unwilling to forgive their perpetrator are less likely to engage with the process (College of Policing, 2015; Strang et al, 2013).

Subtheme 3: Reoffending

This subtheme explores the early signs of Checkpoints influence on recidivism. It is comprised of three further subthemes: The Majority, The Minority and Managerial perspective.

The Majority

The first subtheme explores the navigators view that most Checkpoint clients were "very engaging and appreciative of the support to better their lives" and "that the whole process of being involved with the police has 'scared' them and were grateful of the support

of Checkpoint to put it all behind them". To expand, navigators report, "So far I am not aware of any of my clients reoffending", "I am yet to experience an individual reoffending", "I think that for many people, particularly if they have a job to protect or a family to support, Checkpoint serves as a warning to them that yes they've been able to access support this time and a more holistic approach, but the reality should they reoffend, repeatedly in particular, is a big contrast". This subtheme was the most prevalent subtheme related to recidivism and the anecdotes infer early signs of success.

The literature appears to support the notion that first time offenders are very grateful for custody diversion and for the opportunity to 'redeem' themselves (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2017; Tolan, Grayham & Seymour, 2014). Further, because clients are, in most cases, grateful for redemption, they are found to engage more with available support, and this is an important factor associated with successful behaviour change (Allen, 2018). Even more at this stage, it seems that most checkpoint clients adhered to the conditions of their contract, completing the program without re-offending. However, despite signs of promise, it is too early to determine the efficacy of the program in relation to recidivism over time, for as the program grows, components change and the client base increases, this may change (Davis, Sheidow & McCart, 2015).

The Minority

The second subtheme explores navigator reports of 'the minority' of clients who reportedly reoffended. This subtheme was least prevalent subtheme related to recidivism but is explored for transparency. "I have had one female client re-offend", "I know of one individual who has been referred to Checkpoint to have reoffended which is unfortunate however she was supported by Women's Pathfinder which meant that they were not dealt directly by their navigator", "There has been an occasion that someone was allocated to myself who I didn't meet due to the individual reoffending before we could go forwards with

it who was a prolific offender in the area and was also a heavily entrenched drug user… the nature of the referral went against the grain of Checkpoint's basic remit". The examples are quite vague yet demonstrate at present, female clients and ineligible prolific offenders are most likely to reoffend out of the entire checkpoint population.

With regards to females, the literature does not appear to support this finding, for male offenders across England and Wales typically have a higher recidivism rate than females, are more likely to be remanded in custody, receive a conviction and face prison (Ministry of Justice, 2020). Having said that, studies show although less women end up in the criminal justice system, those who do have more complex needs and females are more likely to commit offences because of mental health problems, drug dependencies and previous abuse/trauma (Pemberton, Balderston & Long, 2019). In fact, a survey found 48% of female offenders are drug users, in comparison to 22% of males (Light, Grant & Hopkins, 2013). Further, female offenders are twice as likely to suffer from a mental health condition in comparison to a male and 60% will have experienced domestic violence and subsequently, are much more likely to suffer from PTSD as a direct consequence (Ministry of Justice, 2018; Howard, Karatzias, Power & Mahoney, 2016). Therefore, it could be argued that degree of need between male and female clients on Checkpoint and the circumstances fuelling criminality mediates the likelihood of recidivism. After all, studies infer men are more likely to commit a low-level offence because of substance infused anger or due to a 'drunken mistake' opposed to complex mental health needs and/or trauma (Davies & Joshi, 2018). Subsequently, the risk of female recidivism may be greater for Checkpoint as females may have greater need, be more complex and subsequently, outcomes are less certain. With that said, as stated by the navigator, female clients are supported by WPF and the efficacy of this service will be explored in a later theme.

On the contrary, it is important to review the entrenched and prolific client who went on to reoffend, particularly as they were not eligible for referral. In alignment with the literature, this type of offender is categorized as a higher risk/level three offender who is likely to have already attended court, custody and have a lengthy criminal conviction (Kelly & Armintage, 2015). This raises the question, why was the offender referred to the scheme in the first place, for the premise of Checkpoint is to target low-level offenders and avoid criminal convictions and interactions with the criminal justice system altogether. The literature infers it would be more appropriate for a prolific offender to be referred to a court-based diversion scheme, for these schemes are better equipped to deal with more serious offenders, with greater need and who are more likely to recidivate (Adler et al, 2016). This is because entrenched and prolific offenders typically require additional measures or sanctions whilst they await a referral for support, for example they may need to be remanded in custody to prevent repeat offending (Bateman, 2017). However, in North Wales, access to court-based diversion schemes appears limited, thus this referral may reflect officers attempts to get support for an entrenched individual through the only available resource, despite the offender surpassing the eligibility criteria (Robin D'Cruz & Whitehead,n.d). However, as the offender failed Checkpoint, it seems they required a different service and greater degree of support, better suited to their needs. Research exploring the prevalence of and motivation behind ineligible referral appears limited. Therefore, to better comprehend this, future research should systematically review the prevalence of ineligible referral to Checkpoint and seek a reason for each to rectify this issue.

Management perspective

This subtheme explores management's perspective of recidivism and if they are aware of any cases that have failed Checkpoint due to recidivism. It starts exploring the NWP

advisor's perspective and latter explores the view of the PCC line manager. Their reports are presented together for ease of comparison.

The advisor reported "The early findings seem to attest to this with only one failure; however, we are only four months into the program. Most individuals coming onto the Checkpoint program are first time offenders having committed low-level offences, such as drugs possession, drunk and disorderly etc. It is quite possible that simply being caught and offered the opportunity to engage is enough to prevent any re-offending, like the speeding drivers who get to keep their license because of attending a driver awareness course, it is debatable how far one's attendance on the course changes the behaviour that caused the offending behaviour in the first place. The real test is when we seek to address complex offending behaviour, the repeat, revolving-door offenders with deep social, economic and health problems". Conversely, the PCC manager gave a rather short response stating it was "too early to tell" if Checkpoint would be successful in diminishing reoffending rates. The two responses are very different and the advisor from NWP gave a detailed response and the line manager from the PCC was rather vague.

The NWP advisor was aware of one-failed case, which juxtaposes the information provided by the navigators. This infers there is a lack of clarity between professionals regarding the actual number of failed cases. Still, the advisor seemed keen to highlight their view Checkpoint clients are less likely to reoffend for they are very low-level and likely to be shocked by their experience. It appears his report is based upon his experience working within the criminal justice system and with this type of offender, as there is a lack of research directly exploring shock as a deterrent in adult custody diversion schemes. There is some research exploring this in youth diversion schemes but because of methodological limitations the data is mostly inconclusive (Adler et al, 2016). Therefore, at present this remains unclear. Moving on, the advisor also compares the premise of Checkpoint to a speed awareness

course, an interesting comparison that does not yet appear to have been explored in the literature. With that said, many studies have explored the efficacy of speed awareness courses finding people who attend these courses are 23% less likely to be caught speeding again in the six months after the course, in comparison to those who accepted the penalty points (Ipsos, 2018). This finding indicates a short-term impact of driving based diversion schemes on driving behaviour. However, to test this theory, a comparative study between the two diversion schemes and their impact on behaviour post intervention is required. Moreover, the advisor suggests the biggest challenge related to recidivism will be in the management of repeat, entrenched offenders. However, it is the researchers understanding that Checkpoint targets low-level offenders. This makes it unclear whether Checkpoint has changed or is planning to change is target demographic to benefit more entrenched and repeat offenders. Clarification on this is required to remove any ambiguity between professionals and for the researcher.

Conversely, the brief response from line manager makes their opinion of recidivism difficult to explore. Yet the brief nature of their response is interesting. On one hand, the empirical evidence supports the claim it is too early to comment on recidivism, for it takes three to five years to gain a valid measurement of the impact of an intervention of recidivism (King & Elderbroom, 2014). Although, some query whether we can ever obtain a valid measurement of recidivism, for we can only measure what is detected, and a large percentage of criminal behaviour occurs without detection (Turner, Medina & Brown, 2019). Still, the premise of this response is empirically supported and perhaps the line manager held back from elaboration because of this. However, it could also be argued the length of response indicates a resistance to elaborate on the early findings, for the line manager facilitates the referral and deferral process. Subsequently, it is likely the line manager is aware of the failed cases reported by the NWP advisor and navigators. It is important to explore the possible

explanations for this to comprehend why the line manager may not want to disclose. The literature infers this may represent a response bias, whereby the manager may not want to respond openly to a negative question due to the fear of being perceived negatively (Muller & Moshhagen, 2019). Research suggests it is quite common for line managers to hold back when probed about issues like recidivism for they can perceive it to be confrontational and in turn be defensive in their response (Saundry et al, 2014). Moving forward, recidivism should be reviewed away from professional perspective and instead, researchers should monitor the quantitative data to assess recidivism. Doing so will remove ambiguity and risk of response bias. However, the ability to do so may be limited by Covid-19 and access to RMS.

Subtheme 4: Professional experience at Checkpoint

This subtheme explores the navigator's professional experience at Checkpoint. It is comprised of two further subthemes: Job satisfaction and Professional rapport.

Job satisfaction

This subtheme is comprised of two further subthemes: Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.

Satisfaction

The first subtheme represents the view of a number of navigators and the manager from the PCC who report satisfaction in role, "Yes I am enjoying my role. I have made a strong working relationship with police officers and enjoy being able to support individuals who are genuinely in need", "I thoroughly enjoy my role and feel supported by my colleagues, manager, and the wider North Wales Police family. I look forward to seeing how we develop as a team. Hope to achieve long term success in helping participants live a crime free life", "I feel passionate about my work and want the best outcome for all the participants that have been referred to Checkpoint", "Overall, yes. The team is brilliant and so wide-

ranging in their knowledge and skills… it's a pleasure to work with them. The work itself is enjoyable and I thoroughly embrace working with people on a one-to-one basis". "Yes, I enjoy my role, I am passionate about the program, its potential and all those people who have been missed in the past". The examples demonstrate a real sense of job satisfaction, which appears to be fuelled by their passion, team morale and a sense of belonging to the policing community.

The empirical evidence suggests those who are passionate about their work and those who feel a sense of be-longing, experience greater levels of job satisfaction and in turn, perform better (Spehar, Forest & Stenseng, 2016). Additionally, research supports the positive relationship between strong professional relationships and job satisfaction, for it is associated with an increase in innovation and achievement, alongside better employee wellbeing, diminished work stress, reduce HR costs and less voluntary turnover (Davidescu, Apotescu, Paul & Casuneanu, 2020; Bryson, Forth & Stokes, 2014). However, the literature suggests it is less prevalent for female professionals to report a sense of organizational be-longing within the police community. One study found females working in the criminal justice system are less likely to feel that they belong, for police communities are male dominant and the sense of community can be heavily mediated by their perception of masculinity (Veldman, Meeussen, Van Laar & Phalet, 2017). This was because male officers, particularly those in positions of power, demonstrate gender-work identity conflicts with females and because of this, the satisfaction of female employees was found to be implicated. When this occurs, there several risks posing risk to female employee's including high turnover rates, an increase in burn-out symptoms, lower job satisfaction, lower work performance and lower perceived performance (Veldman, Meeussen, Van Laar & Phalet, 2017). Having said that, most of the navigators and the line manager from the PCC are female and although employed by NWP, the checkpoint professionals primarily spend time

together. Subsequently, it could be argued in this issue is less likely to inhibit the experience of the navigators. This finding is merely something to be mindful of when interacting with other departments.

Dissatisfaction

The second subtheme heavily juxtaposes the prior and explores the job dissatisfaction reported by most of the navigators, "I deeply regret leaving my previous position and have enquired about returning however at present this is not possible. I do not feel satisfied in my role and I certainly do not feel challenged and do not have confidence that valued", "I feel that the management have been unhelpful, unsupportive, lacking in knowledge and behaved unprofessionally on many occasions and this has led me to feel insecure in my role and having regrets about leaving my previous very successful role within offender management", "Will I say I'm happy? No. No I'm not. No. I don't think I'm challenged; I don't think I'm utilized; I don't think my experience is used, I feel like I am de skilling", "The moment my 12 months is up I'm gone. I do not plan to stay with Checkpoint. Because I don't feel valued, and my experience is not being used". Collectively, the examples demonstrate the navigator's regret in their decision to leave their old jobs, join the scheme and for some this has resulted in a desire to leave the scheme at the end of the contracted year. Their regret and dissatisfaction seemed fuelled by feeling unchallenged, under valued and like their skill set was not appreciated or being utilized. This seems to inhibit the navigators personally.

In the literature, the discussion around decision-making and regret is prevalent, particularly regarding employment (Willits & Franco-Wakins, 2021; Yu, Chen, Zhao & Yu, 2017). The decision to remain or leave a job can be extremely emotional and it requires a lot of cognitive consideration for the potential consequences and benefits of the decision (Overton & Lowry, 2013; Lerner, Li, Valdesolo & Kassam, 2014). When individuals have to make a decision, there is often anxiety and fear around the impact of their choice on their

wellbeing and career and it is common for employees to feel sad should the outcomes of their decision be different to expectation (Hartley & Phelps, 2012; Lerner, Li, Valdesolo & Kassam, 2014; Grupe & Nitsche, 2014). Where employment-based regret is reported, studies suggest there is an increased risk of burn out as a by-product of emotional stress and self-blame (Tian et al, 2019; Shepard, 2013.). In this case, it could be argued there are signs of emotional stress, but the navigators appear to place more blame on the organization as opposed to themselves. Albeit self-blame can be unconscious, difficult to identify or perhaps the navigators may not have wanted to disclose this (Guglielmucci et al, 2018).

Moreover, the empirical evidence also infers several negative consequences associated with feeling under challenged and under valued at work. Research shows employees who do not feel challenged demonstrate higher levels of workplace boredom, which is positively related to a depressed mood at the end of the day and into the evening (van Hoof & van Hooft, 2012: Van Hoof & van Hooft, 2015). Moreover, a study by the APA (2012) found a link between feeling valued at work, wellbeing, and performance (Van De Voorde, Van Veldhoven & Pauuwe, 2011). They found 98% of employees who felt valued at work were motivated to perform to the best of their ability and were engaged with the organization, in comparison to 33% of employees who reported feeling under valued. Further, 21% of valued employees reported intent to search for a new job at the end of the year in comparison to 50% of under valued employees. Subsequently, it seems employee dissatisfaction poses risk to both the navigators and the organization. It is advised the PCC and NWP review this matter and work with the navigators to try and improve their sense of value to diminish regret.

Subtheme 5: Professional Rapport

This theme explores the relationships between the professionals at Checkpoint. It is comprised of three further subthemes: Navigator Rapport, Rapport with Management and Managements perspective of Rapport.

Navigator Rapport

The first subtheme relates to the rapport built between the navigators and how well they work as a collective, "we work very well together", "I rang a colleague (a navigator) this morning for some bits and pieces and he asked me a question and we have no problem with that. We have a wealth of knowledge we can share which is great", "The team is brilliant and so wide-ranging in their knowledge and skills, its a pleasure to work with them". The examples demonstrate the strong rapport between the navigators and that there is a real sense of team spirit within the team. It also seems like they feel able to approach each other with professional queries but also to use their own experiences and knowledge of the criminal justice system to benefit others.

The empirical evidence infers positive interpersonal relationships at work fulfil a fundamental human and positively affect employee mental health, health behaviors, physical health, and mortality risks (Dinis et al, 2019; Ohrnberger, Fichera & Sutton, 2017; Umberson & Montez, 2010). This is because our psychosocial systems respond to positive social situations and positive relationships release oxytocin in the brain, linked to trustworthiness and motivation to help others in the workplace (Gordon, Martin, Feldman & Leckman, 2011; Jones et al, 2017). Further, when relationships in the workplace are characterized by cooperation, trust, and fairness, the reward centre of the brain is activated, and this has a positive impact on trust, respect and confidence (Geue, 2017). Because of this, employees are found to exhibit more altruistic behaviours providing co-workers with help, advice, and feedback on work-related matters (Lodisso, 2019).

Moreover, positive interactions between co-workers are found to improve job satisfaction and positive emotional responses such as empathy, compassion, positive feelings at the end of the working day, increased motivation, and positive shared experience (Rosales, 2015; Houtson, 2020). These relationships also have organizational benefits. Studies show employees reporting positive social interactions with their co-workers demonstrate higher levels of engagement, improved business outcome, lower business costs and fewer safety incidents (Houston, 2020; Witters & Agrawal, 2015). Further, as appears to be the case with the navigators, positive social interactions also benefit knowledge and productivity transfers between trained and un-trained workers (Cornelissen, 2016). An early study by Mas & Moretti (2009) found knowledge transfer improved productivity in less experienced professionals, as they worked quicker and efficiently when working alongside more experienced peers. However, it remains unclear how the positive professional relationships are implicated by the dissatisfaction reported in other areas, if at all. Future research could explore this in relation to the navigator's experience but also how this team spirit may or may not elevate some of the pressures in other areas.

Rapport with Management

The second subtheme relates to the rapport between the navigators, the line manager and the advisor from NWP. It is comprised of two further subthemes: Positives and Negatives.

Positives
This subtheme represents a partial, positive view of the state of the professional relationships between some of the navigators and management, "I believe I have a strong professional relationship with both managers. I am comfortable to approach them and speak openly with them about any queries or concerns", "I believe that my professional relationship

with both managers is very good. I am constantly reassured that I can call and ask for support with any aspect, not only professionally but personally also", "The manager from NWP is very approachable and always replied to emails quickly. We are not allowed to have any contact with him now", "They are both passionate about what they do and its clear they both want to see Checkpoint succeed". The examples infer both managers are approachable, reassuring, and supportive and that they really want Checkpoint to succeed. There is also a subtle tone of unity and togetherness in the pragmatics of the navigator's reports.

Across domains, the empirical evidence supports the benefits of having an approachable, reassuring, and supportive boss or leader (Dally et al, 2014; Cortellazzo, Bruni & Zamperini, 2019; Diaz & Mazuera, 2014). The benefits include but are not exclusive to an increase in employee trust, improved employee confidence, more positive means of communication and overall, an effective way to achieve best practice (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2020; Osbourne & Hammoud, 2017). When employees feel comfortable enough to approach their boss, studies show they are more likely to engage in the 'flow of idea's' process and subsequently, enhance the efficacy of delivery (Bauer, 2020). Studies infer this improves organizational outcomes as employees delivering interventions know the most of what works, what does not work and what may improve the efficacy of the service (Nielson et al, 2016).

Further, there are several independent benefits associated with being able to gain reassurance from an employer, particularly in a new role and during times of uncertainty (D'Auria & De Smet, 2020; Yawson, 2020). Scholars suggest this is because open lines of communication during change or uncertainty, diminishes negative consequences and installs deliberate calmness, a sense of unity and elevates bounded optimism (Hasana & Manxhari, 2017; Smith, 2017; D'Auria & De Smet, 2020). Research suggests during times of crisis, like the coronavirus pandemic, this helps productive practice resume without too much implication (Brassey & Kuyt, 2020).

Studies also show employees who feel supported by their boss, in both personal and professional instances, report higher levels of job satisfaction and subsequently, perform better and work harder (Hammig, 2017; Bryson, Forth & Stokes, 2014). In addition to this, research shows that being a supportive boss also benefits the efficacy of the wider organization because awareness of personal and professional issues can help leaders determine who is best for what job and how each employee is best utilized to maximize their potential without compromising their wellbeing (Kumar, Adish & Chauhan, 2015); Osborne & Hammon, 2017). The literature infers leaders who are approachable, reassuring, and supportive are more likely to be a passionate leader and their passion and energized presence is likely to be infectious (Li, Zhang & Yang, 2017). Therefore, this is likely to positively impact all involved.

Negatives

The second subtheme 'Negatives' represents a very different view of the state of the professional relationships between the navigators and management. It is arguably the most prevalent theme related to rapport. It is comprised of three further subthemes: PCC line manager, NWP manager and Collective concerns. The separate subthemes ensure the different experiences between the navigators and the two different managers are represented clearly.

PCC line manager

This subtheme explores the professional relationships between most of the navigators and their line manager from the PCC. Most of the data explores the navigator's complaints of their line managers management style, "I have sadly felt as though the line manager from the PCC has been unapproachable at times in the beginning and this has meant I have kept a lot of things to myself since then. I feel it has slightly hindered our relationship from building

up", "I am wary of the line manager with certain things as I have heard lot of negative things from other agencies that they have worked with in the past", "Some of things I have heard are quite shocking and concerning. The line manager is not the best Manager, and I believe that someone should have been appointed with better knowledge of policing background. At present I am managing the manager", "The line manager isn't very approachable, and I don't feel comfortable in disclosing complaints/issues to them as when matters have been brought up in the past, I didn't feel that they were taken on board properly", "I personally feel that the line manager has lack of Management and project skills and therefore some of their staff are confused with their leadership". These examples juxtapose the experiences depicted in the prior subtheme. It is clear the navigators occupy several negative attitudes about their manager, deeming her unapproachable, untrustworthy, and lacking essential knowledge in policing and project management. To put it bluntly, some appear to question her ability to manage the project altogether and one even suggests they must manage the line manager at times.

The literature suggests the navigator's dissatisfaction with their line manager is problematic, for it is associated with negative organizational consequences such as a lack of employee motivation, poor job performance and negative attitudes (Gilbert, De Winne & Sels, 2020). Research supports the prevalence of employee dissatisfaction when employees feel their line manager lacks experience and where decision-making is perceived as confusing or ineffective (Jacobs, 2019). The empirical evidence also supports the importance of having an approachable boss, for as previously disclosed, this has a strong impact on the ability to build positive boss-employee relationships (Tran et al, 2018). Where this is not achieved, research suggests it is normal for employees to feel like they are not valued, and this can inhibit the employee trust. A recent survey found having an unapproachable boss causes a 47% decrease in motivation, a 28% drop in productivity and an 18% increase in employee's

pulling a 'sickie' as an avoidance tactic (Churchill, 2019). Further, the same survey found 15% of employees in the UK feel like they must 'manage their manager' and reported instances where they have had to cover up their manager's incompetence on a regular basis and this inhibited organizational outcomes. However, at this point, it is important to remain objective and to highlight that there are no specific examples given to explain why the navigators have had to manage their manger and when they have had to cover up mistakes. Nonetheless, where employees feel this way, the outcomes do not appear promising, as 28% of the employees in this survey sought after new employment as means to find a better boss and a more positive work environment, 20% became self employed and 12% pursued an entirely new career (Churchill, 2019). Therefore, it is important to review ways to diminish these risks.

Research shows admitting to previous mistakes, demonstrating some level of accountability and active engagement in problem solving diminishes this risk (Metcalfe, 2017). However, studies show only 42% of bosses in the UK are willing to admit to their mistakes and 28% dismiss the importance of their errors, refusing to take responsibility or simply blaming others (Churchill, 2019). That is not to say the line manager from the PCC falls into either category, nor is it clear there is sufficient evidence of their need to do so. It is merely explored to highlight that a failure to demonstrate accountability fuels negative attitudes amongst employees and these are considered infectious (Maslach and Leiter, 2016). Moving forward, it may be beneficial to explore the positive and negative experiences of the navigators together, to understand why some navigators have a better experience with the line manager than others. The findings could be used to adjust and work towards repairing the distrust reported.

NWP advisor

The second subtheme explores the issues between some of the navigators and the advisor from NWP. They discuss their dissatisfaction in relation to feeling unheard and disappointed, "He would often undermine the PCC line manager's response to a query and openly stated his frustration with her", "We would often confide in the NWP manager about our frustrations with the PCC Manager and he would reassure us that things were happening at a senior level that he could not discuss and that senior managers were aware of our feelings however it was evident as time went on that nothing was changing so we learned to no longer display our feelings to him", "I no longer complain about how I'm feeling as there doesn't seem any point that your opinion is listened to". "He was aware of all of the concerns and stated he recognized that there were issues, and the PCC knew also yet this was never addressed as far as I am aware. He was approachable yet remained on the outside and eventually we were advised not to contact him regarding Checkpoint issues", "I have disclosed issues to the NWP manager in the past as well, but it didn't seem to resolve things". The examples demonstrate how repeated disclosures and a lack of action from the NWP advisor made the navigators loose faith and trust in them.

Research infers it is important for employees to feel heard and supported in the workplace, for a lack of organizational support is associated with adverse impacts on a worker's dignity and sense of value (Wilkinson, Gollan, Kalia & Xu, 2018). When employees do not feel supported this can create animosity, exclusion, and avoidance in the workplace and this can cause significant stress and job dissatisfaction (Rosales, 2015). Research suggests this is associated with several negative health consequences, including higher risk of cardiovascular disease, compromised immunity, and shortened lifespan (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2016). It is also associated with detrimental affects to employee's emotional wellbeing. For example, one study found employees experience a social pain when they feel isolated and undervalued in the workplace and the impact of this pain on the cerebral cortex

is the same as if physical pain had been experienced (Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010; Sturgeon & Zautra, 2016). It is therefore of little surprise, feeling isolated and unsupported in the workplace is an independent predictor of medically diagnosed depression (Mustaq, Shoib, Shah & Mushtaq, 2014). Should the navigators feel this over a long period of time, studies show there is an increased risk of psychiatric and physiological health problems (Novotney, 2019). Therefore, it is important for NWP to review this issue and explore how they can improve support from the organization to diminish this risk.

Partnership rapport

This subtheme explores the navigator's perception of the relationship between the line manager from the PCC and the advisor from NWP. It is comprised of two further subthemes: Conflict and Power Imbalance.

Conflict

The first subtheme explores the existing conflict between the line manager from the PCC and the manager from NWP and how their conflict creates ambiguity and frustration for the navigators, "They both have different opinions on many things which can make things very confusing. We get told one thing by the NWP manager and another by the line manager from the PCC and vice versa", "There has been some confusion at times as to who we should contact when seeking advice for example; the difficulty being that **** from the PCC is our line manager but **** from NWP offers the policing perspective which can be so helpful in some situations, but he is not our first point of contact", "I am frustrated that there are differences in responses between the two managers", "Recently we have been advised to not contact the NWP manager with any queries…It did however highlight the tension between the Managers and could make situations awkward". "From the outset it was clear to see that there were issues between the managers and communication was shockingly poor", "You can also see that there is conflict between the PCC and the Police, personally I feel this project

should be managed by the Police as they are more aware of the practicalities of working with RMS and offenders", "There are trust issues between management and us because of this lack of communication". The examples demonstrate the frustration felt by most of the navigators and how they feel both managers provide conflicting information, which makes their role more confusing.

The literature supports the adverse impacts of conflict at a senior level on employees, suggesting it is disruptive and confusing (Heyden, Fourne, Koene & Ansari, 2017; Overton & Lowry, 2013). Studies indicate conflict between superiors is likely to impact the entire organizations performance and productivity, diminishing employee moral, creating stress and tension between employees, increasing absenteeism and employee turnover (Kachi et al, 2020; Wang & Wang, 2020). Further, organizational conflict is associated with sleeping problems, loss of appetite or emotional eating and stress related headaches (Goadsby et al, 2017). Employees are also more likely to become unapproachable and avoid meetings with management to diminish their exposure to conflict and reduce their degree of stress (Stults-Kolehmainen & Sintra, 2014). Even more, should this conflict persist, studies show employees are more likely to ruminate, gossip and vent their frustrations instead of focusing on the job at hand (CIPD, 2021). Because of this, organizations are more likely to lose money, time, and relationships with other agencies, with an increased likelihood of project failure (Kiitam, Mclay & Pilli, 2016). To avoid this, the literature suggests the line manager and advisor from NWP should consider training in conflict resolution and consider working out their issues to improve teamwork, productivity, work environment and employee job satisfaction (Overton & Lowry, 2013).

Power Imbalance

This subtheme explores reports of a power imbalance between the manager from the PCC and the advisor from NWP. This subtheme is comprised based on navigator rapports of a discrepancy around who outranks who, "I think there has been a blurring of lines where the PCC and NWP have control and even our manager has said on a number of occasions…'I am PCC…I out rank the police", "The line manager thinks that she outranks people and when we first started she said things like 'oh they'll do it because they have to…because I am PCC'. It feels a little bit 'I'm from the PCC' strutting around", "I think it complicates everything having PCC and NWP", "Our Manager also likes to tell us how 'important' she is in the PCC and they can pull 'rank' over the Police which is not helpful when Navigators are trying to seek solutions in a more holistic approach rather than that's Police and that's PCC". The examples demonstrate the navigator's frustrations around the way their line manager asserts her authority over them and the police.

Research suggests managers who assert their authority in this way often do so because they don't want their authority and/or ability to be questioned (Ryan, 2015). This may be conscious or subconscious and typically stems from the fear of being perceived as weak and/or feeling threatened by the status, power and control held by a partner or organization (Gibson, 2016; Soriano et al, 2018). Some may perceive this to be indicative of toxic leadership, for a perceived threat to status, power and control seems to prompt a toxic behavioural response (Singh, 2018; Hitchcock, 2015). Conversely, it could be argued this behaviour represents fear-based management style, whereby a fear of failure, the unknown, criticism, change and feeling like an imposter can cause a leader to act in less desirable ways (Chromey, 2017). Research indicates leaders who adopt this management style can lack self-awareness and experience and these statements can be used as means to assert dominance and gain control (de Lacerda, 2015). The literature suggests there are no long-term benefits to this leadership approach, merely several consequences and/or risks for the organization and those

on the receiving end of this behaviour. For example, studies have found this approach diminishes the perceived psychological safety of employees, enhances challenge related stress, diminishes employee creativity, and emotionally exhausts employees (Atmadja, 2019; Zhu & Zang, 2019; Berger, Czakert, Leuteritz & LEiva, 2019). Further, in some cases, studies have shown this management style can be an early indication of future bullying, emotional abuse, and the abuse of authority, for the nature of the speech alongside the imbalance of authority may constitute a degree of verbal intimidation (Rivara, 2016). Should this matter escalate, and this type of speech persist over a substantial period, it is also related to an increased risk of physical illness, anxiety disorders, clinically diagnosed depression and in extreme cases, post-traumatic stress disorder (Nielsen et al, 2015). Withal, it is important to acknowledge this is not an inevitable outcome, it is merely a possibility. Still, the navigators are frustrated and lack clarity about who governs the initiative. Subsequently both issues should be addressed.

Management perspective on Rapport

This subtheme explores the manager's view of their professional relationships with the navigators. It is comprised of two further subthemes: PCC perspective and NWP advisor's perspective.

PCC perspective

This subtheme explores the line manager from the PCC's perspective of her professional relationships with the navigators, "There have been disagreements and challenges, but overall, the team has formed a good relationship and support each other, and in turn they support me. It's during times like covid that you realize how well people support one another. They have been brilliant". The response is optimistic yet vague and it seems

they feel there is a reciprocal degree of support between herself and the navigators. However, their response paints a very different picture to that painted by most of the navigators. For instance, they briefly highlight the experience of conflict but are quick to counter it with a string of positive depictions. This infers the line manager either lacks awareness of the issues raised by some of the navigator's, prefers to ignore them altogether or did not want to disclose them during the interview.

The literature suggests leaders who lack awareness of the impact of their actions on their employees or those who refuse to recognize their mistakes are more likely to demonstrate toxic leadership (Singh, 2018). This is because leaders influence both the working environment and the wellbeing of employees and subsequently, they have a responsibility to adopt a non-toxic leadership style to ensure a non-toxic working environment (Atmadja, 2018). Where toxic leadership exists, research suggests there is a strong relationship between toxic behaviour and adverse effects on the mental and physical health of employees, associated with diminished self-esteem, increased self-doubt, low self-worth, helplessness, burnout, and cardiovascular issues (Singh, Sengupta & Dev, 2019). Further, these symptoms are also associated with an increased risk of anxiety, depression and frustration, alongside displaced aggression, where resentment and hatred can consume employees and they may or may not take this out on the organization (Singh, 2018). Toxic leadership can also increase counterproductive behaviours like coming into work late, absence from work and transfers (Hadadian & Sayadpour, 2018). Moreover, a recent survey found toxic leadership was responsible for 48% of reductions in work effort, 38% reduction in work quality and 73% turnover rates (Hitchcock, 2015). Subsequently, it is important to review the efficacy of this leadership style, for should issues persist, employees are more likely to ruminate, gossip and adopt/continue the cycle of other toxic behaviours (Atmadja, 2019; Burns, 2017). This type of negativity can spread quickly, and more employees could

105

become prone to negative behaviours and attitudes, further perpetuating the cycle of toxicity (Burns, 2017). Withal, studies show if a leader can effectively and timeously address this, they can avoid further workplace toxicity (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). Scholars suggest the line manager could review more positive leadership styles and implement a clear and productive problem-solving plan to limit the potential for toxicity developing in the work environment, to positively influence the wellbeing and productivity of workers (Overton & Lowry, 2013; Bhui et al, 2016).

NWP advisor perspective

This subtheme explores the NWP advisors perspective of their professional relationships with the navigators and the struggles they experienced as they tried to reduce their involvement with Checkpoint, "I'd like to think that I have a good relationship with them but it's a difficult balance as I try to gradually withdraw to allow the manager to become more involved – the danger is that they start to feel that I am disinterested, the greater danger is that they become confused over line management (in my head there is a clear line between who manages them – I am not convinced that this is the case with either the navigators or the manager)". The response demonstrates the advisors hopes to have a positive relationship with the navigators but also, that he is concerned for their welfare and the issues they may experience. Further, it seems they are uncertain and concerned about how the navigators may feel about this transitional period. Additionally, they seem concerned that neither, the navigators or the line manager yet has a clear understanding of who should be managing them.

Research suggests that coaching employees through organizational change is complex and challenging and, in most cases, upset or uncertainty, amongst employees and employers, is normal (Reina et al, 2017; Bordia, Hunt, Paulsen & Tourish, 2004). Studies infer where an

employer cares about their employee's wellbeing, they are more likely to feel anxious about how their employee's will react to change and whether the change impacts their understanding of their role and organizational protocol (Whitmore et al, 2018). Moreover, the literature suggests uncertainty during change is a cause of psychological strain for it is associated with the experience of lacking control (Grupe & Nitschke, 2013). To combat this, scholars stress the importance of communication from management but also to include employees in the decision-making process for studies found this reduced uncertainty and increased feelings of control (Bordia, Hobman, Jones, Gallois & Callan, 2004). Perhaps the NWP advisor could review this and take steps to improve communication and navigator involvement moving forward.

Theme 2: structural issues

This theme explores navigator reports of some of the structural issues that inhibited the implementation of Checkpoint. It is comprised of four further subthemes: Poor structured training, lack of structure, low awareness, and lack of resources.

Subtheme 1: Poor structured training

This subtheme explores the navigator's experience of the training package and how they felt their training package was poorly organized, "There was no training package in place when we started which resulted in the start of Checkpoint being delayed and due to staff starting at different dates it meant that the first wave of staff didn't get training when they started", "I started my role believing that there was going to be a training package in place …However the first few months of the program was rather slow and training courses were sporadically placed here and there. Due to this, and having to spend a lot of time waiting around, it made me feel rather frustrated…my motivation and incentive slowly decreased", "There was no plan in place for certain training, certain things were not

communicated to us, training and inductions were cancelled and moved around, that was never explained and it would have been really helpful at the time for the checkpoint managers to both go…do you know what we don't know what's going on". The examples demonstrate the navigator's frustration, and it seems the constant changes, delays, and lack of effective communication (from management) diminished employee morale and motivation. Further, it seems there was a lack of communication regarding the reasons for the constant changes and delays, which inhibited the navigator's confidence in management.

The empirical evidence supports the notion poor organization at the start of an intervention inhibits employee satisfaction, for it can be disruptive and is associated with an increased risk of employee stress and a decrease in trust (Bhui et al, 2016.; Gray et al, 2019). Further, the literature supports the adverse impact of this on the navigator's morale and motivation (Tianya, 2015). Studies show this can be destructive for an intervention in its implementation phase, as it can lead to dissatisfaction, poor productivity, absenteeism, and increased turnover rates (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). This is because low morale causes a disconnect between employees and employers and poor management of early change can increase an employee's scepticism of their leader's competence (Hardy, Alcock & Malpass, 2016). This can also influence employees to question their employers' motives and studies show employees may resist further changes and in extreme cases, attempt to sabotage their employers' efforts (Abbott, 2003; Shaban, Al-Zubi, Ali & Alqtish, 2017). Studies suggest if management had been more transparent with the reasons for the constant changes and delays at the start, they may have better maintained employee morale and trust, for employees typically respond well to honesty during uncertainty (Hardy, Alcock & Malpass, 2016).

Subtheme 2: Lack of structure

This subtheme explores the navigator's frustrations around the lack of structure in their day-to-day role, after their training. Due to poor planning the navigators felt they had

"too much down time" during the first few months of employment and this appeared to further diminish their motivation and perception of the Checkpoint managers competence, "The first few months of the program was rather slow …my motivation and incentive slowly decreased", "When I arrived on my first day, I expected a 'timetable' with instructions of what we were to do daily, again, there was no information as to our plan and most days were sitting around a table doing absolutely nothing", "we spent a lot of time sitting in custody doing nothing all day, or sitting by the computer in the control room in FHQ with nothing to do", "I did not feel confident that senior management knew what the plan was or how they were going to achieve this. As a team, we tried to be proactive during our 'downtime", "there was no plan in place, no training packages booked and everyday in the first few months appeared to have been 'made up' that morning, we spent many days doing nothing at all", "There was never any clear communication as to what time we were to attend everyday or what we would actually be doing. I found this position very anxiety provoking as I have a family and could not commit to anything as I never knew what times I would be working", "It was frustrating that there was no apology for our lack of structure and I felt if Management didn't know then they should have been transparent with us from day one… my enthusiasm was there on day one however from the lack of structure I felt less supportive of Checkpoint as I wasn't confident they knew how Checkpoint was going to work". The examples demonstrate the navigator's frustrations around their lack of structure in their day-to-day role and how they felt poor communication and a lack of effective planning left them with very little to do.

The empirical evidence supports the importance of organizational structure. Studies show that organizations that are poorly organized diminish employee productivity, effective delegation, and employee incentive to work (Telda, 2016). Further, one study explored the impact of doing nothing on employee and found managers underestimate the impact and fail

to anticipate the damaging effect this can have on employee performance and well-being (Bergen & Bressler, 2014). Research shows that without structure, employees face an increased risk of stress, low job satisfaction, burnout, depression, and overall adverse impacts on their mental wellbeing (Bhui et al, 2016; Rajgopal, 2010). This is because most employees have an intrinsic need for job satisfaction and in most cases, satisfaction relies upon available opportunities to utilize their skills and have an active role in an organization (Slemp, Kern & Vella-Brodrick, 2014; Geldenhuys, Bakker & Demerouti, 2020). In fact, doing nothing solely predicts poor outcomes to employee wellbeing (Slemp, Kern & Vella-Brodrick, 2014).

Moreover, it also seems the navigators lacked clarity of their set working hours and this appeared to compromise some of the navigator's work-life balance. Research indicates the necessity of structured work hours, for irregular or uncertain work patterns are found to have damaging effects on the home life, of both men and women (Moen et al, 2016). Employees with uncertain work patterns are more likely to experience work-family conflict and subsequently, suffer greater work stress, emotional exhaustion, and work absence (Richter, Schraml & Leineweber, 2014). Arguably, there is also a financial implication related to employing a team of people and not utilizing their down time effectively (Moen et al, 2016). However, at this time, it is unclear how their time could have been better used or if they were simply employed to soon, as we have not explored all the data. The researcher will revisit this matter should it become clearer.

Subtheme 3: Low awareness

This subtheme is comprised of two further subthemes: Poor promotion approach and Navigator action.

Poor promotion approach

This subtheme explores the view that there was and still is, a lack of awareness amongst the Police regarding what Checkpoint is and what it offers clients, **"When we went live, officers were not aware of what Checkpoint was which resulted in the navigators going round different station explaining what it was, which wasn't our job to do"**, "Many NWP officers remain oblivious to the scheme", "I believe that Checkpoint has not been advertised very well to promote what we can offer participants. Most officers / Sgt at NW Police are not aware of the project / how to refer ", "A few days ago an officer asked me what I did in NWP and when explained he we were led to believe had not heard of it at all yet that the program had been promoted by the management extensively before the navigator's arrival in role". One of the navigators went on explain their opinion that the awareness of Checkpoint was inhibited by the line managers 'top-down' approach to promotion, "we said (to the line manager) oh this is an officer, she didn't know about Checkpoint and the line manager said well what else am I meant to do, I've emailed district inspectors…With respect, even the inspector said well I think there was an email but when I came back off holiday I had over a thousand emails and I deleted them all. So, it was a poor approach". The navigator too went on to explain how this approach had delayed referrals to the scheme by a month, "My first case came through on the 20th of December. That's not good enough" before suggesting, "You must cater your communication to who your audience is. If you're dealing with high up ranking people, then a power point presentation is fine. But if you're dealing with people on the ground, they want you to talk to them".

The empirical evidence supports the importance of a good approach to program promotion, for if police officers or sergeants do not know about the program, they will not be able to make referrals to it (Cordner, 2020). Where awareness is low, the evidence suggests it is normal for employees to become frustrated with management and feel a degree of

animosity towards them (Overton and Lowry, 2013). According to the literature, this is most common amongst employees under top-down management, for top-down managers do not typically involve employees in decision-making (Zhou et al, 2021). Studies show this creates animosity and can cause employees to act on their own accord (Annamalai, 2016). Where this happens, employees must develop and implement a more effective promotion strategy, without the resources or support needed to do the job and this can be very stressful (Bhui et al, 2016). For clarity, a 'top down' approach is the process of upper management (Heyden, Forne, Koene & Werkman, 2017). In this case, this approach was not considered effective because of the number of emails district inspectors received. The empirical evidence supports the notion this was the wrong approach to take for high-ranking professionals are often very busy and not responsible for the daily use or referral to programs like Checkpoint, nor is it their role to spread knowledge of its existence (Bennet, Bennet & Lewis, 2015). This means there is little chance district inspectors would read the email or if they do, it is less likely they would have the time to spread the message of Checkpoint to the police officers and sergeants responsible for Checkpoint referrals. Therefore, a review of a new approach to promotion is advised.

Navigator Action

This subtheme explores the action taken by the navigators to promote Checkpoint. They adopted a new approach to promotion, using a bottom-up approach. One navigator reported, "I began the role in September and no officer that I spoke with was aware of the scheme during the first 3 months, I promoted the program myself at police stations and in external services to those who I had known in my previous roles in services". Another navigator wrote, "I did Rota briefings and I've done that in my own time at 6:30 am in the morning in Wrexham…they had three lots of briefings, so I did each one for them for the different ranks and people coming in late. But with respect, that is what should have been

done without us back in September…Get out there to everything single police station, briefing and Rota and talk to them". They went on to explain how well this was received by those in attendance, "In my third briefing in Wrexham I heard one of the girls who was on my briefing and one of her colleagues came in and she went 'ooooo the lady over there go and talk to her because she has this new thing and it will make our life easier…go and talk to her…Now I feel like we are getting consistent referrals". The examples demonstrate the navigator's efforts to promote checkpoint and how they felt their face-to-face approach was more effective than the approach used by the PCC.

The empirical evidence suggests both 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches have their merits and drawbacks (Annamalai, 2016). Having said that, most agree a bottom-up approach has increased benefits amongst policing professionals, for this approach is most effective for promotion and associated with greater levels of collaboration, a great sense of teamwork, increased morale, better productivity, and harder working employees (McQuerrey, 2020). As the bottom-up approach appeared most effective and better received by the policing professionals, the use of a bottom-up approach is advised moving forward.

Subtheme 4: Lack of resources

This subtheme explores a resource issue at the start of implementation and how this inhibited the navigator's day-to-day role, "We had no phones or laptops until late December", "It took a long time for us to get our work mobiles and laptops which again impacted on our work. We didn't know where our offices would be until very late on and there were many unanswered questions and uncertainty", "There were no pamphlets or posters available for Checkpoint until January/February even though officers were asking for them so they could spread the word. This led to a very slow start and many people missing out on support that they didn't know was available", "In our downtime we were asking if we could visit partner agencies to introduce ourselves however we were told a list would be provided for us

however this never materialized". The examples demonstrate how a lack of necessary resources at the start of the program inhibited their ability to complete their work, network, and guide clients to available support. Further, it seemed this created a degree of uncertainty for the navigators, for they were promised resources that did not materialize.

The empirical evidence suggests how important necessary resources are to employees, for without them, they cannot achieve their best work (Davidescu, Apotescu, Paul & Casuneanu, 2020). Research shows when an employer cannot provide necessary resources, they give a message that they do not truly understand what is required to achieve its goals or do not care of the adverse affect on employee wellbeing (Bhui et al, 2016). Without access to essential resources, there is not a risk to employees' performance, but also his or her confidence and commitment to the organization (Nielson et al, 2017). To be specific, studies show when managers fail to provide necessary resources but expect employees to complete their work-tasks as if they had them, there are a string of negative outcomes like poor employee morale, increased stress and distress, burnout, and the increased likelihood that organizational goals won't be achieved (Nielsen et al, 2017). Scholars suggest that to create a successful organization, employers must motivate and engage their employees by focusing on meeting their needs (Ceschi, Demerouti, Sartori & Weller, 2017). In many cases, respect is a key factor in employee motivation and providing employees with the necessary resources is considered a vital tool in communicating that respect (Osbourne & Hammoud, 2017). This is important for employees in receipt of necessary resources are found to be more engaged and inspired, which results in better overall performance and reduction in the risk of workforce burnout (West and Dawson, 2012).

Theme 3: Practical barriers

This theme is comprised of two subthemes: Barriers to referral and Intervention concerns.

Subtheme 1: Barriers to referral

This subtheme explores several barriers directly inhibiting the referral pathway. It is comprised of three further subthemes: Ineligible referral, referral structure and gender disadvantage.

Ineligible referral

This subtheme is comprised of reports related to ineligible referrals. For clarity, in this case, incorrect referral constitutes any referral made where the navigators felt the client did not meet the eligibility criteria. "My colleague had one who was referred and it turns out the kid was 17…but that wasn't the referrals fault it turned out the kid had lied ... so that was found unsuitable by the time it was too late which was a shame", "My other colleague has two cases of quite entrenched offenders who I don't think are suitable for Checkpoint…I understand they need help and support but I don't think we are the right path for them because with respect they have long criminal histories, history of non compliance", "Initially we were not getting there correct referrals, It was a mixture of incorrect referral methods which meant that they were charged with a conditional caution (which does show on their DBS record), and individuals with convictions that are not suitable for checkpoint (Domestic violence related", "there has been an occasion that someone was allocated to myself who I didn't meet due to the individual reoffending before we could go forwards with it who was a prolific offender in the area and was also a heavily entrenched drug user". The examples demonstrate the navigator's experience of the different types of ineligible offenders referred to Checkpoint.

For the young offender, it appears he was referred to checkpoint because of his deception instead of a consequence of poor police decision-making. It is illegal to provide false details to the police and this offence is punishable by imprisonment of up to six months

(CPS, 2019). Having said that, research suggests where an offender is below the age of 18 and has committed an offence for the first time, they are likely to be let off with a stern warning (Ministry of Justice, 2019). With that said, due to a lack of information regarding how this matter was dealt with by the police, both the reason for and consequences of the deception remain unclear. The literature infers young, low-level offenders are most likely to lie about their age to avoid parental detection (Bateman, 2017). This is because offenders under the age of 18 should not be interviewed without a present parent or appropriate adult, unless there is a significant of risk or harm as a by-product of delaying an interview (CQC, 2011). Subsequently, this is the most likely explanation for his deception.

Conversely, the other ineligible offender appears to be an entrenched drug user, prolific offender, and an individual with a history of criminality and non-compliance. All of which do not appear to fit the set criteria for referral. In addition to this, offenders who had already received a conditional caution were also referred to Checkpoint, despite this juxtaposing remit of Checkpoint. The literature suggests ineligible referrals are most likely a by-product of poor police decision-making, most likely fuelled by limited program awareness and a lack of understanding around the type of offender Checkpoint is intended for (Alang et al, 2017; Laufs & Waseem, 2020). Scholars suggest this is because referral is decided at the professional's discretion and this means their understanding around who is eligible for referral is of paramount importance (Fox, 2015). This is because ineligible referral and the risks of deferral are associated with negative consequences for offenders. For example, should an ineligible offender be incorrectly referred to Checkpoint and then deferred, they may feel let down and distrusting of the policing service and their competence (Laufs & Waseem, 2020; Myhill & Quinton, 2011). Further, should word of incorrect referral get out, it is too likely to diminish public confidence and voluntary attendance (Furlong, Richardson & Fiest, 2021). On the contrary, there is also a risk to clients who are incorrectly referred, for

they may have a greater need that cannot be sufficiently met. For example, clients may require detox and rehabilitation or specialist mental health treatment that is not accessible through this program. Subsequently, incorrect referral may provide hope of access to support without the possibility to fulfil this. To improve this issue, the PCC, NWP, and the navigators could work with all relevant decision makers to ensure they understand who Checkpoint is for, improving the available guidance and improving means of communication around referral-based decision-making. Doing this should diminish any ambiguity.

Referral structure

This subtheme explores a number of structural barriers inhibiting the referral pathway, "We are sometimes getting referrals in from different places, and this does take a lot of time to get processed so there does seem to be a delay in that which causes some frustration", "The only issue we are facing currently is the inability for navigators to access the email address that sergeants email referrals to. We cannot log in to this email a to check the inbox if the Manager is not available to assign referrals to the navigators", "There is a generic email where referrals are emailed to and then the Manager will email this onto a navigator. I know there is some inconsistency to this as personally I have not always received an email from the Manager on every occasion and only found I have been allocated a case when I go into RMS". In addition to this, they went on to explain, "I feel that navigators would be better placed outside of custody suites as a general setup; police stations or hot-desking within other agencies would be more effective given the general lack of referrals made from custody", "Our hours as well mean that when referrals do come from custody, we are usually on rest days or have finished working for the day – this is particularly true for cases of public order or drunk and disorderly which are more prevalent over the weekends and night time.". The examples demonstrate the different barriers inhibiting the efficacy of the referral pathway.

Collectively, these barriers are best depicted as by-products of poor resource management (Dieleman, Gerretsen & van der Wilt, 2009). For clarity, resource management explores the process of appropriately planning and allocating resources to maximize resource efficacy and in turn, create successful projects and work towards organizational goals (Hanson, 2018). In this case, it seems access to essential resources like emails and referrals was lacking, inhibiting the navigator's ability to deal with each referral swiftly and causing delays. Further, it seems the line manager was key in the referral process, yet navigators were not always notified when allocated a new referral. This appears to both complicate the process and create a degree of frustration amongst the navigators for it seems effective communication surrounding referral allocation was lacking. Moreover, it seems the navigators felt that their work location and shift times create an additional barrier to the referral process and that they feel they would be better placed outside of custody, with the flexibility to work during the evenings and weekends.

Research infers challenges related to infrastructure, resource allocation and geography commonly impede the implementation of new programs and that effective communication, organization, appropriate management of technological services and leadership support are essential to improve program efficacy and work towards success (Buljac-Samardzic, Doekhie & van Wijngaarden, 2020). Where issues persist, most programs shift towards self-referral to bypass the barriers associated with seeking referral through general practice (Brown, Boardman, Whittinger & Ashworth, 2010). However, there are other ways to improve a programs infrastructure. For instance, there are several empirically supported referral systems that can be used to facilitate electronic referral and consultation, to improve access to support, reduce waiting times, improve the quality of referral communication and information transfer (Naseriasl, Adham & Janati, 2015). Perhaps this would be useful in this case. Further, to better comprehend the efficacy of moving to a new base, future research could conduct a

literature review and then evaluate the efficacy of moving to a new base, away from custody. This would also help improve our understanding about if there are any benefits to evening or weekend shifts.

Gender disadvantage

This subtheme explores the navigators view around how the referral pathway differs for men and women and why the process is perhaps more difficult for females who have to repeatedly address their issues and/or life experiences to new people, "I do think there is a bit of a mismatch on the level of support the men get and the level of support the women get", "Women have to re complete another needs assessment with WPF, having to share sensitive info with another new person for the second time which I imagine is not easy", "Ironically, the females that have come through the scheme are in need of the most support however all we do as Navigators is sign post them to Women's Pathfinder so we don't do any of the support work with them". "For men, we are much more involved as we provide support ourselves or refer onwards/ co-work with other agencies…I do understand why we have to refer women onwards however looking to the future it may be good to be able to provide the same service for both men and women", "The women complete a Checkpoint needs assessment with ourselves and then referred onto women's pathfinder for support – we do not continue with their support. I think it is a shame that we cannot work with the women through Checkpoint as it has sometimes taken time for Women's pathfinder to contact the female". The examples indicate referral is more complex for females as they must disclose their personal circumstances to several people, several times, something the men on the program do not have to do. It is clear the navigators feel this places female clients at a disadvantage in comparison to men, as they do not receive the same degree of support from the navigators despite having more complex needs. It seems the navigators would like to provide a more equal service to the men and women on the program, to balance out the level of support

provided but also to remove the additional barriers (delays and repeated disclosures) for women.

The literature supports the concerns raised by the navigators suggesting women in the criminal justice system typically have worse mental health than male offenders yet have a more complex journey to receive support (Ministry of Justice, 2018). Studies show there is a big difference between the reasons males and females commit offences. Males are far more likely to commit offences as means to gain status, due to peer pressure or for thrill seeking purposes and females are most likely to commit offences because of their poor mental health, coercion, manipulation, bullying or due to their experience of domestic violence (Ministry of Justice, 2018). Because of this, it is important females are referred to specialist external services like WPF as these services are designed to suit the needs of female offenders and are more effective than generic services in improving female wellbeing and facilitating the change, they need to stop offending (CPS, 2018). To be specific, such services provide tailored health interventions, social care support, substance misuse support and education, as well as providing support for those suffering violence (domestic, financial, sexual etc.) (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services, 2016). Further, as there is a significant issue surrounding homelessness and lack of safe housing for female offenders and specialist services like WPF are essential as females are more likely to remain in an unsafe environment, use substances and subsequently reoffend without their support (Engender, 2018). Therefore, an effective referral system to external support is essential. However, the use of these services is not without limitation. For example, a review commissioned by the Ministry of Justice (2018) inferred a risk associated with the use of community services to support female offenders, for such services are ran by third-sector organizations and subsequently, even where services exist, the level of provision does not and cannot always match the degree of demand. Subsequently there is a risk of more in need individuals missing

out on essential support and reoffending consequently. In addition to this, research suggests that to provide an equal service to males and females, professionals working in the criminal justice system need to be taught how to adopt a gender informed approach. This is something scholars suggest is not yet attained and at present, external services appear to be the most appropriate place to provide support to female offenders. However, it is important to acknowledge how this process may be more difficult for females.

Subtheme 2: Intervention Concerns

This subtheme explores the issues surrounding available interventions. It is comprised of two further subthemes: Drug's education program and Women's Pathfinders.

Drugs Education Program (DEP)

This subtheme explores professional opinions of the DEP, which was created by the line manager from the PCC. It is comprised of two subthemes: Navigator perspective and managers perspective.

Navigator Perspective

This subtheme was the dominant perspective amongst the navigators. It explores the view the DEP is poorly written, contains the wrong content and targets the wrong demographic, **"**That the program itself is poorly written by management and appears to evidence a lack of knowledge in substances and substance misuse clients, trends and behaviours", "Most participants think that the DEP it's not relevant to them and content is poor", "It is lengthy, unnecessary at times and inappropriate in most cases to the offenders and their use of a specific drug", "The material of the DEP is sometime not relevant…there are slides that are aim towards entrenched heroin users, such as method of injecting when if they can't find a vein, which is not at all relevant and there is no need for it on the slides", "I think it needs to be tailored to the audience better… we need more about cannabis, more

about the consequences about failing the DEP…keep it simple…at the end of the day if your preaching to people about high level class A and that's not what their doing then their not going to engage as well and were going to loose them and I'm terrified that is going to happen", "I do not feel that this should be a standalone aspect of Checkpoint – everyone deserves the initial needs assessment to build rapport and offer thorough support…I feel worried that we will not offer our full capability of support to the individuals enrolled onto the program". The reports demonstrate the majority consensus, that the DEP fails to target the specific needs of checkpoint clients and instead, it targets more entrenched individuals.

The literature infers prior to creating the DEP, the creator should have conducted a needs assessment with the intended users, to identify their epidemiological needs and target the behaviours that need to be addressed to diminish substance misuse (Mclellan, 2017). Withal, the data infers this was not done in this case. Without this, studies show the potential for behaviour change and the overall efficacy of the DEP is most likely limited (Michie, West, Sheals & Godinho, 2018; Hagger & Weed, 2019). To improve this, the literature suggests the creator of the DEP should listen to both the navigators and client's views of the DEP and use their feedback to inform an evaluation of its efficacy and to make fundamental changes (Hagger & Weed, 2019).

Management Perspective

This subtheme explores the manager's view of the DEP. The line manager from the PCC wrote the program and reported, "I like the concept of offering harm reduction and raising awareness of the impact of a drugs conviction. Many people make minor mistakes that can cause a lifetime of issue, and at the time without realizing its impact". This report demonstrates their intent to create something that could reduce harm and raise awareness of what could happen should the offenders continue to take drugs. With that said, as they did not express their opinion on the efficacy of its content in practice or its impact on clients, our

understanding of this is inhibited. However, the NWP manager did address this, reporting his support for the programs aim but suggesting the content requires improvement, "I am not overly enamoured with its content, I feel it is out of touch with the individual it purports to educate and support. Most of the individuals offered a DEP will be first time offenders who will simply need to make a choice and be guided in relation to how they should come to make that choice rather than some loose aversion therapy. Having said that, I really like the premise of the DEP and what it seeks to address, the fact that it allows someone to review their life choices at an early enough time to be able to change their life outcome, to an extent". This demonstrates both managers believe in the premise of what the DEP is trying to achieve yet much like the navigators, the manager from NWP feels its content does not appropriately target the needs of Checkpoint clients.

Research infers it is important for a manager or creator of an intervention to listen to constructive feedback, for it can lead to improvements, corrections, personal and professional growth, and an increase in employee morale (Allen, 2015). The literature highlights the importance of target context in intervention research for without a clear focus on what works, for whom and under what contextual circumstance, interventions are likely to fail or underperform (Edwards & Barker, 2014.; International Political Science abstracts, 2020). To avoid this, the feedback provided could be used to change the content and improve potential outcomes of the DEP. However, its important to consider the risks associated with constructive criticism, in that many managers can be resistant to feedback and demonstrate avoidance by changing the subject, making excuses and/or superficially accepting feedback with no intent to act (Chris, 2015). Where this is the case, managers are most likely to continue and pretend that everything is fine and continue to orchestrate their intervention in its original format (Ross, 2011). In this case, there would be an increased risk of a leader's false assessment of their skills and abilities, building up a false sense of perception of the

program's efficacy (Hannah, Lester, Cavarretta & Sumanth, 2014). Therefore, we must explore ways to assist this process to ensure feedback is received well and can benefit the delivery and outcomes of the DEP.

For this process to be effective, it is important to highlight the importance of professional communication. For should this feedback be negatively received by the creator, it may result in anger, denial, blaming and hinder employee confidence, independence, and rapport with management (Kozlow, 2014). To avoid this, the literature suggests it is important that the manager is clear on the intent of her employee's and peers' feedback, to avoid suspicion around hidden agendas (Hardavella, Gaagnat & Sreter, 2017). Should this not be the case, the manager is likely to not have sufficient understanding to self assess and rectify behaviours and this may hinder their personal development (Hardavella, Gaagnat & Sreter, 2017). Scholars suggests a learner-centred approach may benefit this process as managers who are open-minded, good listeners, reflective and willing to improve their own performance are more likely to produce better outcomes (Carroll, 2020). However, personality factors, fear, confidence, context, and individual reasoning processes are known mediators of this process and the impact of such factors, at this stage, remains unclear yet possible (Kerr, Kerr, and Xu, 2017).

Women's Pathfinders (WPF)

This subtheme explore the navigators experience of working with WPF and a number of issues they have encountered with the service, "Women are being referred to Women's Pathfinders which is not working well to my understanding", "it has sometimes taken time for Women's pathfinder to contact the female", "There appears to be a bit of an issue with pathfinder in general because our management seem to think pathfinder are there just for us whereas pathfinder are actually doing a lot more work that is not purely Checkpoint…because with respect if it was just purely checkpoint I think they would have a

case load of half a dozen each.", "For female offenders seeking the Women's Centre's support who live in the North West, they would need to travel to Rhyl which is not ideal if they don't drive and live rural", "The Women's Pathfinder who take over and deliver on behalf of Checkpoint Cymru. We have found as Navigators that we cannot record in detail on the Occurrence Enquiry Log (where all activities, interventions and communications are logged) because they are being seen by someone else. We do receive an email with an overview of what has been happening from the Women's Pathfinder advisor, but I believe this could be done directly by the Navigator and would allow us to record in much more detail". The examples demonstrate the navigator's concerns related to WPF and delays, mixed caseload issues, geographical problems, and logging concerns. Collectively, these issues appear to inhibit the navigator's confidence in the efficacy of the service provided.

Scholars suggest the evidence base supporting the efficacy of third sector organizations in intervention delivery is lacking because there is a lack of robust evaluation data to demonstrate their impact or economic benefit (Bach-Mortensen and Montgomery, 2018). For example, 25% of third sector organizations failed to evaluate the efficacy of their work at all despite an increasing demand for the service (Bach-Mortensen and Montgomery, 2018). Having said that, some data suggests delays are common inhibitors of third sector organizations because there is often an issue controlling the 'flow' of referrals from external organizations due to differences in technological maturity and IT efficacy (Kersten, Blecker & Ringle, 2017). To put it simply, organizations like WPF heavily rely upon email systems and phone calls, which are associated with daily delays and inefficacies. When you consider this under the current global pandemic, research infers delays are more likely due to an influx of need for support (Roberton et al, 2020). In addition to this, data suggests a lack of financial resources and support and poor availability (geographically) are also common barriers to third sector organizations (Bach-Mortensen & Montgomery, 2018). With that said there is

little research exploring the impact of these barriers on the efficacy of service, inhibiting further exploration. Even more, we must also critically consider the navigators reports that WPF is receiving funding from multiple sources and subsequently their ability to solely focus on Checkpoint referrals is lacking. The empirical evidence indicates third sector organizations typically receive funding from multiple bodies as means of survival (Macmillan, 2010). Yet because of this their resources (which are arguably limited anyway) must be spread across multiple organizations and subsequently they are limited, and delays are likely.

Theme 4: Improvements

This theme is the least prevalent and explores general feedback from the professionals surrounding the ways Checkpoint could improve. It is comprised of two subthemes: Navigator's perspective and Management's perspective.

Subtheme 1: Navigator Perspective

This subtheme includes several responses from the navigators when asked how they felt the program could be improved. They discuss their need for clarity, concerns in relation to the manager and desires for several day-to-day adjustments, "No consistency at times with work pattern, goal post's changing frequently. Morale of navigators due to bad management", "There are lots of issues around communication from the Manager. I understand that this is a new project and things can change as Checkpoint evolves however there is no transparency from the Manager…she will often change her mind with guidance from one day to the next with no explanation", "I feel that navigators would be better placed outside of custody suites as a general setup; police stations or hot-desking within other agencies would be more effective given the general lack of referrals made from custody", "Our hours as well mean that when referrals do come from custody, we are usually on rest days or have finished

working for the day – this is particularly true for cases of public order or drunk and disorderly which are more prevalent over the weekends and night time", "Checkpoint needs to be clearer in what it is and what it offers and to whom", "There have been times where it hasn't been clear on how we should proceed with certain things and processes often change so we have to adapt quickly if we are to deliver the service efficiently".

Research supports the navigator's desires for a consistent work schedule, for irregular scheduling is associated with greater work-life conflicts and sometimes, greater work stress (McLean et al, 2014). Further, the data supports the navigators reports that constant goal post shifting is indicative of poor or even toxic management and that constantly changing the goal post only frustrates and confuses employees whilst creating an unsafe working environment (Parker, Knight & Keller, 2020). Additionally, the navigators seem keen to request more transparency from management. Research suggests trust, transparency and loyalty have a circular relationship and that for a leader to be successful, they must be open, honest and communicate clearly for employees to be aware of what is truly happening (Illes & Matthews, 2015). However, studies suggest female managers may be less transparent if they feel they may be perceived as less authoritative or if they fear their honesty may inhibit their status and that they may lose power (Hoeritz, 2013). Withal, the evidence shows transparency benefits practice as problems are solved faster, teams are built easier, relationships grow more authentically, people trust in their leader and employee performance improves (Bernstein, 2014). Therefore, taking steps to improve transparency will likely have multifactorial benefits, transforming the working environment and work towards better organizational outcomes (Hyman-Shurland, 2016).

Managers Perspective

This subtheme explores the manager's perspective of the practical problems inhibiting the program and how they feel the program could be improved. Their two perspectives are

rather different. For example, the line manager from the PCC reported her desires for change, "Only in terms of Governance and where it sits for the purposes of second line management. The program has only been operating for 4 months, approx., and within that will always be issues or challenges around pathways, processes and communications, all of which are ironed out as they present". Her response is rather vague, and she appears happy to briefly acknowledge some of her concerns and desires for change, before quickly explaining all issues are 'ironed out' as they arise. However, the data suggests this is not true from the navigator's perspective.

Research infers an ambiguous response is most common in politics, whereby specific details surrounding issues or barriers are briefly addressed yet specifics remain private to maintain face (Maguire, 2018). With regards to management styles, the literature infers this response aligns with a resistant approach to management, as it seems deflection is used to prevent the interviewer's questions bringing more issues to light (Probst, 2015). This type of resistance is found to block change, creating further resistance amongst employees, impacting their work, whilst inhibiting trust and communication (Schulz-Knappe, Koch & Beckert, 2019). Studies suggest this is most often underpinned by an anxiety around the perception of others and the fear of being viewed as weak or inexperienced (Grupe & Nitscke, 2013). However, honest, and direct depictions relating to issues are in most cases, are better perceived by employees than an ambiguous and surface-based approach (Wright, 2013). This is because honesty and directness are essential to target, counter and rectify issues. Although, it could be argued to be transparent, the manager must want to deal with the issues head on and they are not. Still, she does openly express her desires for clarity surrounding second line management, inferring that at the time of interview, this was not clear. The literature supports the importance of a clear understanding regarding a second line manager, for this role is essential to provide a 'model of leadership' for employees, to set goals and visions for the

department but also to ensure necessary conversations occur between managers and employees (Tsai, 2011). In addition to this, second line managers play an important role in the resolution of conflict between management and employee's (Teague & Roche, 2011). Therefore, clarification around the second line manager may benefit several the issues raised in the other subthemes. Since the interview, it remains unclear whether the issue has been rectified.

In contrast, the NWP manager reported, "There are some practical aspects of Checkpoint that I struggle with. First and foremost is that of placing the navigators in custody – the premise of a custody diversion scheme should be that they do not enter custody in the first place. Geographically and demographically, north Wales is complex; the geography is difficult to navigate, and the mix of rural and urban populace means having to adapt the type of service we offer. I would prefer to see Checkpoint working out of individual stations allowing earlier access to individuals and a greater spread of Navigators. Another aspect of Checkpoint that causes me some angst is where it is placed within the organization, or not as the case currently is. It needs oversight from a policing perspective from within the force, blending in with the offender management programs and the problem-solving initiatives rather than as a stand-alone program". It seems the manager from NWP has a similar opinion to the navigators and feels there is a need to change the navigators base from custody to individual police stations around North Wales. It appears he feels the current base juxtaposes the premise of Checkpoint, to remove clients from the criminal justice system and to try to avoid their contact with custody altogether. Further, in his opinion, individual police stations provide a better service both in terms of geography and the type of service offered.

Research exploring the differences between custodial diversion or police station diversion schemes appears to be limited, as there is a great deal of variety in the way different diversion schemes operate (Birmingham, Awonogun & Ryland, 2018). Scholars note as

diversion exists at multiple points in the criminal justice system, decision-making can be made by courts, police officers, custody officers, which are all diverse in their organizational and operational form (Tyrrell, Bond, Manning & Dogaru, 2017.). This diversity makes it very difficult to draw firm conclusions about whether a change in the location benefits impact (positively or negatively) and the efficacy of the program. Having said that, the efficacy of police station-based diversion is supported, and one study found it was more effective than court diversion in diminishing harm and recidivism (HMIC, 2015). However, it is important to note this appeared to be a by-product of the type of offender identified in police station admissions, for they typically commit less serious offences and subsequently posing a lesser risk of future offending. Further, most police diversion schemes appear to use a multidisciplinary team made up of psychologists, nurses, social workers, recovery workers and administrators, who together with support services, assess and attend to the needs of diversion clients. Yet at present, Checkpoint does not have access to, nor employ such professionals. Therefore, perhaps this would be something for Checkpoint management to consider prior to making a change, particularly as it is unclear whether these professionals mediate the efficacy of police diversion.

Conversely, what appears clear is the increased importance of police officers and criminal justice decision making in police station diversion, for studies infer referral, without arrest, heavily depends upon the 'common sense', awareness and a pre-booking approach used by officers (Dewa, Loong, Trujilo & Bonato, 2018.). However, research indicates police officers often lack knowledge of mental health and subsequent disorders and there is often a lack of communication between the police and mental health service providers (Soares and Pinto da Costa, 2019). This is found to inhibit interpretation of offender behaviour at the first point of contact and result in unnecessary arrest and detention of vulnerable individuals. Scholars have explored multiple ways to improve police officer's identification and handling

of vulnerable people to reduce arrest rates and aid the efficacy of police diversion and they found police officers benefited from crisis intervention training (CIT model) (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2009). This is a model where all police officers receive training about mental health issues, and it was found to enhance short term and long-term outcomes for offenders with mental health problems. Thus, when considering this change, CIT training for police officers should also be considered.

Moreover, it seems the advisor thinks Checkpoint would benefit from a shift in the program's governance and an increased input from a policing perspective. Although, the advisor held back on the reason they felt this change would benefit Checkpoint and how this change could come to fruition. The actual weight of governance between the PCC and NWP remains ambiguous. With that said, the navigator's reports suggest the PCC holds most of the autonomy around the operationalization of Checkpoint. Throughout, the navigators suggest the PCC shy's away from risk and issue management and employee assurance. Both of which are considered integral components for effective program governance and the longevity of Checkpoint. This is a problem for poor program governance is one of the most common causes of intervention failure and for an intervention to be successful, the governing organization must have a clear understanding of the project environment at the start point for without it, the organization will struggle to define an effective governance framework, the roles and responsibilities and stakeholder engagement and communication. It could be argued that because of the issues reported and due to the role of NWP officers in Checkpoint, the governance should be under NWP, for they have the most policing knowledge. However, to explore this properly without ambiguity, future research is required to explore this in greater detail. Further, it is important to highlight that both managers have very different ideas of the changes needed to better facilitate Checkpoint. The line manager from the PCC gave a rather political response to the question.

This marks the end of the results from the thematic analysis and the next section makes several concluding remarks about the overall project findings.

Concluding Remarks

This section is comprised of several concluding remarks and aims to encapsulate the most important findings across data sources. Additionally, there are several remarks with regards to methodological limitations and the complexities of conducting research between two major organizations during a pandemic. All of which are intended to help shape the future of Checkpoint Cymru and guide future research.

Overall, the outcomes from the research project are varied and complex because of the number of components identified, the number of interactions between the different components, how each component challenged the implementation process and how the contextual factors may impact intervention outcomes. Without question, the most prevalent finding is the sheer number of barriers inhibiting the navigator's experience. All the barriers identified pose a plethora of risks to the navigators, affecting their psychological and physical health, job satisfaction and work performance. Further, for some, their experience was so negative they expressed regret leaving their prior job and voiced their desires to leave. In fact, since the completion of this project, informal reports infer one navigator has left the scheme and sought employment elsewhere. This raises the question if other dissatisfied navigators will follow suit. Having said that, all the navigators said they felt positive about the strength of rapport between the navigators and their ability to influence life change. They also supported the efficacy of the scheme and the increased benefits of restorative justice on client outcomes. For most, they were intrinsically motivated and sought-after intrinsic rewards. Yet, some were dissatisfied with the lack of need in the checkpoint cohort. This dissatisfaction

appears to be mediated by prior experience and a personal intrinsic need to maximize impact on life change.

On the contrary, a smaller cohort of navigators reported primarily positive experiences in post. These navigators experienced no issues with management and appeared motivated and engaged with the organization throughout. At present, it is unclear why some navigators have a more positive experience than others. Although the narrative analysis suggests this is perhaps mediated by individual factors, previous work experience and base location. Future research should explore this further.

With regards to the line manager from the PCC, there were a lot of concerns raised. Some suggested the line manger was approachable and passionate, always helpful and a great leader. However, the majority felt the line manager lacked essential leadership experience, was unapproachable and doesn't listen. Most of the navigators agreed, the line manager had an ineffective approach to program promotion, and this inhibited the reach and awareness of Checkpoint. Even more, there were several accusations around the line manager's sense of superiority and desire to assert their authority over the police. This seemed to diminish trust. It also seems the line manager's avoidant approach to conflict resolution and ambiguity in the face of uncertainty was not well received by most of the navigators. Their desire for this to change was very clear.

Moreover, the line managers reports were very different to that reported by most of the navigators and the advisor from NWP. It seems the line manager lacks awareness of the scale of the issues reported by the navigators or avoids talking about them. Across the data, the line manager seemed keen to brush over issues and at times, their response lacked transparency and openness. A good example of this relates to the DEP, whereby the line manager reported no issues with its content despite all the navigators and the advisor having explained its content was not targeted to the checkpoint demographic. It seems the line

manager did not want to acknowledge this criticism, nor draw too much attention to it. Perhaps the line manager considers criticism to be a personal attack posing threat to the perception of their authority and ability. Arguably, due to the number of issues, complaints and concerns raised, the line manager might feel ganged up on and may require additional support with acknowledging, rectifying and personally handling this. After all, the psychological wellbeing of the line manager is essential, and it is not easy to be exposed to this degree of criticism. Conversely, constructive feedback is important to improve practice and it is advised the complaints are reviewed with support but also the intent to act.

Regarding the advisor from NWP, their current role and involvement in Checkpoint remains unclear whilst their departure seems to have created a degree of animosity and feelings of abandonment. The advisor was transparent in their knowledge of most of the barriers related to implementation and explained it is difficult to provide support to the navigators and the line manager, without stepping on the line managers toes. The advisor seemed affected by the organizational conflict and it seems they felt stuck in the middle of the issues between the navigators and the line manager. Although their lack of action inhibited the navigators trust, the navigators were very clear they would like a greater NWP presence in the scheme. This seemed important to the navigator's sense of organizational belonging and wellbeing. However, it remains unclear whether the NWP presence will increase moving forward and if so, how.

Even more, all facilitating professionals and the researcher lack clarity on several issues. These include who Checkpoint is for, if the target demographic plans to change, what is the most important component for life change and how the scheme may or may not change moving forward. Additionally, there was so much ambiguity around the governance of the scheme and clarification of this is considered essential prior to making any changes.

Regarding the actual efficacy of the scheme, there are early signs of promise related to a positive effect on life change, diminishing recidivism rates and harm reduction. Although this finding is limited to a professional view and at present, it is too early to determine the long-term impact of this reliably. With that said, because there are many barriers with the potential to inhibit organizational outcomes, the longevity of the scheme and the wellbeing of professionals is at risk. What is very clear is there is a lot of correctional work to be done to avoid program failure and improve navigator experience. Recommendations for corrections are made throughout and a thorough review of these is advised moving forward. After all, it may be difficult to continue to produce positive outcomes with so much animosity, ambiguity and facing so many barriers.

More broadly, the findings offer several valuable lessons for new partnership projects. The first lesson being the importance of getting the foundations right, prior to launching a scheme. This might involve active team building between managers and employees to build trust and rapport and then actively maintaining this relationship throughout implementation and beyond. Additionally, it would be useful for managers to explore effective means of communicate onto ensure all information is provided clearly, fairly, and effectively, in day-to-day practice and during times of conflict. More, it seemed extremely important to employees that they feel heard by their employers. Thus, it may be helpful if managers take and open approach to feedback at the start to both better manage employee concerns, feedback and/or ideas but also diminish future resistance. It may also be useful if managers become familiar with an approach to manage change and/or conflict. This would allow managers to be prepared and effective, reacting calmly during unrest to support employees through the process effectively. It might also be helpful if line managers attempt to incorporate supervision with employees, to identify their strengths, weaknesses and produce a

plan to improve their skill set. Studies suggest doing this helps employees feel supported and boosts enthusiasm, drive, and morale.

The second lesson relates to the importance of clarity in all areas of implementation, from the start. This might include creating a clear implementation plan, agreed by both facilitating organizations which could be shared with employees and/or any present researchers. It would also be helpful if both organizations could provide regular updates about changes intended and/or made and for this to be documented for all to view. Additionally, it seems essential that the managers have a clear understanding of the project aims, the target demographic, the potential changes, and the end goal. Further, it is necessary that their standpoints align. On the other hand, it is essential employees are also clear on the management structure and all aspects of their job role.

Moreover, there are some wider research lessons to be learnt with regards to the complexities of conducting research between two major organizations. Particularly, how challenging it can be to have the research findings heard and the importance of academic integrity. For instance, NWP sought after a research student to review the implementation and provide feedback about the barriers to implementation. The idea was for NWP to use the data to overcome the issues or barriers identified, to diminish any risks to the scheme. However, as depicted, there were several occasions where NWP failed to act on the feedback provided, despite some of the data suggesting the navigators wellbeing was at risk. It remains unclear why NWP said they shared the research concerns and planned to make changes but didn't. In hindsight, this issue seemed most prevalent when the data was related to the line managers approach and how this affected some of the navigator's wellbeing. It could be argued NWP refrained from addressing the concerns about the line managers because of the potential to create discomfort or fracture an already difficult relationship with the PCC. Conversely, it might have been NWP intended to act but covid-19 and/or orders from higher

up in the Constabulary or PCC prevented this. Alternatively, it could be argued this was a byproduct of funding bias, whereby it could be too risky to raise concerns about the line managers conduct and risk future funding of the scheme. Anecdotal evidence suggested the future of Checkpoint Cymru relied upon the Police and Crime Commissioner being re-elected. Although, it remains unclear if this was fact or merely gossip. Moreover, it could be also be argued NWP were handling matters away from view and supporting the line manager discretely. After all, the line manager was new in post and lacked knowledge of policing systems and/or their usual code of conduct. Arguably, this might have made NWP more accepting of error. Nonetheless, it seemed a lot of people were aware of the issues surrounding the line manager and the navigators, but those with the authority to act were either unable to or chose not to act in the interest of employees.

Due to this, the navigators often turned to the researcher to have their truth heard. Subsequently this meant the responsibility to tell some difficult truths fell on the researcher and this thesis became much more about the navigators struggle to feel heard. The researcher acted with integrity and committed to reporting the data as it came from the navigators. At times, the researcher was asked to amend reports and remove some of the more difficult data. The researcher felt it was best to refuse to be affiliated with any amended reports and ensured the amended report did not have their name on it. Further, the amended reports had a subtitle to state the full report, written by the primary researcher, was available upon request. Further, the researcher documented all raised concerns and took them to NWP. The researcher also sought ongoing advice from Bangor University. Moreover, the researcher decided to be completely transparent and document all of this in this thesis. The rationale being these issues are part of a much wider bias whereby organizations often shy away from less comfortable findings that might show a party in a negative light. A particular issue since the PCC was up for election shortly after implementation. Although it is unclear to what degree, this might

have had an impact. The researcher has spoken openly about this with aim to help other researchers feel less alone or be more prepared for the challenges ahead. Also, to try and say to both organizations, there is no shame in error as we are all human and honest reflections are the only route to improve and learn.

More, at times it was difficult to conduct research because of the tumultuous relationships between the navigators and the line manager, the line manager and the advisor and then the navigators and the advisor. The nature of these relationships resulted in a cycle of gossip, rumination and venting and this created a rather negative and emotionally draining research environment. Also, this issue meant a lot of positive findings related to life change were overshadowed and the overall project felt quite negative and difficult to complete. Additionally, because the researcher had taken an insider/outsider approach and had spent a lot of time with the navigators, the researcher often felt mistaken for a peer and the researcher was often approached as the person to offload on. This was positive and negative in equal measures. On one hand, the navigators felt they could trust the researcher to publish their truth, and this made for important, honest, and raw data. On the other hand, this was mentally exhausting and posed a risk to the researcher's objectivity as they, at times, felt a sense of responsibility for the navigator's wellbeing. After all, few were acknowledging their perspective. Subsequently, the researcher felt an enormous amount of pressure and responsibility to use the project to help the navigator's truth be told. As the researcher was a student, they did not feel equipped to deal with such a complex environment. However, they dealt with all challenges as best as they could and hope their experience can help other researchers be better prepared.

Another unanticipated barrier was the attempt to misuse observation data. Although this only happened on one occasion, the researcher felt it is important to disclose so other researchers are prepared. During the first few months of the project, the line manager from

the PCC approached the researcher to see if they could use the confidential observation data for an enquiry with an employee. This was a clear breach of research boundaries and the researcher acted with integrity, sought advise from their University and declined to comment. Further, the researcher spoke with NWP and agreed the line manager would not be directly involved with the research meetings moving forward. The researcher found this exchange challenging and dealt with it by engaging in supervision. A Professor from Bangor University helped the researcher develop ways to channel personal frustrations and/or discomfort using a reflective diary. This enabled the researcher a safe place to offload and protect their wellbeing. Fortunately, this allowed the researcher to move on from the event and protected the objectivity of the project. Moving forward, the researcher made a conscious effort to interpret all data without bias, only inline with raw data and/or empirical evidence. This was important to declare as it is human nature to interpret behavior differently once a boundary is overstepped.

Lastly, like many projects in this domain, the efficacy of this evaluation was largely inhibited by several methodological limitations like data limitations and covid-19. This made completing the project and drawing assumptions more difficult. That is not to say the findings are not sufficient, interesting and don't tell us something important about what works, what doesn't work and what requires improvement. It is merely that we hoped to know more about the impact of Checkpoint from a range of different perspectives. Further, without access to quantitative data, the researcher was unable to interpret the dose, reach and effect of the scheme on recidivism. This inhibits direct comparison with the data obtained by Durham, at this stage. The impact of this will be reviewed in the limitations section but it is mentioned now for transparency purposes.

What happens now?
Post implementation evaluation

To conduct a thorough process evaluation, the next logical step is to evaluate the fidelity of the project findings using a logical model (Holliday, 2014). Subsequently, the discussion begins with an assessment of whether the scheme was delivered as intended (in terms of fidelity, dose, amendments, and reach). As suggested by Craig et al (2008) this should benefit our understanding of the fidelity and quality of implementation, to clarify causal mechanisms and to identify contextual factors associated with variation outcomes. Following this, the researcher will review other issues that have not yet been brought to light to explore the findings in a wider context.

Fidelity

According to Bragstad et al (2019), the first part of a post implementation evaluation should be a review of interventions fidelity. This is an important component of a process evaluation, for an appropriate assessment of intervention fidelity reveals 'the degree to which the intervention was delivered as intended' (Lloyd et al, 2017). Further, should this project inspire replication, it is essential to maintain fidelity in a new setting. As suggested in the

literature, the fidelity of the current project is assessed in two key areas: Implementation fidelity and theoretical fidelity (Perez et al, 2015).

Implementation fidelity

Implementation fidelity tells us to what extent the intervention (as delivered) matched the intervention (as planned) (Haynes et al, 2016). It focuses on measurable factors like how the professionals were recruited and trained, what proportion of targeted people were reached, client exposure to intervention services and the consistency of intervention delivery across different sites.

Recruitment

Although the line manager's actual intention regarding recruitment is unclear, the data infers they perhaps wanted to recruit nine very different individuals who could all bring something different to the table. This is demonstrated via observation and the fact the navigators are a unique group of professionals, with a breadth of experience between them and a variety of individual difference (in terms of age, personality, and social factors). The only comparable factor between them seems to be their core values, principles, ethos, original motivation, and desire to make a difference via life change. Their differences, particularly the breadth of their previous work experience, seemed to positively affect knowledge transfer, rapport, and peer support. On this basis, it seems that the recruitment process was successful.

With that said, it is important to critically consider the potential pitfalls associated with employing nine very different individuals. It was clear the mix of personality types and the increased experience of some of the navigators mediated the tensions with management and in some cases, the experienced navigators felt they were more experienced than the line manager and could do a better job at managing program. Arguably, this inhibits the fidelity of the recruitment process for it is unlikely the line manager anticipated this issue. On this basis,

it could be argued the recruitment process was delivered as intended but unanticipated issues arose. It remains unclear if these issues should or would influence a new approach to recruitment in the future. Before any changes are made, future researchers could assess how individual factors such as previous work experience, personality, age, and social factors mediate the state of professional relationships between employers and employees. Further, if the current tensions show that experienced subordinates and less experienced leaders do not work cohesively together or if it is more so a case of a personality clash.

Training

Conversely, it seems the fidelity of the training package was lacking, for it was disorganized, poorly planned, not tailored to the navigator's role and not particularly useful in practice. It is very clear that during the training process the navigator's motivation and engagement with the program significantly reduced. This is arguably an undesirable outcome that no organization would want to create. On this basis, it would be hard to suggest the training package was delivered as intended, for it would not be in NWP or the PCC's best interest to fund training that results in employee disengagement, diminished morale and be perceived as ineffective. Upon reflection, perhaps, the discrepancy between the two organizations and disagreements over the most important components for life change (DEP or ACES) distorted clarity when creating the training package. Therefore, to improve the fidelity of the training package, should this be required in the future, the line manager and the advisor could work with the navigators to gain a better understanding of the knowledge and training required to benefit their day-to-day role and program delivery. Doing so would ensure a better use of time, resources, and benefit program delivery. Further, perhaps the PCC and NWP could come up with an agreement of the most important components required for life change and use this agreement to guide the training package.

Reach

On the contrary, the reach of the project remains unclear because of methodological limitations. Access to RMS was required to enable analysis of relevant descriptive statics (case-load numbers, recidivism rates, demographical factors) and to assess whether the scheme had reached the maximum proportion of its target demographic. However, due to Covid-19, access to RMS and police stations or custodial settings was prohibited and subsequently, this project could not explore the number of eligible offenders who met NWP over the course of the year and how many of those offenders were referred to the initiative. Because of this, our understanding around the reach of the program is limited to professional reports.

However, the qualitative evidence is useful and indicates Checkpoint failed to refer all eligible offenders to the scheme. The data shows the programs reach was impeded by the PCC's approach to promotion and this inhibited referral. Regarding the impact of this on programs fidelity, it could be argued through the PCC's perspective, promotion was delivered as intended. However, the PCC's approach did not have the desired outcome and in the future, it may be more beneficial to adopt a different approach. Future research could monitor/explore the efficacy of different promotion approaches via quantitative methods and use the findings to demonstrate if the navigator's approach to promotion improved the reach of a program or not. The findings would also enable an exploration of the dose given, the dose received, the level of participation and if appropriate, the quality of the intervention delivery. This would allow a better understanding of the scheme's fidelity.

In addition to this, it is important to acknowledge how the current global pandemic impeded client's exposure to support and intervention activities. At the start of the initiative, knowledge of the pending COVID-19 situation was not anticipated and subsequently, access

to support and interventions were not tailored to suit the requirements of a global pandemic. This means interventions could not be delivered as intended. As reported in the observational data, adaptations were made with regards to the delivery of the DEP (over the phone) to enable is delivery throughout lockdown. However, due to issues obtaining interview responses, we have little evidence of any use of other interventions besides this. This means our understanding around how third sector organization adapted and how support was made accessible, if it was, is inhibited, Subsequently, it is unclear whether Checkpoint clients were able to gain the maximum benefits from what checkpoint originally intended to offer. The literature exploring this matter is scarce, although some research suggests there has been ineffective access to intervention as a direct by-product of COVID-19 (Ferguson et al, 2020. Pp.1-20). Withal, other research infers custody diversion continues to operate 'as normal' through the coronavirus pandemic, advocating the use of alternatives to avoid face-to-face interaction (Care Quality Commissioner, 2020). However, information beyond this appears limited, inhibiting a thorough exploration of the fidelity, in this case.

Consistency

Finally, it is important to explore the consistency to which components were delivered across different sites. However, knowledge of this is rather limited. Checkpoint Cymru was delivered from three different bases (Llay, St. Asaph, and Caernarvon). Based on the data, it seems the delivery of Checkpoint was not consistent across the three bases, for there were several inconsistencies found regarding access to WPF, base location, experience, and rapport with management. The reported inconsistencies arguably inhibit the fidelity of the project, for different bases appear to be doing better than others, which is unlikely to be intentional. To improve the consistency across sites, a review of the differences at each site should be conducted to better comprehend the differences and work towards more consistent program

delivery. Research could measure the variation between program delivery, referral differences, variance between intervention access and differences in the key barriers faced and use the findings to make recommendations around what works best, what doesn't work and what requires improvement in each base to improve consistency and program fidelity.

Overall, it could be argued that the fidelity of the project is lacking due to several unanticipated barriers. This suggests the program was not implemented as intended, or it was yet the approach taken failed to achieve the desired outcomes. It appears this discrepancy between the desired intention and actual practice, in this case, stems from poor management of the implementation or poor design. Therefore, replicate projects should try to avoid replicating the same mistakes highlighted and may take inference from the potential amendments advised throughout.

Amendments

To fully assess the fidelity of the program, it is important to assess the impact of any amendments or modifications made during implementation. However, a clear review of the amendments is not possible, for the besides anecdotal evidence, there has been no clarity from the PCC or NWP surrounding planned modifications and whether they have been implemented or not. Because of this, the following amendments remain unclear: the use of needs assessments for individuals referred to the DEP, a potential shift in program governance, acceptance of more serious offenders and discussion around accepting perpetrators of domestic violence onto the initiative in the future. The researcher made several requests during meetings to receive clarity on these modifications and was told a list detailing the up-and-coming changes would be emailed. However, this never came to fruition, inhibiting further exploration of the impact of modifications and amendments.

Withal, it is important to highlight that is appeared to be a result of the unanticipated covid-19 situation, which meant NWP were re-assigned away from the Checkpoint project and towards managing the crisis. Because NWP held most of the information regarding the implementation of these changes and the time frame of the project, access was inhibited. Subsequently, it is not possible to review how modifications (actual or planned) positively or negatively impact the fidelity of the program. In the future, researchers could conduct a longitudinal study whereby all the project modifications are recorded in alignment with a review of their impact on the program delivery, to track evaluation changes and assess the difference between the efficacy of the intended program and the modified version.

Theoretical fidelity

In contrast to implementation fidelity, theoretical fidelity helps us explore "the extent to which the intervention as-delivered, was congruent with the intervention theory" (Haynes et al, 2015). To be specific, this relates to the logic and hypotheses that underpin the interventions design. In this case, Checkpoint aimed to provide a "credible alternative to prosecution, by identifying and supporting relevant needs and the 'critical pathways' out of crime, with the result being that low and medium adult offenders are diverted away from the Criminal Justice System, whilst also addressing the underlying causes of their offending behavior". At present, it is too early to determine the efficacy of Checkpoint Cymru and whether it is on track to fulfill this proposal. Further, because of the current global pandemic, the researcher was unable to conduct interviews with checkpoint clients and subsequently not able to gain their perspective on the efficacy of the program, how well their needs were identified and met and whether they felt their engagement will diminish the likelihood of reoffending. This means at present, there is no clear understanding of whether checkpoint is fulfilling its aim, through the eyes of the service user. This is a limitation of this project, as

research demonstrates the importance of gaining a service users perception of an intervention's efficacy to enable comprehension of unanticipated mechanisms, under emphasized critical features and the value of holistic understanding around 'what happens' during intervention (Sutcliffe, Melendez-Torres & Thomas, 2018). Without this, we cannot draw conclusions on whether the service is fully meeting the needs of the service user.

Having said that, from a professional's view, there were early signs that Checkpoint is meeting service user needs and fulfilling its aim to identify need, provide support and diminish recidivism rates. Research suggests where a service user view is unattainable a professional perspective offers the best predictor of intervention efficacy, for they are the people delivering it (Cook, Schwartz & Kaslow, 2017). With that said, covid-19 also inhibited the researcher's ability to observe the navigators conducting the needs assessment. Therefore, it could be argued without independent review or service user reports, the navigator's reports may be subject to bias effects (Fitzgerald & Hurst, 2017). Therefore, when covid-19 restrictions are removed, researchers should start by observing the needs assessment process and gather data from service users to shed light on whether they feel their needs are met or if and where they feel improvement is required. This should be monitored over a long period of time to effectively understand the efficacy of service, reformat the intervention path (if required), to demonstrate any improvements made during implementation and to identify key components to achieve best practice in intervention delivery. Should the covid-19 situation prevent this, clients provided feedback via the navigators with regards to the DEP and how they felt its content did not fit their needs. Particularly for cannabis users who felt the content was out of touch. Thus, perhaps this would be a good place to start when making amendments to better tailor Checkpoint to meet service users needs.

Following a review of the fidelity, dose, adaptations and reach of the project, the next step is to widely discuss the findings to put them in context.

A wider discussion

In this section, the post implementation findings are reviewed in relation to Checkpoint Durham and the replication crisis. It was important to include this comparative as many may ponder how Checkpoint Cymru compares to Durham and if the project fell victim to the replication crisis, in any way.

Checkpoint Cymru and Checkpoint Durham

There were several similarities and differences identified between the schemes. For example, both demonstrated early signs of positive effects of diminishing recidivism, harm reduction and life change. However, Durham's measurement of this effect was arguably more robust, as their findings were based on police-based statistics opposed to professional opinion. For instance, they were able to conduct quantitative analysis and demonstrate the reoffending rate for the Checkpoint clients was 35% compared to 48% for an OOCD cohort and a 13% reduction in recidivism. This enabled the research team to show Checkpoint Durham was more effective than traditional criminal justice outcomes in reducing reoffending. This comparison was not possible in the current study due to methodological limitations and a quantitative approach to monitor checkpoint outcomes was essential to move forward. Conversely, Durham successfully obtained service users, victims, custodial sergeants, and other relevant professions opinions on the efficacy of the scheme and implementation process. Again, due to methodological limitations, this was not possible in the current project, limiting our understanding to the view of 11 professionals. That is not to say the data from the current study is not sufficient, it is merely the small number of participants inhibits the generalizability of the findings and the results are more subjective and more likely to be implicated by individual difference.

Adversely, like the current project, Durham reported several barriers, which inhibited the implementation process. However, their approach to logging and resolving these issues seems different from the approach taken by the PCC and NWP. For example, Durham published an issue and risk log online and proposed admin and technological issues, treatment integrity (specifics not disclosed) and partnership issues (sharing of information) were barriers to implementation. Yet in the current project, there seemed to be a lack clarity or preference to be less transparent about the barriers inhibiting implementation, particularly from the PCC. Further, it seemed Durham better anticipated the likelihood of implementation issues as they treated the start of the implementation process as a testable treatment phase prior to starting randomized control trials. Durham Constabulary stated this approach was taken to allow the team and the police to adapt their processes according to any identified issues. Arguably, if the PCC and NWP had adopted the same process, the issues and barriers relating the implementation may have been less inhibitory. Durham stated all issues were reviewed and "resolved quickly with the assistance of the governance board", something that appears less prevalent in the current project. Additionally, Durham reported a funding issue at the start of the implementation phase and had to seek more funding from local government, the Home Office Innovation fund, the PCC, and King partner organization to continue. Due to the scope of the current project and methodological limitations, a cost analysis was not possible, and it is unclear whether this problem inhibited the current project in anyway. With that said, this is not a criticism of the current project, for the scope and funding for the evaluation of Checkpoint Durham exceeded one year (five years), thus the researcher had more time and resources to conduct further analysis. Moreover, the current project seemed more inhibited by methodological limitations than Durham. For example, the research team at Durham appeared to have greater access to data and their research project was not inhibited

by the covid-19 global pandemic. Because of this the current project had to overcome more unanticipated barriers and it could be argued this inhibited better replication.

Replication crisis

In addition to the covid-19 pandemic, it seems the current project fell victim to the replication crisis in several other ways. Although the scheme shows signs it could go on to produce similar outcomes to Durham in the future, at present Checkpoint Cymru is arguably a less effective replicate of Durham (Hillary & Medaglia, 2020). Several theories discussed in the introduction can be used to shed some light on what might have gone wrong.

One on hand, it could be argued the small sample size (11 participants) was inhibitory to replication, as there was an increased risk that the results denoted from chance and were less to do with an accurate representation of an entire population. After all, individual differences (personality, age and potentially mood/experience) seemed to play a massive part in the data obtained. Arguably the results from this evaluation are far more subjective than that produced by Durham. Another explanation surrounds the fidelity of the project, whereby factors such as the time, culture and environment were not the same as Durham and subsequently, outcome variation was more likely. It could also be argued that the quality of implementation inhibited replication, as barriers relating to structure, resources and clarity seem less prevalent in Checkpoint Durham. Those responsible for Checkpoint Cymru seemed to deviate from the original process set by Durham despite research suggesting this is important when trying to replicate a successful outcome. After all, Checkpoint Cymru has already tried to make substantive changes to the scheme (albeit the implementation of modifications remains unclear) to either adapt the intervention to the new site, to up-to-date content, or to tailor them to a new population. In this case, these updates seemed to have diminished the efficacy of replication.

Limitations

Much like other projects in this domain, limitations largely inhibited the current project. The strengths and limitations of the research project are now explored, for honesty and transparency.

This section starts with brief demonstration of the trustworthiness of the project and the steps taken to ensure the data collection, analysis and reporting process was precise, consistent, systematic, and that all methods of analysis are disclosed with enough detail to enable the reader to determine whether the process is credible. Regarding the observation data, the researcher was transparent about the subjective nature of the data. The narrative approach to analysis was taken to depict the data in the way the researcher saw it. Further, the researcher clearly stated the narrative should only be used to apply context to the interview data, to fill in gaps between what is seen and reported and to benefit the wider discussion. Again, it is declared the narrative is subjective and only represents one researcher's experience. Had the project been carried out by a different researcher the interpretation of the data might have been different. Regarding the interview data, the researcher followed the methods depicted by Braun and Clark's (2006) model to ensure the data collection, analysis and reporting process was precise, concise, systematic, and trustworthy. Each step was followed, and the data was only explored in relation to the empirical evidence. This was important to ensure the interpretation of the data was honest, objective, and trustworthy.

Conversely, the approach to observation yields its own set of pros and cons as depicted by Allen (2017). A naturalistic observation approach allowed the researcher to observe participants in their natural environment. This approach is praised for having high ecological validity as it allows the researcher to observe the flow of behavior in its natural setting. Further, naturalistic observation allows the research to explore unanticipated avenues,

that otherwise may be missed. However, some argue naturalistic observations are less reliable, for variables cannot be controlled, implicating replication and comprehension of the cause-and-effect relationship. In the current project, this was perhaps most inhibitory when trying to uncover the root cause of the issues with management and why some people had more positive experiences than others.

Nonetheless, by choosing to overtly observe and participate, deception was avoided, and consent was obtained. The researcher was also able, when desired, to actively get involved with the navigators. On one hand, this allowed the researcher to gather rich data, as their participation aided rapport with the navigators and built up a degree of trust. This too benefited the flow of data and the navigators, were very open during the interview process. However, there were some limitations of this approach. There was an increased the risk of investigator effects whereby the participant may have amended their behavior through social desirability or Hawthorne effects (Robinson, 2018). To minimize the risk of bias, the researcher observed the participants in their natural environment and informed the participants all data would be kept anonymous. Research infers this is an effective strategy use to prevent participants from altering their behavior (Dawson, 2018). Moreover, upon reflection, sometimes it was difficult to record data due to distraction or difficulty gaining privacy to record information. In attempt to counter this, the researcher wrote all observations in note forms and re-wrote all observation data the evening of, or day after the observation. This was done to recall all details that may have been missed or left out. Although, it is possible the delay inhibited the researchers recall, particularly of direct quotes, should they be important.

Another limitation related to this approach is the risk of the researcher becoming too involved. The researcher remained mindful of this throughout the project, taking a step back from the initiative if they felt their objectivity was at risk to prevent bias data reporting. The

researcher also remained mindful of this during the data analysis and interpretation, presenting data on the premise of its prevalence and through objective interpretation via the empirical evidence. The researcher also sought advise on how involved in the project they should be from their supervisor to understand what the limits of the observation were and how to avoid adverse effects such as fatigue and emotional stress. To be transparent, there were several times where the researcher felt fatigued and stressed due to prying with regards to data and emotional offloading. The researcher followed guidelines and reminded the professional of the ethical guidelines of research, their purpose, and the importance of confidentiality. The researcher also escalated this issue to NWP. Escalation was important to access support, avoid future stress but also to protect the confidentiality of the data. However, it is important to reflect on how this incident could have influenced the researcher's interpretation, should they have not received support. As studies show as humans are vulnerable to an unconscious or implicit bias and can engage in discriminatory behaviors without conscious intent (Pritlove, Juando-Prats, Ala-leppilampi & Parsons, 2019). To eliminate any risk of unconscious bias, the researcher was advised to create a reflective diary to off-load the issues encountered, how they made her feel and to avoid emotional impacts, fatigue, and adverse affects on the project. This was an effective strategy and was used throughout. The researcher is transparent in this to demonstrate their awareness around the risk of subliminal influence during the data analysis and interpretation process. In doing so, this risk of bias is diminished.

Even more, there were several issues related to data throughout the project, particularly in terms of inhibited access, low response rates and bias. As this point has been heavily discussed already, it is merely acknowledged for its inhibitory affect on the project. However, it is important to add, accessing and obtaining data from large organizations seems a prevalent barrier inhibiting psychological research. In many cases, researchers are

considered to benefit from specific training in how to deal with the complexities of facilitating and maintaining access of data in large organizations (Okumus, Altinay & Roper, 2006). Arguably, had the researcher received this kind of training before the start of the project, the retrieval of quantitative data and promised reports from NWP may have been easier. More, low response rates heavily inhibited the project, particularly during the second round of interview questions where response was so low the data set was considered insufficient for use. This limited the researcher's clarity of how Checkpoint was operationalized during the Covid-19 lockdown. It is important to consider the reasons response rates were so low. On one hand, low response rates could reflect the complexities in juggling working from home and home life matters like childcare and it may be responding to research questions was less important and less of a priority in comparison to completing essential work and homeschooling/family time. After all, participants were not paid, nor did they receive any type of reward for their participation. Had this been the case, participants may have had an increased incentive to engage. Moreover, response rates may reflect the impact of covid-19 on the professional's personal wellbeing and motivation to engage in research, for studies found 44% of employees demonstrated low motivation and poorer work performance as a direct consequence of lockdown and covid-19 situation (Relocate, 2020).

On the contrary, it is important to consider the limitations associated with data obtained and how the questions asked could have influenced professional response. The interview questions were based on the observation data and were used to gather more information on important issues, changes or to formally record professional opinion. It could be argued that since the researcher was recruited to inform the PCC and NWP of issues, barriers and concerns inhibiting the scheme the questions may have focused on negatives opposed to positives. However, the researcher remained mindful of the risk of negative bias and took several steps to diminish this risk. The researcher took time to develop a balanced

set of questions that reflected different components, which were important to intervention outcomes. All questions were verified and checked by a supervisor at Bangor University, who assessed the appropriateness of the questions and considered them appropriate for distribution. Further, the researcher ensured all the questions were open questions stating, 'if so, how?' at the end of each question. This was done to ensure all participants had the freedom to elaborate and express their opinion without constraint. It is important to address, the potential impact of the questions on the line manager and advisor, particularly when asking for their opinion on the state of their relationships with the navigators and views on the drugs education program, which the line manager created. Arguably, asking this question could evoke a degree of anxiety, as both managers were aware of navigator concerns whilst the line manager became aware other professionals were reviewing the program they created.

With regards to the navigators, on numerous occasions some of them failed to directly respond to the set questions. In many cases, it seemed as if the questions did not matter and at some points, some of the navigators responded out of context, venting their frustration, and ranting about their negative experiences. Research infers where anger and frustration exist, participants are more likely to rant and vent their frustrations when given an opportunity to be heard (Parlimaris, 2010). This is declared as this may have influenced the tone of the data in parts. Withal, studies show the benefits related to venting frustrations and how this can be a cathartic experience for frustrated individuals (Thomson, 2017). Thus, although it is possible the themes of the data were affected by the mood and built-up anger of some of the navigators, the ability to discuss their experience likely benefited their wellbeing.

Coronavirus Pandemic

It is important to be clear, the coronavirus pandemic heavily inhibited the project, and this was discussed throughout. However, it is important to reflect upon the impact of Covid-

19 on the researcher. Scholars note the impact of covid-19 on all psychological research was 'catastrophic' and the spread of Covid-19 seemed to highlight pre-existing gender inequalities limiting psychological research (Ferguson et al, 2020). One study found the submission of research by female researchers declined in comparison to that produced by male academics (Vincent-Lamarre, Sugimoto C.R and Larivière, 2020). This finding was considered to reflect women having to juggle caring for their families and children whilst completing research from home. This is an important finding to reflect upon as the researcher is female, a mother and had to juggle home schooling, childcare, and research duties. Further, as resources were prioritized to COVID-19 this meant the possible extension to turn the current project into a PhD project was revoked. This inhibited the exploration of the long-term impacts of Checkpoint but also prevented a catch up of the data missed throughout lockdown.

Having said this, one of the major strengths of this project, irrespective of all barriers, is the resilience, adaptability, and perseverance in the name of producing essential research, during uncertain and very difficult times. Against all odds, the project was completed and is considered sufficient for a Master of Research Project and that is quite significant.

Bibliography

Abbott, J., 2003. Does employee satisfaction matter? A study to determine whether low employee
morale affects customer satisfaction and profits in the business-to-business sector. *Journal of
Communication Management*, 7(4), pp.333-339.

Abramovaite, J., Bandyopadhyay, S., Bhattacharya, S. and Cowen, N., 2018. Alternatives to
Custody: Evidence from Police Force Areas in England and Wales. *The British Journal of
Criminology*, 59(4), pp.800-822.

Adler, J., Edwards, S., Scally, M., Gill, D., Puniskis, M., Gekoski, A. and Horvath, M., 2016. What
Works in Managing Young People who Offend? A Summary of the International
Evidence. *Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University*, pp.1-79.

Akers, R., 1990. Rational Choice, Deterrence, and Social Learning Theory in Criminology: The Path
Not Taken. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-)*, 81(3), p.653.

Alang, S., McAlpine, D., McCreedy, E., & Hardeman, R. (2017). Police Brutality and Black Health:
Setting the Agenda for Public Health Scholars. *American journal of public health*, *107*(5),
662–665. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303691

Alarid, L. and Vega, O., 2011. Identity Construction, Self Perceptions, and Criminal Behavior of
Incarcerated Women. *Deviant Behavior*, 31(8), pp.704-728.

Allen, 2018. The Science of Gratitude. *Science Center*, pp.1-72.

Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand

    Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411

Allen. 2015. Committee on the Science of Children Birth to Age 8: Deepening and Broadening the

    Foundation for Success; Board on Children, Youth, and Families; Institute of Medicine;

    National Research Council; Allen LR, Kelly BB, editors. Transforming the Workforce for

    Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation. Washington (DC): National

    Academies Press (US); 2015 Jul 23. 4, Child Development and Early Learning. Available

    from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK310550/

Alm, D. Crime Victims and the Right to Punishment. *Criminal Law, Philosophy* **13,** 63–81 (2019).

    https://doi.org/10.1007/s11572-018-9459-8

Alper, M., Durose, M. and Markman, J., 2018. 2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: A 9-Year

    Follow-up Period (2005-2014). *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, pp.1-24.

American Psychological Association, 2014. Incarceration Nation. [Blog] Available at:

    <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2014/10/incarceration>

Ames, A., Antonio, E., Hitchcock, J. and Webster, S., 2018. Adult Out of Court Disposal Pilot

    Evaluation – Final Report. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-85.

Annamalai, 2016. WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE ON TOP-DOWN AND BOTTOM-UP

    APPROACHES IN IMPROVING ACCESS TO WATER, SANITATION AND

    ELECTRICITY SERVICES IN LOW-INCOME OR INFORMAL

    SETTLEMENTS?. *London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, UCL Institute of*

    Education, University College London., pp.1-448.

APA, 2017. Change at Work Linked to Employee Stress, Distrust and Intent to Quit, New Survey

    Finds. *American Psychological Association*,.

Apel, R. and Nagin, D., 2011. General Deterrence. *Oxford Handbooks Online*,

Apel, R. and Nagin, D., 2015. Deterrent Effect of Police and Prisons. *International Encyclopedia of*

    the Social & Behavioral Sciences, pp.260-265.

Aspers, P. and Corte, U., 2019. What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology*,

    42(2), pp.139-160.

Atmadja, T., 2019. Workplace Toxicity, Leadership Behaviors, and Leadership Strategies. *Walden*

    University, pp.1-169.

Austin, Z. and Sutton, J., 2014. Qualitative Research: Getting Started. *The Canadian Journal of*

    Hospital Pharmacy, 67(6).

Austin, Z., & Sutton, J. (2014). Qualitative research: getting started. *The Canadian journal of*

    hospital pharmacy, *67*(6), 436–440. https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v67i6.1406

Auty, K. and Liebling, A., 2019. Exploring the Relationship between Prison Social Climate and

    Reoffending*. *Justice Quarterly*, 37(2), pp.358-381.

Bach-Mortensen, A. and Montgomery, P., 2018. What are the barriers and facilitators for third sector

    organisations (non-profits) to evaluate their services? A systematic review. *Systematic*

    Reviews, 7(1).

Barnow, B. and Greenberg, D., 2013. Replication issues in social experiments: lessons from US

    labor market programs. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 46(3), pp.239-252.

Barry, Monica (2009) Promoting desistance amongst young people. In: Youth Justice Handbook,

    Theory , Policy and Practice. Willan Publshing. ISBN 1-843927-16-0

Bateman, T., 2017. The state of youth justice 2017 An overview of trends and developments. *University of Bedforshire*, pp.3-60.

Bauer, 2020. Maximising success. *SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guidelines Series*, [online] pp.1-54. Available at: <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/special-reports-and-expert-views/Documents/Onboarding-New-Employees.pdf> [Accessed 25 March 2021].

Bell, C., Bhana, A., McKay, M. and Petersen, I., 2007. A Commentary on the Triadic Theory of Influence as a Guide for Adapting HIV Prevention Programs for New Contexts and Populations. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 5(3-4), pp.243-267.

Bell, S. G., Newcomer, S. F., Bachrach, C., Borawski, E., Jemmott, J. B., 3rd, Morrison, D., Stanton, B., Tortolero, S., & Zimmerman, R. (2007). Challenges in replicating interventions. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, *40*(6), 514–520. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.09.005

Bennet, A., Bennet, D. and Lewis, J., 2015. Leading with the Future in Mind: Knowledge and Emergent Leadership. *MQIPress*,.

BENNETT, C. (2006). Taking the Sincerity Out of Saying Sorry: Restorative Justice as Ritual. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 23*(2), 127-143. Retrieved March 22, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24355119

Bergen, C. and Bressler, M., 2014. LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP: DOING NOTHING AND ITS DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS. *European Journal of Management*, 14(1), pp.83-94.

Berger, R., Czakert, J. P., Leuteritz, J. P., & Leiva, D. (2019). How and When Do Leaders Influence Employees' Well-Being? Moderated Mediation Models for Job Demands and Resources. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 2788. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02788

Bergström, E. and García Martínez, M., 2016. The Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Employee Engagement. *University UMEA*, pp.48-49.

Bernstein, E., 2014. The Transparency Trap. *Harvard Buisness review*,

Berry, M., Philo, G., Tiripelli, G., Docherty, S. and Macpherson, C., 2012. Media coverage and public understanding of sentencing policy in relation to crimes against children. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 12(5), pp.567-591.

Bertram, W., 2020. *New Report, Arrest, Release, Repeat, Reveals How Many People Go To Jail Each Year And How Many Times They Go*. [online] Prisonpolicy.org. Available at: <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2019/08/26/arrests-report/>

Bhui, K., Dinos, S., Galant-Miecznikowska, M., de Jongh, B., & Stansfeld, S. (2016). Perceptions of work stress causes and effective interventions in employees working in public, private and non-governmental organisations: a qualitative study. *BJPsych bulletin*, *40*(6), 318–325. https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.115.050823

Bibas, S., & Richard A. Bierschbach. (2004). Integrating Remorse and Apology into Criminal Procedure. *The Yale Law Journal, 114*(1), 85-148. doi:10.2307/4135717

Birmingham, L., Awonogun, O. and Ryland, H., 2017. Diversion from custody: An update. *BJPsych Advances*, 23(6), pp.375-384.

Björklund, Hellman, Jensen, Åkerblom and Brämberg, 2019. Workplace Bullying as Experienced by Managers and How They Cope: A Qualitative Study of Swedish Managers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(23), p.4693.

Blumenthal, S. and Wessely, S., 1992. National survey of current arrangements for diversion from custody in England and Wales. *BMJ*, 305(6865), pp.1322-1325.

Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D. and DiFonzo, N., 2004. Uncertainty during

    organizational change: Is it all about control?. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

    Psychology, 13(3), pp.345-365.

Boriboontha, 2006. THE EFFECT OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES ON CRIME

    VICTIMS: A META-ANALYSIS. *Department of law*, [online] pp.1-261. Available at:

    <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/3582/1/427216.pdf> [Accessed 22 March 2021].

Bottoms, A, Von Hirsch, A (2012) The crime-preventive impact of penal sanctions. In: Cane, P,

    Kritzer, H (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research. Oxford: Oxford

    University Press.

Bradley, A (2017) Trauma-informed practice: Exploring the role of adverse life experiences on the

    behaviour of offenders and the effectiveness of associated criminal justice strategies.

    Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University

Bradley, A (2017) Trauma-informed practice: Exploring the role of adverse life experiences on the

    behaviour of offenders and the effectiveness of associated criminal justice strategies.

    Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University.

Bradley, A (2017) Trauma-informed practice: Exploring the role of adverse life experiences on the

    behaviour of offenders and the effectiveness of associated criminal justice strategies.

    Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University.

Bradford, B., & Quinton, P. (2014). Self-Legitimacy, Police Culture and Support for Democratic

    Policing in an English Constabulary. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2406350

Braga, A. and Weisburd, D., 2012. The Effects of "Pulling Levers" Focused Deterrence Strategies on

    Crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 8(1), pp.1-90.

Bragstad, L., Bronken, B., Sveen, U., Hjelle, E., Kitzmüller, G., Martinsen, R., Kvigne, K., Mangset, M. and Kirkevold, M., 2019. Implementation fidelity in a complex intervention promoting psychosocial well-being following stroke: an explanatory sequential mixed methods study. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1).

Braithwaite, J. (1999). Restorative Justice: Assessing Optimistic and Pessimistic Accounts. *Crime and Justice,25*, 1-127. Retrieved March 18, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147608

Braithwaite, J. (2002) Restorative Justice & Responsive Regulation, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brassey, J. and Kruyt, M., 2020. How to demonstrate calm and optimism in a crisis. *Mckinsey and Company*, pp.1-7.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.1-3.

British Psychological Society, 2014. Code of Human Research Ethics. *The British Psychological Society*, [online] pp.6-28. Available at: <https://www.bps.org.uk/sites/bps.org.uk/files/Policy/Policy%20-%20Files/BPS%20Code%20of%20Human%20Research%20Ethics.pdf>

Brown, J., Boardman, J., Whittinger, N. and Ashworth, M., 2010. Can a self-referral system help improve access to psychological treatments?. *British Journal of General Practice*, 60(574), pp.365-371.

Bryson, Forth and Stokes, 2014. DOES WORKER WELLBEING AFFECT WORKPLACE PERFORMANCE?. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-122.

Bryson, Forth and Stokes, 2014. DOES WORKER WELLBEING AFFECT WORKPLACE PERFORMANCE?. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-122.

Buljac-Samardzic, M., Doekhie, K. and van Wijngaarden, J., 2020. Interventions to improve team

    effectiveness within health care: a systematic review of the past decade. *Human Resources*

    for Health, 18(1).

Bun, M., Kelaher, R., Sarafidis, V. and Weatherburn, D., 2019. Crime, deterrence and punishment

    revisited. *Empirical Economics*, pp.2-31

Burns, W. A. (2017). A descriptive literature review of harmful leadership styles:Definitions,

    commonalities, measurements, negative impacts, and ways to

Carpenter, D. M., Geryk, L. L., Chen, A. T., Nagler, R. H., Dieckmann, N. F., & Han, P. K. (2016).

    Conflicting health information: a critical research need. *Health expectations : an*

    international journal of public participation in health care and health policy, *19*(6), 1173–

    1182. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12438

Carroll, C., Patterson, M., Wood, S., Booth, A., Rick, J. and Balain, S., 2007. A conceptual

    framework for implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science*, 2(1).

Carroll, J., Bradley, L., Crawford, H., Hannant, P., Johnson, H. and Thompson, A., 2021. SEN

    support: A rapid evidence assessment. *Department of Education*, pp.1-105.

Carroll, K. M., & Kiluk, B. D. (2017). Cognitive behavioral interventions for alcohol and drug use

    disorders: Through the stage model and back again. *Psychology of addictive behaviors :*

    journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors, *31*(8), 847–861.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000311

Causton, J., Tracy-Bronson, C. P., & MacLeod, K. (2015). Beyond treats and timeouts: Humanistic

    behavior supports in inclusive classrooms. International Journal of Whole Schooling, 11(1),

    68-84.

Ceschi, A., Demerouti, E., Sartori, R., & Weller, J. (2017). Decision-Making Processes in the

    Workplace: How Exhaustion, Lack of Resources and Job Demands Impair Them and Affect

    Performance. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 313. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00313

Chalfin, A. and McCrary, J., 2017. Criminal Deterrence: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of*

    Economic Literature, 55(1), pp.5-48.

Champine, R. B., Lang, J. M., Nelson, A. M., Hanson, R. F., & Tebes, J. K. (2019). Systems

    Measures of a Trauma-Informed Approach: A Systematic Review. *American journal of*

    community psychology, *64*(3-4), 418–437. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12388

Chanana, N., & Sangeeta (2020). Employee engagement practices during COVID-19

    lockdown. *Journal of public affairs*, e2508. Advance online publication.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2508

Chris, J., 2015. Examples of Constructive Criticism in the Workplace. *Driving Buisness*

    connections,.

Christensen, M., Innstrand, S.T., Saksvik, P.O. et al. (1 more author) (2019) The line manager's role

    in implementing successful organizational interventions. Spanish Journal of Psychology, 22.

    e5. ISSN 1138-7416

Chromey, D., 2017. "I'M NOT JUST CRAZY.": EXPLORING THE IMPOSTOR PHENOMENON

    IN AN EDUCATIONAL AND COMMUNICATIVE CONTEXT. *North Dakota State*

    University of Agriculture and Applied Science, pp.1-105.

Churchill, F., 2019. Management style increasingly blamed for stress-related absence, finds CIPD

    poll. *People Management*,.

CIPD, 2021. Dealing with conflict at work: a guide for line managers. *CIPD*,.

Claes, B. and Shapland, J.M. (2017) Desistance from crime and restorative justice.

Clark D. M. (2018). Realizing the Mass Public Benefit of Evidence-Based Psychological Therapies:

    The IAPT Program. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, *14*, 159–183.

    https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050817-084833

Clark, C., Bales, W., Scaggs, S., Ensley, D., Coltharp, P. and Blomberg, T., 2016. Assessing the

    Impact of Post-Release Community Supervision on Post-Release Recidivism and

    Employment. *Department of Justice*, pp.6-17.

Clarke, M., Brown, S., & Völlm, B. (2017). Circles of Support and Accountability for Sex

    Offenders: A Systematic Review of Outcomes. *Sexual Abuse*, *29*(5), 446–

    478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215603691

College of Policing, 2013. Conrol, restraint and searches. *College of Policing: Authorised*

    Professional pratise, [online] Available at: <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-

    content/detention-and-custody-2/control-restraint-and-searches/> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

College of Policing, 2015. Restorative Justice. [online] Available at:

    <https://whatworks.college.police.uk/toolkit/Pages/Intervention.aspx?InterventionID=24>

    [Accessed 22 March 2021].

Committee on the Science of Changing Behavioral Health Social Norms; Board on Behavioral,

    Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences; Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education;

    National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Ending Discrimination Against

    People with Mental and Substance Use Disorders: The Evidence for Stigma Change.

    Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2016 Aug 3. 2, Understanding Stigma of

    Mental and Substance Use Disorders. Available from:

    https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK384923/

Cook, S. C., Schwartz, A. C., & Kaslow, N. J. (2017). Evidence-Based Psychotherapy: Advantages and Challenges. *Neurotherapeutics : the journal of the American Society for Experimental NeuroTherapeutics*, *14*(3), 537–545. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13311-017-0549-4

Cordner, G., 2020. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE EVIDENCE-BASED POLICING IN 45 SMALL BYTES. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-138.

Cornelissen, T., 2016. Do social interactions in the workplace lead to productivity spillover among co-workers?. *IZA World of Labor*,.

Cortellazzo, L., Bruni, E., & Zampieri, R. (2019). The Role of Leadership in a Digitalized World: A Review. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 1938. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938

Costello, B. and Laub, J., 2020. Social Control Theory: The Legacy of Travis Hirschi's Causes of Delinquency. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 3(1), pp.21-41.

Coutts, P., 2018. Turning Point: The Police's Production and Use of Evidence to Reduce Reoffending. *Alliance for useful evidence*, [online] Available at: <https://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Turning-point-case-study-v1.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

CPS, 2019. Minor Offences. *The Code for Crown Posecutors*, [online] Available at: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/minor-offences>

CPS, 2019. Public Order Offences incorporating the Charging Standard. *CPS*, [online] Available at: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/public-order-offences-incorporating-charging-standard>

CQC, 2011. Who's looking out for children?. *An Inspection led by HMI Constabulary with HMI Prisons, HMI Probation, the Care Quality Commission, the Healthcare Inspectorate Wales and the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales*, pp.1-52.

Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I. and Petticrew, M., 2008. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*,.

Crilly, N. and Cardoso, C., 2017. Where next for research on fixation, inspiration and creativity in design?. *Design Studies*, 50, pp.1-38.

Croisdale, T., 2007. offenders are rational enough to consider both the consequences and benefit of their actions, likening the decision to commit a crime to the decision to get married or go to university. *Simon Fraser University*, pp.1-163.

Cropanzano, R., Ambrose, M., Goodstein, J. and Butterfield, K., 2015. Restorative Justice. *The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*,

Cullen, F., Fisher, B., & Applegate, B. (2000). Public Opinion about Punishment and Corrections. *Crime and Justice, 27*, 1-79. Retrieved March 18, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147662

Cullen, F., Jonson, C. and Nagin, D., 2011. Prisons Do Not Reduce Recidivism. *The Prison Journal*, 91(3_suppl), pp.48S-65S.

Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Advances in criminological theory: Vol. 15. Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (p. 367–395). Transaction Publishers

D'Arcy, J., Herath, T. A review and analysis of deterrence theory in the IS security literature: making sense of the disparate findings. *Eur J Inf Syst* **20,** 643–658 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.23

D'Auria, G. and D'Smet, A., 2020. Leadership in a crisis: Responding to the coronavirus outbreak and future challenges. *McKinsey and Company*,.

Dadashazar, N., 2017. Offender Recidivism: A Quantitative Study of Motivational Risk Factors and Counseling. *Walden University*, pp.1-194.

Dallery, J., Cassidy, R. N., & Raiff, B. R. (2013). Single-case experimental designs to evaluate novel technology-based health interventions. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *15*(2), e22. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.2227

Daly J, Jackson D, Mannix J, Davidson PM, Hutchinson M. The importance of clinical leadership in the hospital setting. *J Healthc Leadersh*. 2014;6:75-83 https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S46161

Davidescu, A., Apostu, S., Paul, A. and Casuneanu, I., 2020. Work Flexibility, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance among Romanian Employees—Implications for Sustainable Human Resource Management. *Sustainability*, 12(15), pp.1-53.

Davidson, R. J., & Kaszniak, A. W. (2015). Conceptual and methodological issues in research on mindfulness and meditation. *The American psychologist*, *70*(7), 581–592. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039512

Davies, D. and Thate, M., 2017. Religion and the Individual: Belief, Practice, and Identity. *MDPI*, pp.1-206.

Davis, M., Sheidow, A. J., & McCart, M. R. (2015). Reducing recidivism and symptoms in emerging adults with serious mental health conditions and justice system involvement. *The journal of behavioral health services & research*, *42*(2), 172–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-014-9425-8

Davis, M., Sheidow, A. J., & McCart, M. R. (2015). Reducing recidivism and symptoms in emerging adults with serious mental health conditions and justice system involvement. *The journal of behavioral health services & research*, *42*(2), 172–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-014-9425-8

Davis, R., Campbell, R., Hildon, Z., Hobbs, L. and Michie, S., 2014. Theories of behaviour and

    behaviour change across the social and behavioural sciences: a scoping review. *Health*

    Psychology Review, 9(3), pp.323-344.

Dawson, J., 2018. Who Is That? The Study of Anonymity and Behavior. *APA*,.

Day, D., Fleenor, J., Atwater, L., Sturm, R. and McKee, R., 2014. Advances in leader and leadership

    development: A review of 25years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1),

    pp.63-82.

Day, D., Fleenor, J., Atwater, L., Sturm, R. and McKee, R., 2014. Advances in leader and leadership

    development: A review of 25years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1),

    pp.63-82.

de Lacerda, T., 2015. Understanding leadership effectiveness in organizational settings: An

    integrative approach. *University of Lisbon*,.

Department of Health, 2021. Mental Health Act 1983: Code of Practice. *GOV*, [online] pp.2-457.

    Available at:

    <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat

    a/file/435512/MHA_Code_of_Practice.PDF> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Dewa, C., Loong, D., Trujillo, A. and Bonato, S., 2018. Evidence for the effectiveness of police-

    based pre-booking diversion programs in decriminalizing mental illness: A systematic

    literature review. *PLOS ONE*, 13(6).

Di Domenico, S. I., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). The Emerging Neuroscience of Intrinsic Motivation: A

    New Frontier in Self-Determination Research. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, *11*, 145.

    https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00145

Di Domenico, S. I., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). The Emerging Neuroscience of Intrinsic Motivation: A

New Frontier in Self-Determination Research. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, *11*, 145.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00145

Diaz, L. and Mazuera, N., 2015. Leadership characteristics that shape the leadership style of leaders

of financially sustainable social innovation projects. *School of buisness and Economics*,

[online] pp.1-119. Available at: <http://www.diva-

portal.org/smash/get/diva2:781435/FULLTEXT01.pdf> [Accessed 25 March 2021].

Dieleman, M., Gerretsen, B., & van der Wilt, G. J. (2009). Human resource management

interventions to improve health workers' performance in low and middle income countries: a

realist review. *Health research policy and systems*, *7*, 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-7-

7

Diener, E. & Biswas-Diener, R. (2021). The replication crisis in psychology. In R. Biswas-Diener &

E. Diener (Eds), *Noba textbook series: Psychology.* Champaign, IL: DEF publishers.

Retrieved from http://noba.to/q4cvydeh

Dijksterhuis, A., van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how

to win a game of Trivial Pursuit. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 865–877.

Dinis, M., Sousa, H., Moura, A., Viterbo, L., & Pinto, R. J. (2019). Health Behaviors as a Mediator

of the Association Between Interpersonal Relationships and Physical Health in a Workplace

Context. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(13), 2392.

https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16132392

Disley, E. and Liddle, M., 2016. Local perspectives in Ending Gang and Youth Violence Areas

Perceptions of the nature of urban street gangs. *Home Office*, pp.9-56.

Disley, E., Taylor, C., Kruithof, K., Winpenny, E., Liddle, M., Sutherland, A., Lilford, R., Wright,

S., McAteer, L. and Francis, V., 2016. Evaluation of the Offender Liasion and Diversion

Trial Schemes. *RAND*, [online] pp.1-39. Available at:

<https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1200/RR1283/RAND_R

R1283.pdf

Durcan, G., Saunders, A., Gadsby, B. and Hazard, A., 2014. The Bradley report Five years

on. *Centre for Mental Health*, [online] pp.4-36. Available at:

<http://www.mentalhealthchallenge.org.uk/library-files/MHC151-

Bradley_report_five_years_on.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Duwe, G., 2017. The Use and Impact of Correctional Programming for Inmates on Pre- and Post-

Release Outcomes. *The National Institute of Justice*, p.2.

Earp, B. and Trafimow, D., 2015. Replication, falsification, and the crisis of confidence in social

psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.

Edwards, N. and Barker, P., 2014. The Importance of Context in Implementation Research. *JAIDS

Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 67(Supplement 2), pp.157-162.

El Sayed, S., Piquero, A. and TenEyck, M., 2016. Differentiating Between Moffitt's Developmental

Taxonomy and Silverthorn and Frick's Delayed-Onset Models of Female

Offending. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(4), pp.631-650.

Elkin, 2019. Office for National Statistics.

Elkin, M., 2019. Crime in England and Wales: year ending March 2019. *Office of National statistics*,

p.1.

Engender, 2018. GENDER, HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS: A LITERATURE REVIEW.

pp.1-37.

Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2015. Preventing deaths in detention of adults with mental

health conditions. *Commission in Wales*, [online] p.1. Available at:

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/preventing-deaths-detention-adults-mental-health-conditions> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Esmaili, A., Zieyaei, M., Khajeh, A. and Baratvand, M., 2011. The Relationship between Recidivism, Labeling, Deviant Identity and Social Boycott among Tabriz's Prisoners. *International Conference on Humanities, Society and Culture*, 20(1).

Evans, E., 2016. A Realistic Evaluation of Integrated Offender Management in one English County: A Partnership for Desistance?. *Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, [online] pp.7-77. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42492901.pp.7-77

exploration. *Science/Society/Law/Crime/Criminology*, [online] 3, pp.1-18. Available at: <https://uk.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/65244_Maguire_Chapter_3.pdf> [Accessed 14 March 2021].

Ezell, M. and Cohen, L., 2004. Desisting from Crime. pp.1-4.

Faber, J., & Fonseca, L. M. (2014). How sample size influences research outcomes. *Dental press journal of orthodontics*, *19*(4), 27–29. https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-9451.19.4.027-029.ebo

Fairchild, G., van Goozen, S. H., Calder, A. J., & Goodyer, I. M. (2013). Research review: evaluating and reformulating the developmental taxonomic theory of antisocial behaviour. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, and allied disciplines*, *54*(9), 924–940. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12102

Farrall, S., Bottoms, A., & Shapland, J. (2010). Social structures and desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, *7*(6), 546–570. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370810376574

Fazel, S. and Wolf, A., 2015. A Systematic Review of Criminal Recidivism Rates Worldwide:
Current Difficulties and Recommendations for Best Practice. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), p.e0130390.

Fazel, S., Hayes, A., Bartellas, K., Clerici, M. and Trestman, R., 2016. Mental health of prisoners:
prevalence, adverse outcomes, and interventions. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(9), pp.871-881.

Feilzer, M., 2019. *Mres - Checkpoint Cymru: A Process Evaluation Of The Introduction Of A
Custody Suite Diversion Scheme In North Wales*. [online] Bangor University. Available at:
<https://www.north-wales.police.uk/news-and-appeals/police-boss-launches-pioneering-
scheme-to-steer-offenders-away-from-life-of-crime>

Ferguson, N., Laydon, D., Nedjati-Gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K. and Baguelin, M., 2020. Report 9:
Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and
healthcare demand. *WHO. Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team.*, pp.1-20.

Ferguson, P., 2016. The Presumption of Innocence and its Role in the Criminal Process. *Criminal
Law Forum*, 27(2), pp.131-158.

Ferreira, J., 2016. Life-Course Criminology: Comparing the Dual Taxonomy and Age-Graded
Theories of Criminal. *Inquires Journal*, p.1.

Fidler, 2018. Reproducibility of Scientific Results. *Stanford encylopedia of Philosphy*,.

Fischer, C., Malycha, C. and Schafmann, E., 2019. The Influence of Intrinsic Motivation and
Synergistic Extrinsic Motivators on Creativity and Innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10.

FitzGerald, C., & Hurst, S. (2017). Implicit bias in healthcare professionals: a systematic
review. *BMC medical ethics*, *18*(1), 19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0179-8

FitzGerald, C., Martin, A., Berner, D. and Hurst, S., 2019. Interventions designed to reduce implicit
prejudices and implicit stereotypes in real world contexts: a systematic review. *BMC
Psychology*, 7(1).

Fox, D., 2015. Power relations in advocacy approaches in family group conferencing with children and young people. *London Metropolitan University*, pp.1-287.

Furlong, S., Richardson, V. and Fiest, A., 2021. Police powers: pre-charge bail overview of the evidence (accessible). *Home Office*,.

Gabriel, D., 2013. Qualitative data analysis. *Research Guides*, [online] p.1. Available at: <https://deborahgabriel.com/2013/04/25/qualitative-data-analysis/> .

Gadd, D. and Farrall, S., 2004. Criminal Careers, Desistance and Subjectivity. *Theoretical Criminology*, 8(2), pp.123-156.

Garrigan, B., Adlam, A. and Langdon, P., 2018. Moral decision-making and moral development: Toward an integrative framework. *Developmental Review*, 49, pp.80-100.

Geldenhuys, M., Bakker, A. and Demerouti, E., 2020. How task, relational and cognitive crafting relate to job performance: a weekly diary study on the role of meaningfulness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(1), pp.83-94.

Gerkin, P., Walsh, J., Kuilema, J. and Borton, I., 2017. Implementing Restorative Justice Under the Retributive Paradigm. *SAGE Open*, 7(1), p.1-10

Geue, P., 2017. Positive Practices in the Workplace: Impact on Team Climate, Work Engagement and Task Performance. *Regent University*, [online] pp.1-30. Available at:<https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol10iss1/4ELJ-Geue.pdf> [Accessed 22 March 2021].

Gibson, 2016. A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY. *University of Birmingham*, pp.3-276.

Gilbert, C., De Winne, S. and Sels, L., 2020. The influence of line managers and HR department on employees' affective commitment. *Faculty of Business and Economics*, pp.1-39.

Glen, S., 2017. Charging and Out of Court Disposals: A National Strategy. *National Police Cheifs council*, pp.2-44.

Goadsby, P. J., Holland, P. R., Martins-Oliveira, M., Hoffmann, J., Schankin, C., & Akerman, S. (2017). Pathophysiology of Migraine: A Disorder of Sensory Processing. *Physiological reviews*, *97*(2), 553–622. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00034.2015

Goldweber, A., Dmitrieva, J., Cauffman, E., Piquero, A. and Steinberg, L., 2010. The Development of Criminal Style in Adolescence and Young Adulthood: Separating the Lemmings from the Loners. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(3), pp.332-346.

Goode, 2014. Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Springer Science+Business*, pp.1-62.

Gordon, I., Martin, C., Feldman, R. and Leckman, J., 2011. Oxytocin and social motivation. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 1(4), pp.471-493.

GOV, 2015. What Works to Reduce Reoffending: A Summary of the Evidence. *Scottish Government*, p.139.

Gray, P., Senabe, S., Naicker, N., Kgalamono, S., Yassi, A., & Spiegel, J. M. (2019). Workplace-Based Organizational Interventions Promoting Mental Health and Happiness among Healthcare Workers: A Realist Review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(22), 4396. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16224396

Grigoryeva, M. and Matsueda, R., 2014. Rational Choice, Deterrence, and Crime: Sociological Contributions. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, pp.4316-4327.

Grimwood, G., 2012. Reducing Reoffending: The "what works" debate. *The House of Commons*, pp.19-26.

Grupe, D. W., & Nitschke, J. B. (2013). Uncertainty and anticipation in anxiety: an integrated neurobiological and psychological perspective. *Nature reviews. Neuroscience*, *14*(7), 488–501. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3524

Guglielmucci, F., Franzoi, I., Bonafede, M., Borgogno, F., Grosso, F. and Granieri, A., 2018. "The Less I Think About It, the Better I Feel": A Thematic Analysis of the Subjective Experience of Malignant Mesothelioma Patients and Their Caregivers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9.

Hadadian, Z. and Sayadpour, Z., 2018. Relationship between Toxic Leadership and Job Related Affective Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Job Stress. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 7(1), pp.1-9.

Hagger, M. and Weed, M., 2019. DEBATE: Do interventions based on behavioral theory work in the real world?. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 16(1).

Hale, C., Hayward, K., Wahidin, A. and Wincup, E., 2013. Criminology. *Oxford University press*,.

Hämmig, O., 2017. Health and well-being at work: The key role of supervisor support. *SSM - Population Health*, 3, pp.393-402.

Hannah, S., Sumanth, J., Lester, P. and Cavarretta, F., 2014. Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: Critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(5), pp.598-621.

Hanson, B., 2018. What Is Resource Management & Why Is It Important?. *Citrix*, p.1.

Hardavella, G., Aamli-Gaagnat, A., Saad, N., Rousalova, I., & Sreter, K. B. (2017). How to give and receive ⌐⌐feedback effectively. *Breathe (Sheffield, England)*, *13*(4), 327–333. https://doi.org/10.1183/20734735.009917

Hardcastle, S. J., Hancox, J., Hattar, A., Maxwell-Smith, C., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., & Hagger, M. S. (2015). Motivating the unmotivated: how can health behavior be changed in those

unwilling to change?. *Frontiers in psychology*, *6*, 835.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00835

Harding, D., Morenoff, J., Nguyen, A. and Bushway, S., 2017. Short- and long-term effects of imprisonment on future felony convictions and prison admissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(42), pp.11103-11108.

Harding, D., Morenoff, J., Nguyen, A. and Bushway, S., 2017. Short- and long-term effects of imprisonment on future felony convictions and prison admissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(42), pp.1103-1108.

Hardy, B., Alcock, T. and Malpass, J., 2016. The impact of changing management practices on the morale of contact centre workers. *CIPD*, pp.1-8.

Hartley, C. A., & Phelps, E. A. (2012). Anxiety and decision-making. *Biological psychiatry*, *72*(2), 113–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.12.027

Harty, M., Jarrett, M., Thornicroft, G. and Shaw, J., 2012. Unmet needs of male prisoners under the care of prison Mental Health Inreach Services. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 23(3), pp.285-296.

Hasan, R. and Manxhari, M., 2017. Importance of Communication During Change: A Case of the Municipality of Vlora. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(1), pp.1-15.

Hawk, M., Coulter, R., Egan, J., Fisk, S., Reuel Friedman, M., Tula, M. and Kinsky, S., 2017. Harm reduction principles for healthcare settings. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 14(1).

Hawkley, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: a theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, *40*(2), 218–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-010-9210-8

Hayes, H., 2006. Apologies and Accounts in Youth Justice Conferencing: Reinterpreting Research Outcomes1. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9(4), pp.369-385.

Hayes, J. P., Vanelzakker, M. B., & Shin, L. M. (2012). Emotion and cognition interactions in PTSD: a review of neurocognitive and neuroimaging studies. *Frontiers in integrative neuroscience*, *6*, 89. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2012.00089

Haynes, A., Brennan, S., Redman, S. 2015. Figuring out fidelity: a worked example of the methods used to identify, critique and revise the essential elements of a contextualised intervention in health policy agencies. *Implementation Sci* **11,** 23 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0378-6

Hendry, J. and King, C., 2016. Expediency, Legitimacy, and the Rule of Law: A Systems Perspective on Civil/Criminal Procedural Hybrids. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 11(4), pp.733-757.

Henry, S., 2021. *Social Construction of Crime*. [online] Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412971997.n34> [Accessed 14 March 2021].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2021. Exercising Discretion: The Gateway to Justice. *Criminal Justice Joint Inspection*, pp.1-38.

Heyden, M., Fourné, S., Koene, B., Werkman, R. and Ansari, S., 2017. Rethinking 'Top-Down' and 'Bottom-Up' Roles of Top and Middle Managers in Organizational Change: Implications for Employee Support. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(7), pp.961-985.

Heydon, G., & Naylor, B. (2018). Criminal record checking and employment: The importance of policy and proximity. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *51*(3), 372–394. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865817723410

Hillary, F. and Medaglia, J., 2020. What the replication crisis means for intervention science. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 154, pp.3-5.

Hillier, J. and Mews, A. 2018. The reoffending impact of increased release of prisoners on temporary licence, *London: Ministry of Justice.* pp.5-8

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the Explanation of Crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 89*(3), 552-584. Retrieved March 18, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2779005

Hitchcock, 2015. The Relationship Between Toxic Leadership, Organizational Citizenship, and Turnover Behaviors Among San Diego Nonprofit Paid Staf. *University of San Diego*, pp.1-153.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2019. HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales Annual Report. pp.16-46.

HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2016. Desistance and young people: An inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation. *Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation*, pp.2-45.

HMIC, 2015. The welfare of vulnerable people in police custody. *Inspecting Policing in public interest*, pp.16-23.

HMPP, 2019. HMPPS risk of serious harm guidance 2020. *GOV*, [online] p.1. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hmpps-risk-of-serious-harm-guidance-2020> [Accessed 18 March 2021].

Hoeritz, K. (2013). Stereotypes and Their Consequences for Women as Leaders in Higher Education Administration (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/654

Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The Efficacy of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: A Review of Meta-analyses. *Cognitive therapy and research*, *36*(5), 427–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-012-9476-1

Holliday, L., 2014. Using logic model mapping to evaluate program fidelity. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 42, pp.109-117.

Holt-Lunstad, J., & Smith, T. B. (2016). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for CVD: implications for evidence-based patient care and scientific inquiry. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)*, *102*(13), 987–989. https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-309242

Houston, E., 2020. The Importance of Positive Relationships in the Workplace. *Positive Psychology*, p.1.

Howard, R., Karatzias, T., Power, K. and Mahoney, A., 2016. Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms mediate the relationship between substance misuse and violent offending among female prisoners. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 52(1), pp.21-25.

Howarth, E., Devers, K., Moore, G., O'Cathain, A. and Dixon-Woods, M., n.d. Contextual issues and qualitative research.

Hucklesby, A. and Wahidin, A., 2013. Criminal Justice. *Oxford University Press*, 2, pp.5-392.

Hughes, K., Lowey, H., Quigg, Z. and Bellis, M., 2016. Relationships between adverse childhood experiences and adult mental well-being: results from an English national household survey. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1).

Hyman-Shurland, Y., 2016. The Merits of Trust in Transformational Leadership. *Walden University*. Pp.1-207.

Illes, K. and Matthews, M., 2015. LEADERSHIP, TRUST AND COMMUNICATION: BUILDING TRUST IN COMPANIES THROUGH EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP COMMUNICATION. *University of Westminister*, pp.1-27.

improve these harmful leadership styles. Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary

International Political Science Abstracts. (2020). *International Political Science Abstracts*, *70*(5), 633–758. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020834520963464

Ipsos, 2018. Impact Evaluation of the National Speed Awareness Course. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-111.

Jacobs, B., 2010. DETERRENCE AND DETERRABILITY*. *Criminology*, 48(2), pp.417-441.

Jacobs, C. M. (2019). Ineffective-Leader-Induced Occupational Stress. *SAGE Open*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019855858

Jacobson, J., Heard, C. and Fair, H., 2017. Prison: Evidence of its use and over-use from around the world. *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*, [online] pp.17-25. Available at: <https://www.prisonstudies.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/global_imprisonment_web2c.pdf>

Jahan, N., Naveed, S., Zeshan, M., & Tahir, M. A. (2016). How to Conduct a Systematic Review: A Narrative Literature Review. *Cureus*, *8*(11), e864. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.864

Jalaget, R., 2016. The Impact of Change and Change Management in Achieving Corporate Goals and Objectives: Organizational Perspective. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5(11), pp.1233-1237.

Järnström, E. and Sällström, L., 2012. Work Motivation. *University of Gothenberg*, pp.1-48.

Jeffrey W. Knopf (2010) The Fourth Wave in Deterrence Research, Contemporary Security Policy, 31:1, 1-33, DOI: 10.1080/13523261003640819

Johnston, L., Goldsmith, L. and Finegood, D., 2020. Developing co-funded multi-sectoral partnerships for chronic disease prevention: a qualitative inquiry into federal governmental public health staff experience. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 18(1).

Jolliffe, D. and Hedderman, C., 2015. Investigating the Impact of Custody on Reoffending Using Propensity Score Matching. *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(8), pp.1051-1077.

Jollis, D., Faber, W. and Diyamandoglu, V., 1998. Biological stability of drinking water in New York City. *Water Science and Technology*, 38(6), pp.181-190.

Jones, C., Barrera, I., Brothers, S., Ring, R., & Wahlestedt, C. (2017). Oxytocin and social functioning. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*, *19*(2), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2017.19.2/cjones

Justice System: The Role of the Garda Síochána Adult Cautioning Scheme," Irish Journal of Applied Social. Studies: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 7.doi:10.21427/D7FD9S

Kachi, Y., Inoue, A., Eguchi, H., Kawakami, N., Shimazu, A. and Tsutsumi, A., 2020. Occupational stress and the risk of turnover: a large prospective cohort study of employees in Japan. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1).

Kaplan, R. M., Chambers, D. A., & Glasgow, R. E. (2014). Big data and large sample size: a cautionary note on the potential for bias. *Clinical and translational science*, *7*(4), 342–346. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.12178

Kelly, L. and Armitage, V., 2015. Diverse Diversions: Youth Justice Reform, Localized Practices, and a 'New Interventionist Diversion?. *Youth Justice*, 15(2), pp.117-133.

Kennedy, C., Fonner, V., Armstrong, K., Denison, J., Yeh, P., O'Reilly, K. and Sweat, M., 2019. The Evidence Project risk of bias tool: assessing study rigor for both randomized and non-randomized intervention studies. *Systematic Reviews*, 8(1).

Kerr, S., Kerr, W. and Xu, T., 2017. Personality Traits of Entrepreneurs: A Review of Recent Literature. pp.1-52.

Kersten, Blecker and Ringle, 2017. *Digitalization in supply chain management and logistics*. [online] Dx.doi.org. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15480/882.1442> [Accessed 5 April 2021].

Khamisa, N., Oldenburg, B., Peltzer, K., & Ilic, D. (2015). Work related stress, burnout, job satisfaction and general health of nurses. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *12*(1), 652–666. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120100652

Kiitam, A., McLay, A. and Pilli, T., 2016. Managing conflict in organisational change. *International Journal of Agile Systems and Management*, 9(2), p.114.

Kim, H., Sefcik, J. and Bradway, C., 2016. Characteristics of Qualitative Descriptive Studies: A Systematic Review. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 40(1), pp.23-42.

King, J., 2011. Going Straight On Probation: Desistance Transitions and the Impact of Probation. *University of Birmingham*, pp.1-353.

King, J., 2011. Going Straight On Probation: Desistance Transitions and the Impact of Probation. *University of Birmingham*, pp.1-353.

King, R. and Elderbloom, B., 2014. Improving Recidivism as a Performance Measure. *Urban Institute*,.

King, S., 2010. Going Straight On Probation: Desistance Transitions and the Impact of Probation. *The University of Birmingham*, [online] pp.5-7. Available at: <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/3172/5/King_11_PhD.pdf>

Kozlow, 2014. LEADING FROM WITHIN: Building Organizational Leadership Capacity. pp.7-264.

Krueger, 2017. Observation in Evaluation. *University of Minnesota*, pp.1-6.

Kumar, S., Adhish, V. S., & Chauhan, A. (2015). Managing bosses and peers. *Indian journal of community medicine : official publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine*, *40*(1), 14–18. https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.149263

Lacey, N. and Pickard, H., 2015. To Blame or to Forgive? Reconciling Punishment and Forgiveness in Criminal Justice. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*,.pp. 665–696

Lambie, I. and Randell, I., 2013. The impact of incarceration on juvenile offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(3), pp.448-459.

Lankford, A. and Madfis, E., 2017. Don't Name Them, Don't Show Them, But Report Everything Else: A Pragmatic Proposal for Denying Mass Killers the Attention They Seek and Deterring Future Offenders. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(2), pp.260-279.

Laraway, S., Snycerski, S., Pradhan, S., & Huitema, B. E. (2019). An Overview of Scientific Reproducibility: Consideration of Relevant Issues for Behavior Science/Analysis. *Perspectives on behavior science*, *42*(1), 33–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40614-019-00193-3

Lattimore, P., Dawes, D. and Barrick, K., 2018. Desistance from Crime over the Life Course. *National Criminal Justice Reference Service*, pp.1-3.

Laub, J., & Sampson, R. (2001). Understanding Desistance from Crime. *Crime and Justice, 28*, 1-69. Retrieved March 18, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147672

Laufs, J., & Waseem, Z. (2020). Policing in pandemics: A systematic review and best practices for police response to COVID-19. *International journal of disaster risk reduction : IJDRR*, *51*, 101812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101812

Lauwaert, K. and Aertsen, I., 2015. Desistance and restorative justice. *European Forum for Restorative Justice*, pp.1-190.

Leadership, 3(1), 33-36. doi:10.17062/cjil.v3i1.53

Leask, C., Sandlund, M., Skelton, D., Altenburg, T., Cardon, G., Chinapaw, M., De Bourdeaudhuij, I.,Verloigne, M. and Chastin, S., 2019. Framework, principles and recommendations for utilising participatory methodologies in the co-creation and evaluation of public health interventions. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 5(1), pp.1-66.

Leaw, J. N., Ang, R. P., Huan, V. S., Chan, W. T., & Cheong, S. A. (2015). Re-Examining of Moffitt's Theory of Delinquency through Agent Based Modeling. *PloS one*, *10*(6), e0126752. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0126752

Lee and McCrary, 2009. The Deterrence Effect of Prison: Dynamic Theory and Evidence. *Princeton University*, pp.1-66.

Lerner, J., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P. and Kassam, K., 2014. Emotion and Decision Making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, [online] pp.3-38. Available at: <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/jenniferlerner/files/annual_review_manuscript_june_16_final.final_.pdf> [Accessed 22 March 2021].

Leshem, S., 2010. The benefits of a right to silence for the innocent. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 41(2), pp.398-416.

Li, J., Zhang, J., & Yang, Z. (2017). Associations between a Leader's Work Passion and an Employee's Work Passion: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 1447. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01447

Lieberman and Fair, 2017. Sense of self and responsibility: a review of learning from the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust Prison Reform Fellowships – Part V. *Prison reform Trust*, pp.1-18.

Light, M., Grant, E. and Hopkins, K., 2013. Gender differences in substance misuse and mental health amongst prisoners. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-36.

Limbani, F., Goudge, J., Joshi, R., Maar, M., Miranda, J., Oldenburg, B., Parker, G., Pesantes, M., Riddell, M., Salam, A., Trieu, K., Thrift, A., Van Olmen, J., Vedanthan, R., Webster, R., Yeates, K. and Webster, J., 2019. Process evaluation in the field: global learnings from seven implementation research hypertension projects in low-and middle-income countries. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1).

Ling, S., Umbach, R. and Raine, A., 2019. Biological explanations of criminal behavior. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 25(6), pp.626-640.

Little, W. and McGivern, G., 2014. DEVIANCE, CRIME, AND SOCIAL CONTROL. *Introduction to Sociology*, pp.7-8.

Lloyd, A. and Borrill, J., 2019. Examining the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice in Reducing Victims' Post-Traumatic Stress. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 13(1), pp.77-89.

Lloyd, J., Dean, S., Creanor, S., Abraham, C., Hillsdon, M., Ryan, E. and Wyatt, K., 2017. Intervention fidelity in the definitive cluster randomised controlled trial of the Healthy Lifestyles Programme (HeLP) trial: findings from the process evaluation. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 14(1).

Lodisso, 2017. The Effects of Interpersonal Relationship on Employees' Job Satisfaction: The Case of Education Department, Hawassa City Administration. *Journal of Business and Management*, pp.21-27.

Loeber R., Farrington D.P. (2014) Age-Crime Curve. In: Bruinsma G., Weisburd D. (eds) Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2_474

Lohne, K., 2018. Penal humanitarianism beyond the nation state: An analysis of international criminal justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 24(2), pp.145-162.

Lugosi, P., 2006. Between Overt and Covert Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(3), pp.541-561.

Lussier, P., McCuish, E. & Corrado, R.R. The Adolescence–Adulthood Transition and Desistance from Crime: Examining the Underlying Structure of Desistance. *J Dev Life Course Criminology* **1,** 87–117 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40865-015-0007-0

Mackenzie, D., 2001. Corrections and Sentencing in the 21st Century: Evidence-Based Corrections and Sentencing. *The Prison Journal*, 81(3), pp.299-312.

Maculan, E. and Gil Gil, A., 2020. The Rationale and Purposes of Criminal Law and Punishment in Transitional Contexts. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 40(1), pp.132-157.

Maguire, 2018. Barriers to Women Entering Parliament and Local Government. *IPR Report October 2018*, pp.1-82.

Maguire, M., Disley, E., Liddle, M., Meek, R. and Burrowes, N., 2019. Developing a toolkit to measure intermediate outcomes to reduce reoffending from arts and mentoring interventions. *Ministry of justice*, pp.1-52.

Marsh, N., McKay, E., Pelly, C. and Cereda, S., 2019. PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE OF AND CONFIDENCE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND SENTENCING. *Sentencing council*, pp.1-60.

Mas, Alexandre, and Enrico Moretti. 2009. "Peers at Work." *American Economic Review*, 99 (1): 112-45.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*, *15*(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

Mason, S., Parry, J., Elbeck, S. and Sobrepera, A., 2019. PATIENTS OR PRISONERS: IMPLICATIONS OF OVERLOOKING MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF FEMALE OFFENDERS. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 16(1), pp.77-84.

May, T., Holloway, K., Buhociu, M. and Hugget, M., 2021. A Qualitative Study of the Misuse and Diversion of Prescription Only and Over-the-Counter Medication. *Centre for Criminology*, 1, pp.1-99.

McCartan, K., Kemshall, H., Westwood, S., Solle, J., Mackenzie, G., Cattell, J. and Pollard, A., 2014. Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA): A Case File Review of Two Pilots. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-10.

McIntyre, T., & O'Donnell, I. (2017). CRIMINALS, DATA PROTECTION, AND THE RIGHT TO A SECOND CHANCE. *Irish Jurist, 58*, new series, 27-55. doi:10.2307/26448059

McLean ,S.2014. Targeting the Use of Reminders and Notifications for Uptake by Populations (TURNUP): a systematic review and evidence synthesis. Southampton (UK): *NIHR Journals Library*Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK260108/

McLellan A. T. (2017). Substance Misuse and Substance use Disorders: Why do they Matter in Healthcare?. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association*, *128*, 112–130.

McMahon, G. and Jump, D., 2017. Starting to Stop: Young Offenders' Desistance from Crime. *Youth Justice*, 18(1), pp.3-17.

McNeill, F., Farrall, S., Lightowler, C., and Maruna, S. (2012) How and why people stop offending: discovering desistance. Other. Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services.

McQuerrey, L., 2019. Team Effectiveness & Increased Productivity.

Meijer, S., 2017. Rehabilitation as a Positive Obligation. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 25(2), pp.145-162.

Metcalfe, J., 2017. Learning from Errors. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68(1), pp.465-489.

Metropolitan Police, 2020. Crime type definitions. [online] p.1. Available at:
<https://www.met.police.uk/sd/stats-and-data/met/crime-type-definitions/>

Mews, A., Hillier, J., McHugh, M. and Coxon, C., 2015. The impact of short custodial sentences, community orders and suspended sentence orders on re-offending. *Ministry of Justice*, [online] pp.4-43. Available at:
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat a/file/399389/impact-of-short-custodial-sentences-on-reoffending.PDF>

Mews, A., Hillier, J., McHugh, M. and Coxon, C., 2015. The impact of short custodial sentences, community orders and suspended sentence orders on re-offending. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-43.

Michie, S., West, R., Sheals, K. and Godinho, C., 2018. Evaluating the effectiveness of behavior change techniques in health-related behavior: a scoping review of methods used. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 8(2), pp.212-224.

Ministry of Justice, 2010. *Breaking The Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation And Sentencing Of Offenders*. Ministry of Justice.pp.14-36

Ministry of Justice, 2016. Prison Safety and Reform. [online] pp.13-58. Available at:
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat a/file/565014/cm-9350-prison-safety-and-reform-_web_.pdf>

Ministry of Justice, 2020. A Smarter Approach to Sentencing. *Ministry of Justice*, [online] pp.2-155. Available at:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat a/file/918187/a-smarter-approach-to-sentencing.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Ministry of Justice, 2020. National Statistics: Criminal Justice Statistics quarterly: March 2020. *Ministry of Justice*, [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-march-2020/criminal-justice-statistics-quarterly-march-2020> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Ministry of Justice, 2020. Statistics on Women and the Criminal Justice System 2019. *Ministry of Justice*, pp.1-16.

Ministry of Justice, 2021. Female Offender Strategy. *Ministry of Justice*, [online] pp.2-55. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_dat a/file/719819/female-offender-strategy.pdf> [Accessed 22 March 2021].

Minor, D., Persico, N. and Weiss, D., 2018. Criminal background and job performance. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 7(1), pp.1-44.

Minor, D., Persico, N., & Weiss, D. M. (2018). Criminal background and job performance. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, *7*(1), [8]. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40173-018-0101-0

Mkandawire, T. (2010). Aid, Accountability, and Democracy in Africa. *Social Research, 77*(4), 1149-1182. Retrieved March 22, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23347123

Moen, P., Kelly, E. L., Fan, W., Lee, S.-R., Almeida, D., Kossek, E. E., & Buxton, O. M. (2016). Does a Flexibility/Support Organizational Initiative Improve High-Tech Employees' Well-Being? Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network. *American Sociological Review*, *81*(1), 134–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415622391

Moen, P., Kelly, E., Fan, W., Lee, S., Almeida, D., Kossek, E. and Buxton, O., 2016. Does a Flexibility/Support Organizational Initiative Improve High-Tech Employees' Well-Being? Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network. *American Sociological Review*, 81(1), pp.134-164.

Moen, T., 2006. Reflections on the Narrative Research Approach. *International Institute for Qualitative Methodology*, pp.1-14.

Moffitt, T., 1993. Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy. *American Psychological Association*, 100(4), pp.674-701.

Moore, K., Stuewig, J. and Tangney, J., 2015. The Effect of Stigma on Criminal Offenders' Functioning: A Longitudinal Mediational Model. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(2), pp.196-218.

Morrison, D. M., Hoppe, M. J., Gillmore, M. R., Kluver, C., Higa, D., & Wells, E. A. (2009). Replicating an intervention: the tension between fidelity and adaptation. *AIDS education and prevention : official publication of the International Society for AIDS Education*, *21*(2), 128–140. https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.2009.21.2.128

Morrison, D. M., Hoppe, M. J., Gillmore, M. R., Kluver, C., Higa, D., & Wells, E. A. (2009). Replicating an intervention: the tension between fidelity and adaptation. *AIDS education and prevention : official publication of the International Society for AIDS Education*, *21*(2), 128–140. https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.2009.21.2.128

Motz, R., Barnes, J., Caspi, A., Arseneault, L., Cullen, F., Houts, R., Wertz, J. and Moffitt, T., 2019. Does contact with the justice system deter or promote future delinquency? Results from a longitudinal study of British adolescent twins. *Criminology*, 58(2), pp.307-335.

Muldoon, R. and Bicchieri, C., 2018. Social norms. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*,.

Müller, S. and Moshagen, M., 2018. Controlling for Response Bias in Self-Ratings of Personality: A Comparison of Impression Management Scales and the Overclaiming Technique. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 101(3), pp.229-236.

Muncie, J. (2000) 'Decriminalising Criminology', British Criminology Conference:

Mushtaq, R., Shoib, S., Shah, T., & Mushtaq, S. (2014). Relationship between loneliness, psychiatric disorders and physical health ? A review on the psychological aspects of loneliness. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research : JCDR*, *8*(9), WE01–WE4. https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2014/10077.4828

Myhill, A. and Quinton, P., 2011. It's a fair cop? Police legitimacy, public cooperation, and crime reduction. *National Policing Improvement agency*, pp.1-20.

Nagin, D., 2013. Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century. *Crime and Justice*, 42(1), pp.199-263.

Nagin, D., 2013. Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century. *Crime and Justice*, 42(1), pp.199-263.

Nagin, D., Cullen, F. and Jonson, C., 2009. Imprisonment and Reoffending. *Crime and Justice*, 38(1), pp.115-200.

Naseriasl, M., Adham, D., & Janati, A. (2015). E-referral Solutions: Successful Experiences, Key Features and Challenges- a Systematic Review. *Materia socio-medica*, *27*(3), 195–199. https://doi.org/10.5455/msm.2015.27.195-199

National Audit Office, 2011. *The Cost Of A Cohort Of Young Offenders To The Criminal Justice System*. [ebook] Ministry of Justice, p.23. Available at: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/1011663_technical_paper.pdf>

National Audit Office, 2017. *Mental Health In Prisons*. [ebook] Her Majesty's Prison & Probation Service, NHS England and Public Health England, pp.1-10. Available at:

<https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Mental-health-in-prisons-Summary.pdf>

National Office for Statistics, 2020. Crime in England and Wales QMI. *Crime and Justice*, [online] Available at: <http://file:///Users/Danielle/Downloads/Crime%20in%20England%20and%20Wales%20QMI.pdf>

National Police Cheif's Council, 2017. CHARGING AND OUT OF COURT DISPOSALS: A National strategy. [online] pp.5-11. Available at: <https://www.npcc.police.uk/Publication/Charging%20and%20Out%20of%20Court%20Disposals%20A%20National%20Strategy.pdf> [Accessed 15 September 2020].

Neyroud, P., 2018. Out of Court Disposals managed by the Police: a review of the evidence. *University of Cambridge*, pp.1-38.

Nielsen, K., Nielsen, M., Ogbonnaya, C., Känsälä, M., Saari, E. and Isaksson, K., 2017. Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Work & Stress*, 31(2), pp.101-120.

Nielsen, M., Tangen, T., Idsoe, T., Matthiesen, S. and Magerøy, N., 2015. Post-traumatic stress disorder as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 21, pp.17-24.

North Wales Police, 2019. *Pioneering Scheme To Steer Offenders Away From Life Of Crime Launched - News And Appeals - North Wales Police*. [online] North-wales.police.uk. Available at: <https://www.north-wales.police.uk/news-and-appeals/police-boss-launches-pioneering-scheme-to-steer-offenders-away-from-life-of-crime>

Novotney, A., 2020. The risks of social isolation. *APA*,.

Nowell, L., Norris, J., White, D. and Moules, N., 2017. Thematic Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), pp.1-3.

O'Donnell, M., Nelson, L., Ackermann, E., Aczel, B., Akhtar, A., Aldrovandi, S., Alshaif, N., Andringa, R., Aveyard, M., Babincak, P., Balatekin, N., Baldwin, S., Banik, G., Baskin, E., Bell, R., Białobrzeska, O., Birt, A., Boot, W., Braithwaite, S., Briggs, J., Buchner, A., Budd, D., Budzik, K., Bullens, L., Bulley, R., Cannon, P., Cantarero, K., Cesario, J., Chambers, S., Chartier, C., Chekroun, P., Chong, C., Cleeremans, A., Coary, S., Coulthard, J., Cramwinckel, F., Denson, T., Díaz-Lago, M., DiDonato, T., Drummond, A., Eberlen, J., Ebersbach, T., Edlund, J., Finnigan, K., Fisher, J., Frankowska, N., García-Sánchez, E., Golom, F., Graves, A., Greenberg, K., Hanioti, M., Hansen, H., Harder, J., Harrell, E., Hartanto, A., Inzlicht, M., Johnson, D., Karpinski, A., Keller, V., Klein, O., Koppel, L., Krahmer, E., Lantian, A., Larson, M., Légal, J., Lucas, R., Lynott, D., Magaldino, C., Massar, K., McBee, M., McLatchie, N., Melia, N., Mensink, M., Mieth, L., Moore-Berg, S., Neeser, G., Newell, B., Noordewier, M., Ali Özdoğru, A., Pantazi, M., Parzuchowski, M., Peters, K., Philipp, M., Pollmann, M., Rentzelas, P., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., Philipp Röer, J., Ropovik, I., Roque, N., Rueda, C., Rutjens, B., Sackett, K., Salamon, J., Sánchez-Rodríguez, Á., Saunders, B., Schaafsma, J., Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M., Shanks, D., Sherman, M., Steele, K., Steffens, N., Sun, J., Susa, K., Szaszi, B., Szollosi, A., Tamayo, R., Tinghög, G., Tong, Y., Tweten, C., Vadillo, M., Valcarcel, D., Van der Linden, N., van Elk, M., van Harreveld, F., Västfjäll, D., Vazire, S., Verduyn, P., Williams, M., Willis, G., Wood, S., Yang, C., Zerhouni, O., Zheng, R. and Zrubka, M., 2018. Registered Replication Report: Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), pp.268-294.

Oberauer, K. and Lewandowsky, S., 2019. Addressing the theory crisis in psychology. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 26(5), pp.1596-1618.

Office of The Durham Police, Crime and Victim's Comissioner, 2020. *Global Award For Pioneering Checkpoint Offender Programme*. [online] Durham-pcc.gov.uk. Available at: <https://www.durham-pcc.gov.uk/News-and-Events/News-Archive/2019/oct-dec/Global-award-for-pioneering-Checkpoint-offender-programme.aspx>

Ohrnberger, J., Fichera, E. and Sutton, M., 2017. The relationship between physical and mental health: A mediation analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 195, pp.42-49.

Okamus, F., Altinay, L. and Roper, A., 2006. GAINING ACCESS FOR RESEARCH Reflections from Experience. *CORE*, pp.1-31.

Okata, D., 2015. Criminological theory and Crime

Oliveira, N., & Lumineau, F. (2019). The Dark Side of Interorganizational Relationships: An Integrative Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, *45*(1), 231–261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318804027

Oliver, R., Alexander, B., Roe, S. and Wlasny, M., 2019. The economic and social costs of domestic abuse. *Home Office*, pp. 7-8

Osborne, S. and Hammoud, M., 2017. Effective Employee Engagement in the Workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, 16(1).

Overton, A. R., & Lowry, A. C. (2013). Conflict management: difficult conversations with difficult people. *Clinics in colon and rectal surgery*, *26*(4), 259–264. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1356728

Overton, A. R., & Lowry, A. C. (2013). Conflict management: difficult conversations with difficult people. *Clinics in colon and rectal surgery*, *26*(4), 259–264. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1356728

Overton, A. R., & Lowry, A. C. (2013). Conflict management: difficult conversations with difficult people. *Clinics in colon and rectal surgery*, *26*(4), 259–264. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1356728

Pager, D. and Western, B., 2009. Investigating Prisoner Reentry: The Impact of Conviction Status on the Employment Prospects of Young Men. *Department of Justice*, pp.1-136.

Palinkas, L., Horwitz, S., Green, C., Wisdom, J., Duan, N. and Hoagwood, K., 2015. Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), pp.533-544.

Pangod, K., 2016. Criminal Justice. [online] 1(1). Available at: <https://www.bookdepository.com/Criminal-Justice-Kirstein-Pran-P-Pangod/9781680945966>

Paré, G. and Kitsiou, S., 2020. Methods for literature reviews. *Handbook of eHealth Evaluation: An Evidence-based Approach*, pp.157-181.

Parker, S., Knight, C. and Keller, A., 2020. Remote Managers Are Having Trust Issues. *Harvard Buisness review*,

Parlamis, Jennifer, "Venting Anger: Third Party Targets and Responses" (2010). Organization, Leadership, and Communications. Paper 4. http://repository.usfca.edu/olc/4

Paternoster, R. and Bushway, S., 2009. Desistance and the Feared Self: Toward an Identity Theory of Criminal Desistance. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 99(4), pp.1-55.

Paternoster, R., 2010. How Much Do We Really Know About Criminal Deterrence. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 100(3), pp.765-824.

Paternoster, R., 2010. How Much Do We Really Know about Criminal Deterrence. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 100(3), pp.1-61.

Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Bushway, S. *et al.* Human Agency and Explanations of Criminal Desistance: Arguments for a Rational Choice Theory. *J Dev Life Course Criminology* **1,** 209–235 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40865-015-0013-2

Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Bushway, S., Kerrison, E. and O'Connell, D., 2015. Human Agency and Explanations of Criminal Desistance: Arguments for a Rational Choice Theory. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 1(3), pp.209-235.

Pemberton, S., Balderston, S. and Long, J., 2019. Trauma, Harm and Offending Behaviour: What works to address social injury and criminogenic need with criminal justice involved women? INITIAL FINDINGS. *University of Birmingham*, pp.1-54.

Pérez, D., Van der Stuyft, P., Zabala, M. et al.(2015) A modified theoretical framework to assess implementation fidelity of adaptive public health interventions.Implementation Sci **11,** 91 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0457-8

Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C. and Guckenburg, S., 2010. Formal System Processing of Juveniles: Effects on Delinquency. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 6(1), pp.1-88.

Pickard H. (2014). Responsibility without Blame: Therapy, Philosophy, Law. *Prison service journal*, *213*, 10–16.

Piggot, E. and Wood, W., 2018. Does Restorative Justice Reduce Recidivism? Assessing Evidence and Claims about Restorative Justice and Reoffending. *Routledge International Handbook of Restorative Justice*, pp.1-22.

Pols, A., 2016. May Stakeholders be Involved in Design Without Informed Consent? The Case of Hidden Design. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(3), pp.723-742.

Portell, M., Anguera, T., Chacón-Moscoso, S. and Sanduvete-Chaves, S., 2015. Guidelines for reporting evaluations based on observational methodology. *Psicothema*, 27(3), pp.283-289.

Porter, G., 2016. A Protocol and Experimental Trial: The Checkpoint Desistance Programme in Durham. *Wolfson College*, pp.13-16.

Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2006). *The Empirical Status of Deterrence Theory: A Meta-Analysis.* In F. T.

Prison Reform Trust, 2011. *Prison Reform Trust Submission To The Ministry Of Justice: Breaking The Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation And Sentencing Of Offenders*. pp.3-7.

Prison Reform Trust, 2019. *Prison: The Facts*. [ebook] pp.2-16. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Bromley%20Briefings/Prison%20the%20facts%20Summer%202019.pdf>

Prison Reform Trust, 2021. BRADLEY REPORT. [online] p.1. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/WhatWeDo/Projectsresearch/Mentalhealth/TroubledInside/BradleyReport> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Pritlove, C., Juando-Prats, C., Ala-leppilampi, K. and Parsons, J., 2019. The good, the bad, and the ugly of implicit bias. *The Lancet*, 393(10171), pp.502-504.

Probst, B., 2015. The Eye Regards Itself: Benefits and Challenges of Reflexivity in Qualitative Social Work Research. *Social Work Research*, 39(1), pp.37-48.

Public Health England, 2018. Process evaluation. *GOV UK*, [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-in-health-and-well-being-overview/process-evaluation>

R. Allen., 2020. Prison, Rehabilitation and Reoffending. Available at: <http://probationmatters.blogspot.com/2019/11/prison-rehabilitation-and-reoffending.html>

Radford, K., Sturgeon, B., Cuomo, I. and Lucas, O., 2018. 'Walking this thin line' Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Experiences of Mental Health & Wellbeing in N. Ireland. *Institute for Conflict Research*, pp.1-48.

Rafferty, A. and Jimmieson, N., 2016. Subjective Perceptions of Organizational Change and Employee Resistance to Change: Direct and Mediated Relationships with Employee Well-being. *British Journal of Management*, 28(2), pp.248-264.

Rajgopal T. (2010). Mental well-being at the workplace. *Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, *14*(3), 63–65. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5278.75691

Rajgopal T. (2010). Mental well-being at the workplace. *Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, *14*(3), 63–65. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5278.75691

Rajgopal, T., 2010. Mental well-being at the workplace. *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 14(3), p.63.

Rakovec-Felser Z. (2014). Domestic Violence and Abuse in Intimate Relationship from Public Health Perspective. *Health psychology research*, *2*(3), 1821. https://doi.org/10.4081/hpr.2014.1821

Ratner, Carl (2002). Subjectivity and Objectivity in Qualitative Methodology [29 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *3*(3), Art. 16, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0203160.

Raza, M., Akhtar, M., Husnain, M. and Akhtar, M., 2015. The Impact of Intrinsic Motivation on Employee's Job Satisfaction. *Management and Organizational Studies*, 2(3).

Reavis, J. A., Looman, J., Franco, K. A., & Rojas, B. (2013). Adverse childhood experiences and adult criminality: how long must we live before we possess our own lives?. *The Permanente journal*, *17*(2), 44–48. https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/12-072

Reina, C., Rogers, K., Peterson, S., Byron, K. and Hom, P., 2017. Quitting the Boss? The Role of Manager Influence Tactics and Employee Emotional Engagement in Voluntary Turnover. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(1), pp.5-18.

Restorative Justice, 4 (3). pp. 302-322. ISSN 2050-473X

Rhodes, W., Gaes, G., Kling, R. and Cutler, C., 2018. Relationship Between Prison Length of Stay and Recidivism: A Study Using Regression Discontinuity and Instrumental Variables With Multiple Break Points. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(3), pp.731-769.

Richter, A., Schraml, K. and Leineweber, C., 2014. Work–family conflict, emotional exhaustion and performance-based self-esteem: reciprocal relationships. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 88(1), pp.103-112.

Rivara F, Le Menestre S. (2016). Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, and Practice. Washington. Committee on the Biological and Psychosocial Effects of Peer Victimization: Lessons for Bullying Prevention; Board on Children, Youth, and Families; Committee on Law and Justice; Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education; Health and Medicine Division; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine;Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK390414/

Roberton, T., Carter, E., Chou, V., Stegmuller, A., Jackson, B., Tam, Y., Sawadogo-Lewis, T. and Walker, N., 2020. Early estimates of the indirect effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and child mortality in low-income and middle-income countries: a modelling study. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(7), pp.901-908.

Roberts, P., 2002. Double Jeopardy Law Reform: A Criminal Justice Commentary. *Modern Law Review*, 65(3), pp.393-424.

Robin-D'Cruz and Whitehead, n.d. Pre-court diversion for adults: an evidence briefing. *Centre for Innovation*, pp.1-16.

Rocque M., Slivken L. (2019) Desistance from Crime: Past to Present. In: Krohn M., Hendrix N., Penly Hall G., Lizotte A. (eds) Handbook on Crime and Deviance. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20779-3_19

Rocque, 2012. UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MATURATION AND DESISTANCE FROM CRIME: A LIFE-COURSE DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH. *Northeastern University*, [online] pp.1-263. Available at: <https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:1026/fulltext.pdf> [Accessed 18 March 2021].

Rocque, M., Posick, C. and White, H., 2015. Growing Up Is Hard to Do: An Empirical Evaluation of Maturation and Desistance. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 1(4), pp.350-384.

Roediger, H., 2012. Psychology's Woes and a Partial Cure: The Value of Replication. *Association for Psychological science*, [online] p.1. Available at: <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/psychologys-woes-and-a-partial-cure-the-value-of-replication> [Accessed 19 March 2021].

Rosales, Robert M., "Energizing Social Interactions at Work: An Exploration of Relationships That Generate Employee and Organizational Thriving" (2015). Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP) Capstone Projects. 86. http://repository.upenn.edu/mapp_capstone/86

Rosenfeld, R., 2017. The Social Construction of Crime. *Oxford Bibliographies Online Datasets*,.

Ross, 2011. Case management What it is and how it can best be implemented. *The Kings Fund*, pp.1-32.

Royal College of Psychiatrists, 2020. Detainees with substance use disorders in police custody: Guidelines for clinical management. *The Royal College of Psychiatrists, and The Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, pp.1-94.

Ruvebana, E. and Brus, M., 2015. Before It's Too Late: Preventing Genocide by Holding the Territorial State Responsible for Not Taking Preventive Action. *Netherlands International Law Review*, 62(1), pp.25-47.

Ryan, Louise (2015). "Inside" and "Outside" of What or Where? Researching Migration Through Multi-Positionalities [57 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *16*(2), Art. 17, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1502175.

Sabo, V., 2017. Social Relationships in Young Off oung Offenders: Rele enders: Relevance to Peers, Poverty, and Psy , and Psychological Adjustment chological Adjustment. *The University of Western Ontario*, pp.1-29.

Safa, N., Maple, C., Furnell, S., Azad, M., Perera, C., Dabbagh, M. and Sookhak, M., 2019. Deterrence and prevention-based model to mitigate information security insider threats in organisations. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 97, pp.587-597

Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2009. Diversion: A better way for criminal justice and mental health. *Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health*, [online] pp.1-64. Available at: <http://www.ohrn.nhs.uk/resource/policy/DiversionSCMH.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Salvatore, C. and Taniguchi, T., 2012. Do Social Bonds Matter for Emerging Adults?. *Deviant Behavior*, 33(9), pp.738-756.

Salvatore, C., & Taniguchi, T. A. (2012). Do Social Bonds Matter for Emerging Adults?. *Deviant behavior*, *33*(9), 738–756. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2012.679888

Saundry, R., Latreille, P., Dickens, L., Irvine, C., Teague, P., Urwin, P. and Wibberley, G., 2021. Reframing Resolution - Managing Conflict and Resolving Individual Employment Disputes in the Contemporary Workplace. *Acas Policy Resolution*, pp.1-21.

Schulz-Knappe, C., Koch, T. and Beckert, J., 2019. The importance of communicating change. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 24(4), pp.670-685.

Schwalbe, C. S., Gearing, R. E., MacKenzie, M. J., Brewer, K. B., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of experimental studies of diversion programs for juvenile offenders. Clinical Psychology Review, 32, 26-33. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.10.002

Schyns, B. and Schilling, J., 2013. How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), pp.138-158.

Scurich, N., Nguyen, K. and John, R., 2015. Quantifying the presumption of innocence. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 15(1), pp.71-86.

Selected Proceedings. Volume 3,

Shaban, O., Al-Zubi, Z., Ali, N. and Alqotaish, A., 2017. The Effect of Low Morale and Motivation on Employees' Productivity & Competitiveness in Jordanian Industrial Companies. *International Business Research*, 10(7), p.1.

Shanks, D. R., Newell, B., Lee, E. H., Balikrishnan, D., Ekelund, L., Cenac, Z., Kavvadia, F. & Moore, C. (2013). Priming intelligent behavior: Elusive phenomenon. *PLOS One*. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0056515

Shapland, J., 2016. Forgiveness and Restorative Justice: Is It Necessary? Is It Helpful?. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 5(1), pp.94-112.

Shapland, J., 2016. Forgiveness and Restorative Justice: Is It Necessary? Is It Helpful?. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 5(1), pp.94-112.

Sharp N.L., Bye R.A., Cusick A. (2019) Narrative Analysis. In: Liamputtong P. (eds) Handbook
of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences. Springer, Singapore.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_106

Shepard, B.C. Between harm reduction, loss and wellness: on the occupational hazards of
work. *Harm Reduct J* **10,** 5 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7517-10-5

Sherman, L. and Strang, H., 2007. restorative justice: the evidence. *The Smith Institute*, pp.5-96.

Sherman, L., 2013. The Rise of Evidence-Based Policing: Targeting, Testing, and Tracking. *Crime
and Justice*, 42(1), pp.377-451.

Singh, N., Sengupta, S. and Dev, S., 2019. Toxic Leadership: The Most Menacing Form of
Leadership. *Dark Sides of Organizational Behavior and Leadership*,.

Singh, R., 2016. The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivators on Employee Engagement in
Information Organizations. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science
Online*, 57(2), pp.197-206.

Sirdfield, C. and Brooker, C., 2021. Maximising positive mental health outcomes for people under
probation supervision. *HM Inspectorate of Probation*, pp.1-15.

Slemp, G., Kern, M. and Vella-Brodrick, D., 2015. Workplace Well-Being: The Role of Job Crafting
and Autonomy Support. *Psychology of Well-Being*, 5(1).

Smith, A., 2017. Communication Strategies Used During Organizational Change in a Health Care
Organization. *Walden University*, pp.1-140.

Soares, R., & Pinto da Costa, M. (2019). Experiences and Perceptions of Police Officers Concerning
Their Interactions With People With Serious Mental Disorders for Compulsory
Treatment. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, *10*, 187. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00187

Solomon, A., 2012. *In Search Of A Job: Criminal Records As Barriers To Employment*. pp.42-49.

Soriano, E. C., Pasipanodya, E. C., LoSavio, S. T., Otto, A. K., Perndorfer, C., Siegel, S. D., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2018). Social constraints and fear of recurrence in couples coping with early stage breast cancer. *Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, *37*(9), 874–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000649

Spehar, I., Forest, J. and Stenseng, F., 2016. Passion for Work, Job Satisfaction, and the Mediating Role of Belongingness. *Passion for Activities: Motives, Experiences, and Outcomes*,.

Spieth, P. M., Kubasch, A. S., Penzlin, A. I., Illigens, B. M., Barlinn, K., & Siepmann, T. (2016). Randomized controlled trials - a matter of design. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*, *12*, 1341–1349. https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S101938

Steer, R., Jewkes, Y., Humphreys, K. and Goldman, M., 2016. *Rehabilitation By Design: Influencing Change In Prisoner Behaviour*. pp.1-28.

Stevens, 2019. Health Needs Assessment of Adverse Childhood Experiences in Bradford. *City of Bradford Metropolitan district council*, pp.1-108.

Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. and De Cremer, D., 2018. Successful Organizational Change: Integrating the Management Practice and Scholarly Literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), pp.752-788.

Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. and De Cremer, D., 2018. Successful Organizational Change: Integrating the Management Practice and Scholarly Literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), pp.752-788.

Strang, H., Sherman, L., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. and Ariel, B., 2013. Restorative Justice
Conferencing (RJC) Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on
Offender Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction. A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic
Reviews*, 9(1), pp.1-59.

Strang, H., Sherman, L., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. and Ariel, B., 2013. Restorative Justice
Conferencing (RJC) Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on
Offender Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction. A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic
Reviews*, 9(1), pp.1-59.

Strang, H., Sherman, L.W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. and Ariel, B. (2013). 'Restorative Justice
Conferencing (RJC) Using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on
Offender recidivism and victim satisfaction. A systematic review.

Stroebe, W. and Strack, F., 2014. The Alleged Crisis and the Illusion of Exact
Replication. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(1), pp.59-71.

Stults-Kolehmainen, M. A., & Sinha, R. (2014). The effects of stress on physical activity and
exercise. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, *44*(1), 81–121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-
013-0090-5

Stults-Kolehmainen, M. A., & Sinha, R. (2014). The effects of stress on physical activity and
exercise. *Sports medicine (Auckland, N.Z.)*, *44*(1), 81–121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-
013-0090-5

Sturgeon, J. and Zautra, A., 2016. Social pain and physical pain: shared paths to resilience. *Pain
Management*, 6(1), pp.63-74.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); Office of the Surgeon General
(US). Facing Addiction in America: The Surgeon General's Report on Alcohol, Drugs, and
Health [Internet]. Washington (DC): US Department of Health and Human Services; 2016

Nov. CHAPTER 6, HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS AND SUBSTANCE USE
DISORDERS. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK424848/

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); Office of the Surgeon General
(US). Facing Addiction in America: The Surgeon General's Report on Alcohol, Drugs, and
Health [Internet]. Washington (DC): US Department of Health and Human Services; 2016
Nov. CHAPTER 4, EARLY INTERVENTION, TREATMENT, AND MANAGEMENT OF
SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS.Available from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK424859/

Sutcliffe, K., Melendez-Torres, G., Burchett, H., Richardson, M., Rees, R. and Thomas, J., 2018. The
importance of service-users' perspectives: A systematic review of qualitative evidence
reveals overlooked critical features of weight management programmes. *Health Expectations*,
21(3), pp.563-573.

Sweeten, G., Piquero, A.R. & Steinberg, L. Age and the Explanation of Crime, Revisited. *J Youth
Adolescence* **42,** 921–938 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9926-4

Sweeten, G., Pyrooz, D. and Piquero, A., 2012. Disengaging From Gangs and Desistance From
Crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(3), pp.469-500.

Tafvelin, S., von Thiele Schwarz, U., Nielsen, K. and Hasson, H., 2018. Employees' and line
managers' active involvement in participatory organizational interventions: Examining direct,
reversed, and reciprocal effects on well-being. *Stress and Health*, 35(1), pp.69-80.

Taylor, D., 2019. Prisons and Probations. *The Prison Service*, p.1.

Teague, P. and Roche, W., 2011. Line managers and the management of workplace conflict:
evidence from Ireland. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(3), pp.235-251.

Telda, T., 2016. The Impact of Organizational Culture on Corporate Performance. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*, pp.1-157.

The Home Office, 2006. A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending. *HM Goverment*, pp.7-14.

The Library of Congress, 2020. The Impact of Foreign Law on Domestic Judgments: England and Wales. *Library of Congress*, [online] Available at: <https://www.loc.gov/law/help/domestic-judgment/englandandwales.php>

The Prison Reform Trust, 2019. *Prison The Facts Summer 2019*. [ebook] Prison Reform Trust, pp.2-16. Available at: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Bromley%20Briefings/Prison%20the%20facts%20Summer%202019.pdf>

The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, 2015. *What is crime?*. [ebook] University of Glasgow, p.1. Available at: <http://www.sccjr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/SCCJR-What-is-crime.pdf> [Accessed 14 March 2021].

Theodorakis, N., Ttofi, M. and Farrington, D., 2015. Crime and Punishment in the United Kingdom. *The Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*, pp.1-6.

Theodorakis, N., Ttofi, M. and Farrington, D., 2015. Crime and Punishment in the United Kingdom. *The Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*, pp.1-6.

Thomas, D., 2009. A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis. *University of Auckland*, pp.1-11.

Thomas, D., 2016. A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis. *University of Auckland*, pp.1-11.

Thompson, K., 2017. The social construction of crime. *Revise Sociology*, [online] p.1. Available at: <https://revisesociology.com/2019/11/22/the-social-construction-of-crime/> [Accessed 14 March 2021].

Thomson, A,.2017. A Phenomenological study of venting about work on Facebook. University of Cantebury. Pp1-181

Tian, L., Pu, J., Liu, Y. *et al.* Relationship between burnout and career choice regret among Chinese neurology postgraduates. *BMC Med Educ* **19,** 162 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1601-3

Tian, L., Pu, J., Liu, Y., Zhong, X., Gui, S., Song, X., Xu, S., Zhou, X., Wang, H., Zhou, W., Chen, J. and Xie, P., 2019. Relationship between burnout and career choice regret among Chinese neurology postgraduates. *BMC Medical Education*, 19(1), pp.1-20.

Tianya, 2015. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE & EMPLOYEE BEHAVIOR. *LAHTI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES*, pp.1-53.

Tolan, Graham and Seymour, Mairéad (2014) "Increasing the Potential for Diversion in the Irish Criminal

Tonry, M., 2008. Learning from the Limitations of Deterrence Research. *Crime and Justice*, 37(1), pp.279-311.

Tran, K. T., Nguyen, P. V., Dang, T., & Ton, T. (2018). The Impacts of the High-Quality Workplace Relationships on Job Performance: A Perspective on Staff Nurses in Vietnam. *Behavioral sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, *8*(12), 109. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8120109

Troy, A. S., Shallcross, A. J., Brunner, A., Friedman, R., & Jones, M. C. (2018). Cognitive reappraisal and acceptance: Effects on emotion, physiology, and perceived cognitive costs. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*, *18*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000371

Tsai, Y., 2011. Relationship between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11(1).

Turner, D., Wolf, A., Barra, S., Müller, M., Gregório Hertz, P., Huss, M., Tüscher, O. and Retz, W., 2020. The association between adverse childhood experiences and mental health problems in young offenders. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*,.

Turner, E., Medina, J. and Brown, G., 2019. Dashing Hopes? the Predictive Accuracy of Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment by Police. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 59(5), pp.1013-1034.

Tyrrell, K., Bond, E., Manning, M. and Dogaru, C., 2017. Diversion, Prevention and Youth Justice: a model of integrated decision making. *University of Suffolk*, pp.35-39.

Umberson, D., & Montez, J. K. (2010). Social relationships and health: a flashpoint for health policy. *Journal of health and social behavior*, *51 Suppl*(Suppl), S54–S66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510383501

Van De Voorde, K., Paauwe, J. and Van Veldhoven, M., 2011. Employee Well-being and the HRM-Organizational Performance Relationship: A Review of Quantitative Studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(4), pp.391-407.

van Duin, L., Bevaart, F., Zijlmans, J., Luijks, M. A., Doreleijers, T., Wierdsma, A. I., Oldehinkel, A. J.,Marhe, R., & Popma, A. (2019). The role of adverse childhood experiences and mental health care use in psychological dysfunction of male multi-problem young adults. *European child & adolescent psychiatry*, *28*(8), 1065–1078. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-018-1263-4

van Hooff, M. and van Hooft, E., 2016. Work-related boredom and depressed mood from a daily perspective: the moderating roles of work centrality and need satisfaction. *Work & Stress*, 30(3), pp.209-227.

van Hooft, E., & van Hooff, M. (2018). The state of boredom: Frustrating or depressing?. *Motivation and emotion*, *42*(6), 931–946. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9710-6

Van Wingerden, J. and Van der Stoep, J., 2018. The motivational potential of meaningful work: Relationships with strengths use, work engagement, and performance. *PLOS ONE*,.

Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S., & Young, T. (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC medical research methodology*, *18*(1), 148. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7

Lasker, R., Weiss, E., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership Synergy: A Practical Framework for Studying and Strengthening the Collaborative Advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, *79*(2), 179-205. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.00203

Veldman, J., Meeussen, L., Van Laar, C., & Phalet, K. (2017). Women (Do Not) Belong Here: Gender-Work Identity Conflict among Female Police Officers. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 130. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00130

Vincent-Lamarre P., Sugimoto C.R., Larivière V. The decline of women's research production during the coronavirus pandemic. Nature Index. 19 May 2020 https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/decline-women-scientist-research-publishing-production-coronavirus-pandemic [Google Scholar]

Vincent-Lamarre, P., Sugimoto, C. and Larivière, V., 2020. The decline of women's research production during the coronavirus pandemic. *Nature Index*,.

Viswanathan M, Patnode CD, Berkman ND, et al. Assessing the Risk of Bias in Systematic Reviews of Health Care Interventions. 2017 Dec 13. In: Methods Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare

Research and Quality (US); 2008-. Available from:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK519366/

Wallace, D. and Wang, X., 2020. Does in-prison physical and mental health impact

recidivism?. *SSM - Population Health*, 11, p.1-50.

Walters, G., 2020. Predicting Future Intimate Partner Violence with Past Intimate Partner Violence:

The Moderating Role of Proactive and Reactive Criminal Thinking. *Criminal Justice and

Behavior*, 47(8), pp.943-955.

Wang, Q. and Wang, C., 2020. Reducing turnover intention: perceived organizational support for

frontline employees. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 14(1).

Weaver, B., 2019. Understanding desistance: a critical review of theories of desistance. *Psychology,

Crime & Law*, 25(6), pp.641-658.

Webster, R., 2019. *Reoffending Rates Are Climbing*. [online] Russell Webster. Available at:

<http://www.russellwebster.com/reoff419/>

Weir, K., Routledge, G. and Kilili, S., 2019. Checkpoint: An Innovative Programme to Navigate

People Away from the Cycle of Reoffending: Implementation Phase Evaluation. *Policing: A

Journal of Policy and Practice*,

Welsh Government, 2021. Review of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) policy: report. *GOV*,

[online] Available at: <https://gov.wales/review-adverse-childhood-experiences-ace-policy-

report-html> [Accessed 22 March 2021].

West, M. and Dawson, J., 2012. Employee engagement and NHS performance. *The Kings Fund*,

pp.2-23.

White, K., & Cameron, J. (2000). Resistance to change, contrast and instrinci motivation. *Behavioral

and Brain Sciences, 23*(1), 11-116. Doi.:10.1017/S0140525X00482403

Whitmore, M., Stewart, K., Pollard, J., van Belle, J., Yang, M. and Van, C., 2018. Promising practices for health and wellbeing at work. *RAND*, pp.1-123.

Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P., Kalfa, S. and Xu, Y., 2018. Voices unheard: employee voice in the new century. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(5), pp.711-724.

Williams, K., Papadopoulou, V. and Booth, N., 2021. Prisoners' childhood and family backgrounds. *Ministry of Justice*, [online] pp.1-38. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/278837/prisoners-childhood-family-backgrounds.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2021].

Willits, T. and Franco-Watkins, A., 2021. Is it Worth the Regret? Deciding to Engage in Employee Voice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*,

Wilson and Hoge, 2020. THE EFFECT OF YOUTH DIVERSION PROGRAMS ON RECIDIVISM. *International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology*, 40(5), pp.1-22.

Wilson, D., Brennan, I. and Olaghere, A., 2018. Police-initiated diversion for youth to prevent future delinquent behavior: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 14(1), pp.1-88

J., Wise. 2010. Commentary: Getting behind closed doors: The process of conducting research in a criminal justice setting, *Current Narratives.* 2, 2010, 129-140. Available at:https://ro.uow.edu.au/currentnarratives/vol1/iss2/11

Wilson, D., Olaghere, A. and Kimbrell, C., 2017. Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Principles in Juvenile Justice: A MetaAnalysis. *National Crime Justice Reference Service*, pp.1-145.

Wisse, B., & Sleebos, E. (2016). When Change Causes Stress: Effects of Self-construal and Change Consequences. *Journal of business and psychology*, *31*, 249–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9411-z

Witters, D. and Agrawal, S., 2015. Well-Being Enhances Benefits of Employee Engagement.

Wood D. et al. (2018) Emerging Adulthood as a Critical Stage in the Life Course. In: Halfon N., Forrest C., Lerner R., Faustman E. (eds) Handbook of Life Course Health Development. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47143-3_7

Wooditch, A., Tang, L. and Taxman, F., 2014. Which Criminogenic Need Changes Are Most Important in Promoting Desistance From Crime and Substance Use?. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(3), pp.276-299.

Wooditch, A., Tang, L. and Taxman, F., 2014. Which Criminogenic Need Changes Are Most Important in Promoting Desistance From Crime and Substance Use?. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(3), pp.276-299.

Wooditch, A., Tang, L. L., & Taxman, F. S. (2014). WHICH CRIMINOGENIC NEED CHANGES ARE MOST IMPORTANT IN PROMOTING DESISTANCE FROM CRIME AND SUBSTANCE USE?. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *41*(3), 276–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813503543

World Health Organization, 2005. *Mental Health And Prisons*. Penal reform, pp.1-4.

World Justice Project, 2019. What is the Rule of Law. *The Four Universal Principles*, [online] Available at: <https://worldjusticeproject.org/about-us/overview/what-rule-law>

Wörtler, B., Van Yperen, N., Mascareño, J. and Barelds, D., 2020. The Link Between Employees' Sense of Vitality and Proactivity: Investigating the Moderating Role of Personal Fear of Invalidity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11.

Wright, A., 2013. Reward system and organisational culture. *University of Greenwich*, pp.11-344.

Wright, V., 2010. Deterrence in Criminal Justice: Evaluating Certainty vs. Severity of Punishment. [online] pp.1-12. Available at: <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Deterrence-in-Criminal-Justice.pdf> [Accessed 18 March 2021].

Yael Cannon and Dr. Andrew Hsi, *Disrupting the Path from Childhood Trauma to Juvenile Justice: An Upstream Health and Justice Approach*, 43 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 245 (2016). Available at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/ulj/vol43/iss3/1

Yawson, R., 2020. Strategic flexibility analysis of HRD research and practice post COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), pp.406-417.

Yu, X., Chen, J., Zhao, S. and Yu, X., 2017. Impact of rumination and regret on depression among new employees in China. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 45(9), pp.1499-1509.

Yukhnenko, D., Sridhar, S. and Fazel, S., 2019. A systematic review of criminal recidivism rates worldwide: 3-year update. *Wellcome Open Research*, 4, p.28.

Zhou, Y., Liu, G., Chang, X. and Hong, Y., 2019. Top-down, bottom-up or outside-in? An examination of triadic mechanisms on firm innovation in Chinese firms. *Asian Business & Management*, 20(1), pp.131-162.

Zhu, J. and Zhang, B., 2019. The Double-Edged Sword Effect of Abusive Supervision on Subordinates' Innovative Behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10.

Zhu, J., & Zhang, B. (2019). The Double-Edged Sword Effect of Abusive Supervision on Subordinates' Innovative Behavior. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 66. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00066

Zwann, R., Etz, A., Lucas, R. and Donnellan, M., 2021. Making replication mainstream. *Behavioural and Brain Science*, pp.1-61.

Zwetsloot, G., Scheppingen, A., Bos, E., Dijkman, A. and Starren, A., 2013. The Core Values that Support Health, Safety, and Well-being at Work. *Safety and Health at Work*, 4(4), pp.187-196.

Appendix

Appendix A: Ethical approval

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

22nd January 2020

Dear Danielle Pritchard

Re: Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales.

I am now able to give permission for the commencement of your research project as outlined in your revised ethics application. Please retain this letter as proof of approval by Bangor University for your study.

The Reference Number for your project is SHIPSSMA1920(3)

I wish you well with your research.

Yours sincerely

Timothy Holens

Appendix B: Consent sheet

**Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of
a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales**

Staff consent form

*Please tick the boxes that **apply to you**.*

I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for ☐
this study *Yes I confirm*

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to ☐
withdraw at any time without giving a reason   *Yes I understand*

I understand that my contact details will be stored on a confidential ☐
database *Yes I understand*

I consent for anonymised quotations from the interview
☐
to be used in publications *Yes I consent*

I consent for anonymised quotations to be used for teaching
purposes *Yes I consent* ☐

Name: ███████████

Email: █████████████████████████████

Date: ████████████

Appendix C: Information Sheet

Appendix A: Information leaflet

College of Business, Social Sciences and Law, Bangor University

_____

Gwynedd LL57 2DGFfon/Tel: (01248) 388728Elusen. Gofrestrig Rhif/Registered charity 1141565

PRIFYSGOL BANGOR UNIVERSITY

Checkpoint Cymru: A process evaluation of the introduction of a custody suite diversion scheme in North Wales.

Information leaflet

Introduction

The research has been commissioned by the Police and Crime Commissioner Arfon Jones and it is conducted in partnership with North Wales Police. It will explore the implementation of a custody diversion scheme called 'Checkpoint Cymru' in North Wales.

About the study

The research aim is to obs[...] Cymru in North Wales and [...] process to North Wales Pc[...] voluntary sector organisat[...] include exploring any gap[...] barriers to implementatio[...] map the use of checkpoin[...] profile of cases referred to[...] completion rates of check[...] checkpoint interventions c[...] indicators of impact on re[...] developments. The resear[...] Checkpoint across relevan[...] CPS, courts, defence lawy[...] working with victims- Vict[...] etc.

What will happen to the results of the study?

We will draw conclusions based on the findings of the evaluation and will present these in a final report for the Police and Crime Commissioner and North Wales Police. The findings will be used for a Research Masters thesis and it will be published as a journal article.

About the research team:

Danielle Pritchard from Bangor University is the research lead and is supervised by Professor Martina Feilzer and Proffessor Stefan Machura from Bangor University.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee.

Next steps:

If you would like to participate in the research, please complete the consent to interview form and return it by email to: policeresearch@bangor.ac.uk.

Contact for further information

If you would like any further information, please contact Danielle Pritchard (dnp19grq@bangor.ac.uk) or Prof Martina Feilzer (01248-388171/ m.feilzer@bangor.ac.uk) or Prof Stefan Macura (01248-382214/ s.machura@bangor.ac.uk). We will then get in touch with you directly.

If you want to make a complaint about the research, please contact: Professor Molyneux, Dean of the College of Business, Law, Education and Social Sciences, College Road, Bangor, LL57 2DG; telephone: 01248-383231, email: p.molyneux@bangor.ac.uk.

Thank you

Appendix D: Interview schedule

Interview schedule for Professionals

1. What is your involvement in the Checkpoint project?

2. What do you think Checkpoint is trying to achieve?

3. Did you feel supportive of the programme's implementation from the start? (please explain your answer in as much detail as possible)

4. Do you support the implementation of the programme now?

5. Do you think the programme will improve people's lives? (Please explain your answer in as much detail as possible, with reference to relevant examples)

6. Do you feel the programme is successful in reducing repeat offending? (Please explain your answer in as much detail as possible, with any relevant examples)

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

7. Do you feel the programme has failed anybody? (Please explain your answer in as much detail as possible, with any relevant examples)

8. Would you regard Checkpoint as a "soft option"? (please explain your answer in as much detail as possible)

9. Can you identify any practical problems with Checkpoint itself?

10. Is Checkpoint receiving the right referrals? (Please explain this in as much detail as possible detail)

11. How efficient is the referral pathway? And are you aware of any barriers inhibiting this pathway?

12. Do you feel the referral process is the same for men and women? (Please explain the reason for your answer, with reference to relevant examples)

13. Do you feel Checkpoint could be improved in any way and if so, how?

14. Do you enjoy your role?

COLEG Y CELFYDDYDAU, DYNIAETHAU A BUSNES
COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND BUSINESS

YSGOL HANES, ATHRONIAETH A GWYDDORAU CYMDEITHAS
SCHOOL OF HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

15. How is your professional relationship with Checkpoint management from the

    OPCC (Anna) and NWP (Iwan)?

16. How do you feel about the Drugs Education Programme [DEP]?

17. How do you feel about drug offences being diverted away from Checkpoint?

18. Please use this section to address anything else you would like to discuss.

Thank you for your participation. Please now read the debrief sheet and send your

answers via email to daniellepritch95@outlook.com.

Appendix E. Example of coded transcripts *(anonymised and broken down for anonymity purposes)*

Interview schedule for Professionals

1. What is your involvement in the Checkpoint project?

   My role is as a Checkpoint Navigator carrying out interventions to the

   individuals who are enrolled onto the programme when and as appropriate

2. What do you think Checkpoint is trying to achieve?

   To offer a second chance to those who have perhaps made a mistake as well as

   ensuring that the underlying issues experienced by individuals are addressed,

   offering the opportunity to access support rather than focusing on the offence

   itself and a more punitive approach

3. Did you feel supportive of the programme's implementation from the start?

   (please explain your answer in as much detail as possible)

   Yes , the appeal of doing something new and trying to turn a negative

   situation into a potentially very positive one in the long run is huge, The

   principles of the programme are ones that I value and agree with

Comments:

- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:58 — Comment [1]: Role
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:58 — Comment [2]: Checkpoint navigator
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:58 — Comment [3]: Job role: intervention delivery
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:58 — Comment [4]: Support when and as appropriate
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [5]: Offer
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [6]: Second chance
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [7]: Made a mistake
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [8]: Underlying issues
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [9]: Issues addressed
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [10]: Offer the opportunity
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 14:59 — Comment [11]: Access support
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:00 — Comment [12]: Focus shift: from offence to help and support
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:05 — Comment [13]: CIS: punitive approach
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:07 — Comment [14]: Certainty
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:07 — Comment [15]: Job appeal
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:07 — Comment [16]: Something new
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:07 — Comment [17]: Negative to positive
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:08 — Comment [18]: Inspired
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:08 — Comment [19]: Navigator opinion: values the principle of the programme
- Danielle Pritchard 16/20 15:08 — Comment [20]: Personally values

COLEG Y CELFYDDYDAU, DYNIAETHAU A BUSNES
COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND BUSINESS

YSGOL HANES, ATHRONIAETH A GWYDDORAU CYMDEITHAS
SCHOOL OF HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

4. Do you support the implementation of the programme now?

Some elements have changed – such a shift in focus to the Drug Education Programme rather than the needs assessment stage. I see this as a potential pitfall, as we could miss opportunities to support individuals to our full abilities, as well as making it more difficult for those individuals to come forward and express their needs to us. However, those basic principles that founded Checkpoint and its ethos still work well and I believe this opportunity has benefitted those who have received it.

5. Do you think the programme will improve people's lives? (Please explain your answer in as much detail as possible, with reference to relevant examples)

Certainly for those who are entering the criminal justice system for the first time, this can have a huge positive effect and serve as a stern warning, but also a second chance. When you recognize that individuals need support and the work you do enables that, it can be extremely effective. However, for some of the individuals who come onto the programme, particularly the Drug Education Programme only, it can provide information but will not I believe have a profound impact.

Appendix F: Debrief sheet

COLEG Y CELFYDDYDAU, DYNIAETHAU A BUSNES
COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND BUSINESS

YSGOL HANES, ATHRONIAETH A GWYDDORAU CYMDEITHAS
SCHOOL OF HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Thank you for taking part in the research study. The aim of the study is to observe the process of implementing Checkpoint Cymru in North Wales and to provide feedback on the implementation process to North Wales Police, related criminal justice agencies, and voluntary sector organisations working with victims and offenders. If you wish to discuss your participation further or you decide you do not want your answers included in the project, you can contact the researcher at dnp19grg@bangor.ac.uk. If you would like to do this, this won't affect your role in anyway.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions [dnp19grg@bangor.ac.uk].

Thank you again for taking part.

Contacts: Samaritans: https://www.samaritans.org/ or by phone on 116 123 or British association of counselling and Psychotherapy www.bacp.co.uk

Appendix G: Thematic maps 1,2,3 and 4.

```
                    ┌─────────────────┐
                    │  Theme 2: Early │
                    │     issues      │
                    └────────┬────────┘
        ┌────────────┬───────┴───────┬──────────────┐
┌───────────────┐┌──────────────┐┌──────────────┐┌──────────────┐
│ Sub 1: Poor   ││ Sub 2:Lack of││ Sub 3:Low    ││ Sub 4:Lack of│
│ structured    ││ structure in ││ awareness    ││ resources    │
│ training      ││ role         ││              ││              │
└───────────────┘└──────────────┘└──────┬───────┘└──────────────┘
                              ┌──────────┴──────────┐
                      ┌───────────────┐    ┌──────────────┐
                      │ Poor          │    │ Navigator    │
                      │ advertisement │    │ action       │
                      │ approach      │    │              │
                      └───────────────┘    └──────────────┘
```

```
                         ┌─────────────────┐
                         │ Theme 3:        │
                         │ Practical barriers│
                         └────────┬────────┘
              ┌───────────────────┴──────────────────────┐
      ┌───────────────┐                          ┌───────────────┐
      │ Sub 1:Barriers to│                       │ Sub 2:        │
      │ referral      │                          │ Intervention  │
      │               │                          │ concerns      │
      └───────┬───────┘                          └───────┬───────┘
    ┌─────────┼─────────┐                      ┌──────────┴──────────┐
┌─────────┐┌─────────┐┌─────────┐      ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐
│Ineligable││Structural││Gender   │     │Drugs education│  │Women's       │
│referral  ││issues    ││disadvantage│  │programme     │  │Pathfinder(WPF)│
└─────────┘└─────────┘└─────────┘      │(DEP)         │  └──────────────┘
                                        └──────┬───────┘
                                      ┌─────────┴─────────┐
                                 ┌──────────┐   ┌──────────────┐
                                 │Navigators│   │Managements   │
                                 │perspective│  │perspective   │
                                 └──────────┘   └──────────────┘
```

229

```
┌─────────────────────┐
│       Theme         │
│   4:Improvements    │
└─────────────────────┘
          │
    ┌─────┴─────┐
    │           │
┌─────────┐ ┌─────────────┐
│Navigator│ │ Managements │
│perspective│ │ perspective │
└─────────┘ └─────────────┘
```