
**The 'Quick-Time, Slow-Time' Model of Violence Prevention:
Developing an evidence-based model of support and
learning following violent incidents in an English Young
Offender Institution.**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Forensic Practice</i>
Manuscript ID	JFP-11-2024-0071.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	violence prevention, youth custody, organisational learning, model development, assaults, process mapping

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

TITLE: The ‘Quick-Time, Slow-Time’ Model of Violence Prevention: Developing an evidence-based model of support and learning following violent incidents in an English Young Offender Institution.

ABSTRACT:

Violence remains a significant concern within youth custodial settings, despite policy frameworks intended to reduce it. This article explores a collaborative project in one young offender institution (YOI) aimed at re-mapping existing violence prevention systems to develop a new structured model that addresses organisational barriers.

The project employed collaborative systems mapping of provision across three phases: (1) a targeted review of violence prevention evidence in youth custody settings; (2) practice observation including consultations with staff at a YOI; and (3) collaborative re-modelling current practice in consultation with staff. The process emphasised alignment with operational practices, incorporating evidence-based approaches to violence prevention.

The 'Quick-Time, Slow-Time' model of violence prevention was developed and established three distinct but interconnected phases to provide a structured process after any violent situation and facilitate learning. Each phase has distinct roles, focusing on immediate safety and wellbeing needs, rapid learning and actions, and a comprehensive understanding of violent incidents feeding into strategic planning.

The paper presents a theory-informed and operationally grounded framework for understanding and responding to violence in youth custody settings. The model provides a template for institutions to enhance violence prevention while maintaining operational effectiveness and staff well-being.

The paper presents a theory-informed and operationally grounded framework for understanding and responding to violence in youth custody settings. The model provides a template for institutions to enhance violence prevention while maintaining operational effectiveness and staff well-being.

text

This paper presents the development of a re-modelled, phased framework for violence prevention in youth custody, grounded in evidence and developed collaboratively with practitioners. The model reflects existing practice and offers a practical tool for implementing and aligning policy with practice while promoting staff support, a youth-centred approach, and institutional learning.

The 'Quick-Time, Slow-Time' Model of Violence Prevention: a proposed model of operationalising learning following violent incidents in an English Young Offender Institution.

Abstract

Purpose Violence remains a significant concern within youth custodial settings, despite policy frameworks intended to reduce it. This article explores a collaborative project in one young offender institution (YOI) aimed at re-mapping existing violence prevention systems to develop a new structured model that addresses organisational barriers.

Approach The project employed collaborative systems mapping of provision across three phases: (1) a targeted review of violence prevention evidence in youth custody settings; (2) practice observation including consultations with staff at a YOI; and (3) collaborative re-modelling current practice in consultation with staff. The process emphasised alignment with operational practices, incorporating evidence-based approaches to violence prevention.

Findings The 'Quick-Time, Slow-Time' model of violence prevention was developed and established three distinct but interconnected phases to provide a structured process after any violent situation and facilitate learning. Each phase has distinct roles, focusing on immediate safety and wellbeing needs, rapid learning and actions, and a comprehensive understanding of violent incidents feeding into strategic planning.

Practical implications The paper presents a theory-informed and operationally grounded framework for understanding and responding to violence in youth custody settings. The model provides a template for institutions to enhance violence prevention while maintaining operational effectiveness and staff well-being.

Originality This paper presents the development of a re-modelled, phased framework for violence prevention in youth custody, grounded in evidence and developed collaboratively with practitioners. The model reflects existing practice and offers a practical tool for implementing and aligning policy with practice while promoting staff support, a youth-centred approach, and institutional learning.

Keywords: Violence Prevention, Youth Custody, System Mapping, Organizational Learning, Model Development, Assaults.

Introduction

Violence is a prominent feature of youth custody, being experienced at various rates and levels around the world (Ministry of Justice [MoJ], 2024; Klatt *et al*, 2016). In 2023, England and Wales held around 430 boys and 12 girls aged 15-18 in youth custody (which houses Children and Young People [CYP] aged 10–18 years) with a reported annual assault rate of 384 per 100 CYP and a serious assault rate of 34.4 per 100 CYP (MoJ and HMI Prisons, 2023a).

While efforts to reduce youth imprisonment have succeeded (Youth Justice Board, 2024), violence rates in custody remain problematic (HMI Prisons, 2023a). This challenge stems partly from the dramatic rise in violent offence sentencing, with the proportion increasing from 33% to 65% between 2015-16 and 2022-23 (Ibid). Justice-involved CYP are disproportionately more likely to have experienced trauma, which can compound their propensity to violence (Duron *et al*, 2022; Boxer *et al*, 2023). These figures underscore an urgent need to develop more effective violence prevention strategies and practices in youth custody grounded in effective responses to violence.

Victims of violence can experience both short and long-term effects on psychological well-being, including increased risk of anxiety, depression and suicide (Blaauw *et al*, 2001; Johnson Listwan *et al*, 2010). Within the youth estate, violence creates a pervasive sense of threat and uncertainty, disrupting educational and rehabilitative activities, undermining relationships, and creating challenging working conditions for staff (REDACTED, 2022). Developing meaningful and effective responses to these challenges is essential for building safe and rehabilitative environments for staff and CYP in custody.

During the Covid-19 pandemic, youth and adult custody experienced a significant decrease in violence in prisons in the UK and USA due to regime changes resulting in reduced social mixing and increased isolation (Barnert, 2020; Bateman, 2020; MoJ, 2022). However, limiting interaction also resulted in reduced socialisation, gym, education and rehabilitative programmes (Bateman, 2020; MoJ 2022). Brief reductions in violence have not been sustained, and the increased levels of isolation have harmful effects on the physical, psychological, developmental and emotional well-being of CYP (Barnert, 2020; Bateman, 2020), simultaneously reducing the likelihood of effective rehabilitation. Violence prevention approaches should not rely on reducing contact among CYP in custody, as echoed by official bodies (HMI Prisons, 2023a).

The Youth Custody Service (YCS) accommodates all CYP aged under 18 years in custody across England and Wales. This includes four Young Offender Institutes (YOIs), one Secure training Centre (STC), one Secure School (SS) and eight Secure Children’s Homes (SCH). Established standards set by the MoJ and Youth Justice Board (2019) include meeting the needs, and addressing the risks of CYP in secure settings, and ensuring that the environment is safe. There are existing youth custody policies supportive of violence prevention, including the Positive Behaviour Framework (MoJ, 2020) grounded in the NHS Framework for Integrated Care (SECURE STAIRS) (Anna Freud Centre, n.d.). Although these theoretical and evidence-

based approaches have shown positive outcomes (Edbrook-Childs *et al.* 2022), their practical implementation has varied significantly across YOI sites (Brookes *et al.* 2019).

Following an invitation from a YOI in England, we conducted a process re-mapping of its violence prevention approach. Working collaboratively with the establishment, we sought to examine gaps in implementing existing policy and re-model current practice to reflect an evidence-informed, whole-institution model which enhanced violence prevention practice.

The project aimed to enhance existing organisational practice by improving alignment with current evidence on effective approaches to violence prevention in youth custody settings.

This collaborative project had three key objectives:

- 1) To develop an understanding of violence processes within the institution and identify gaps in current responses to violence that hinder effective prevention.
- 2) To re-focus on proactive violence *prevention* at the institution, informed by staff and CYP perspectives.
- 3) To develop recommendations and a practical model aligned with current approaches and culture of YOI and the YCS in England and Wales.

Methodology

We employed a process mapping approach in one English YOI housing up to 118 young people (aged 15-18). Process mapping (PM) is widely used in healthcare and covers five phases: (i) preparation, planning and process identification, (ii) data and information gathering, (iii) process map generation, (iv) analysis, (v) taking it forward (Antonacci, 2021). The project comprised three stages: (1) literature review to inform phase (i) and (ii); (2) practice observation fieldwork (phase ii)-; and (3) consultation and re-modelling workshop (phase iii and iv), with each stage informing the next to develop a revised process map.

Since the project focused on re-mapping and observing current processes rather than conducting research, formal ethical approval was not required (Moule *et al.*, 2016). However, following best practice, the PM plan received establishment management approval and adhered to ethical principles throughout staff and CYP engagement (WHO 2013). This included in every interaction, clearly outlining our role and purpose, ensuring explicit verbal consent, and avoiding personal information or verbatim quotes. For safeguarding, a minimum of two people attended every CYP interaction, including HMYOI staff. No sensitive conversations exploring trauma or potentially implicating participants in poor behaviour were conducted.

The PM approach was underpinned by Garvin's organisational learning theory (1993), which identifies five building blocks of a learning organisation: systematic problem solving, experimentation, learning from past experience, learning from others, and transferring knowledge. These principles were embedded throughout the PM process. The literature review stages reflected systematic problem solving, grounding the work in evidence. The fieldwork enabled learning from past experience by capturing current practices and operational realities. The generation of a revised process map facilitated knowledge transfer

by making the processes explicit and accessible. Collaboration during the re-modelling workshop supported analysis and experimentation, allowing stakeholders to test and refine ideas and to learn from others. Phase v of process mapping (taking it forward) is not outlined in this paper.

Stage one: literature review

This involved a non-systematic literature review of existing academic and practitioner literature, YCS national and local policies, including the Positive Behaviour Framework (MoJ, 2020) and government and arms-length body reports, including recent HM Inspectorate of Prisons establishment reports (e.g. HMIP, 2022). This aimed to identify literature around the causes of violence, approaches to violence reduction and good practice guidance within youth custody settings. In total 174 distinct sources were reviewed, including 91 peer-reviewed research articles. A series of principles were collated from this literature review which underpin an effective model of violence reduction in secure youth settings:

1. Understanding the role and utility of violence.
2. Understanding the role that dual harm (violence and self-harm) can play.
3. The impact of current institutional policies and practices.
4. The role and influence of institutional culture and environment.
5. The role of relationships.
6. The need for and role of trauma-informed practice.

Findings from stage one were presented to senior management to guide our observations during the project's fieldwork element in stage two.

Stage two: Practice observation fieldwork

Stage two examined operational practice and implementation challenges through observations and consultations to review current institutional policies and practices and consider their alignment with evidence-based best practices from stage one.

Fieldwork centred upon the direct observation of wings and violence management approaches, including behaviour management, conflict resolution, case management, and security protocols including CCTV and Use of Force reviews. No violent incidents were witnessed during our visit. Informal discussions and observations focussed on clarifying our understanding of the approaches and staff perspectives on the operation of current prevention methods including specific barriers to violence reduction. We used rapid ethnography principles and informal consultations to identify current process and systemic barriers to violence prevention. Rapid ethnographies draw on a range of field methods to develop an informed understanding of participants' views in relation to the programmes and activities being evaluated (Millen, 2000).

Three project team members conducted practice observations focused on violence prevention strategies through two full-day site visits to the YOI, during daytime hours, to gain an understanding of its operational context, routine practices, and associated challenges. The

team observed staff undertaking their usual roles and engaged in informal consultations with over 20 stakeholders, including senior leadership, frontline youth custody workers and specialist interventions staff including the conflict resolution team, violence prevention and security staff. Three CYP were observed or provided incidental comments. These interactions provided insights into the nature of violence-related issues and current approaches to prevention. Observing and hearing the testimonies in situ facilitated a more nuanced understanding of how violence, harm, and safety are perceived and addressed within the YOI.

The team facilitated a broad engagement across diverse participants within a limited timeframe (Millen, 2000). Observations and discussions were opportunistic and shaped by contextual factors including staff availability, CYP regime schedules, and ongoing interventions. Senior management and trusted staff facilitated the visits, helping to ensure access and foster trust.

In line with ethical practice for consultancy, no identifiable information (for example name, age, role and gender (for staff), sentence length or offence type (for CYP) was collected. Everyone observed, including the CYP, was fully briefed as to the nature of the project and verbal consent was provided after they had confirmed that they understood the nature of the project and our plans for the data.

We adopted an immersive, ethnographic approach to sense-making with observations and conversations documented through reflective field notes and team debriefs. Following the visits, the project team engaged in collaborative reflection to synthesise insights and identify recurring patterns across the data. Themes were developed inductively, emerging from repeated observations and shared narratives across stakeholder groups and intended to highlight main organisational challenges and opportunities for improvement in violence prevention practices.

Stage three: Consultation and model development

In this stage, the project team focused on the structured development of a revised process model to address violence within the YOI. As per phase (iii) of the process mapping methodology, a draft model was constructed by synthesising insights from the literature review and fieldwork stages including key action points and current gaps. This involved translating the required policies, observed practices and feedback into a visual representation of an ideal system. The draft map served as the foundation for collaborative analysis, enabling participants to reflect on existing processes and propose modifications.

Finally, the analysis of the draft model was undertaken (as per phase (iv) of the process mapping methodology) leading to a re-drafted process model. This involved three members of the project team conducting a full-day collaborative workshop with 12 staff, including operational (Youth Custody Workers and managers), non-operational and professional staff (e.g. psychologists and data analysts). The workshop aimed to discuss the draft model with staff members across the establishment to revise the model and develop its

operationalisation. Participants were given an explanation of the purpose, goals for each part of the model, and initial implementation ideas, providing verbal consent for participation. Detailed discussions were held to consider ways to accomplish each part, focusing on improving current methods, identifying necessary changes, and integrating the model into existing practices and national policy.

Findings

Stage one: Literature review

The review considered the causes of violence and strategies to address and alleviate challenges with responding to violence. Key areas included: understanding the use of violence; people who dual harm (co-occurring violence and self-harm); the impact of current institutional policies and practices; institutional culture and environment – enablers and activators to violence prevention; the role of relationships; and developing trauma-informed practice. A summary follows.

Understanding the use of violence

Many people in custodial estates have pre-existing behavioural repertoires illustrative of criminal behaviour which can underlie custodial violence (Irwin and Cressey, 1962). Imported characteristics include moral disengagement (Moore, 2015), experiencing or witnessing violence, leading to normalisation of its use (Muller *et al*, 2000; Zettler, 2021). Pre-existing drug use (Klatt *et al*, 2016), excessively authoritarian or permissive parenting styles (Ehrenreich *et al*, 2014) and trauma (Day 2021; Zettler 2021) can increase the likelihood of violence in custody. These experiences may not be isolated and can be mutually occurring or compound one another over time. ‘Imported’ behaviours can be challenging for anyone working with young people in a closed environment, given the intense physical and emotional confines and associated stressors placed upon all involved (Crewe, 2011).

People who dual harm (co-occurring violence and self-harm)

Violence and self-harm continue to rise in YCS, although this data is gendered, with most self-harm incidents occurring in female institutions (Youth Justice Board, 2024). Adults who dual harm in prison engage in significantly higher rates of refractory behaviour with far greater experience under restriction or punishment than their solely violent peers (REDACTED *et al*, 2020), whilst young adults had earlier and prolonged contact with the criminal justice system (REDACTED *et al*, 2025). People who engage in both violence and self-harm typically share experiences of early trauma, substance abuse and educational challenges (Steinhoff *et al*, 2022), with behaviours alternating based on situational factors (REDACTED, 2023). This complexity necessitates an integrated case management approach involving multiple professionals (REDACTED, 2018).

The impact of current institutional policies

Youth custodial sites are closed environments with extreme asymmetric power imbalances, high dependency on staff, high levels of boredom, a sense of fear, and lack of protection (Van

der Helm *et al*, 2009). This informs a pervasive sense of unsafety for CYP and staff and increase in the use of force by staff, leading to a 'culture of survival' in many institutions (Liévano-Karim and Ritterbusch, 2021; Price, 2021). The use of force by staff can increase when staff feel unsafe (Liévano-Karim and Ritterbusch, 2021; Crewe *et al.*, 2015); inconsistent use of force can create a sense of unfairness, while overuse can legitimise violence by reinforcing a culture of it (Crewe *et al.*, 2015; Price, 2021). Responses to violence, such as placement in segregation or protection units, have been associated with increased physical assault at both the individual and institutional levels (Van der Helm *et al.*, 2009), potentially due to factors such as increased anger, frustration, and mental health issues that can develop in restrictive environments. Custodial policies and practices play an essential role in the overall regime, particularly behavioural management approaches acting as facilitators or inhibitors of violence, depending on their content and application. Policies and practices that disproportionately target youth with challenging behaviour whilst lacking clear explanation, leading to perceptions of unfairness or injustice, can increase tensions and violence within custodial settings (Day, 2021). Where violent incidents do occur, embedding post-aggression debriefs for both staff and youth has been identified as a positive practice to improve learning and mitigate future violence (Caminiti *et al.*, 2021).

Institutional culture and environments

Institutional policies shape the custodial environment and can influence behaviour, with environmental and cultural factors playing a significant role (Clements, 1982). Custodial environments, including YOIs, are ordinarily austere as part of the regime of deprivation, though this is not always the case worldwide. In Denmark, some units adopt a therapeutic environment to develop a more nurturing ethos, acknowledging that the lack of stimulation and the inherently boring nature of confinement can act as a precursor to violence (Bengtsson, 2021). Evidence indicates that a predictable and structured environment with clear routines and procedurally just processes can help regulate emotions and reduce violence (Pickering *et al*, 2022).

Informed by institutional culture and environment, procedural justice plays an important role in providing a sense of safety among staff and CYP, and in improving faith in an institution itself. CYP report higher levels of anxiety and lower feelings of safety considered less 'just' or fair (Cox, 2021), or where there are a lack of clearly delineated rules and boundaries (Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2015). From a staffing perspective meanwhile, a lack of clarity and consistency over their own roles and procedures can lead to lower morale, high turnover, low motivation and unbalanced staffing ratios (Liefwaard and Hazelzet, 2014; Day, 2021). This can create further anxiety and uncertainty through inconsistent application of procedures and a lack of procedural justice. Uneven application of rules and procedures can increase risk of violence (Maguire, 2018).

The role of relationships

Relationships within custodial settings, both between CYP and staff, and among CYP, are crucial in violence prevention. Some CYP avoid forming friendships due to concerns about expectations of rule-breaking and its impact on their confinement progress (Nurse, 2021). For others, there is limited value placed on friendships that they do not expect to last beyond their confinement (Nurse, 2021). Staff may discourage relationship-building among CYP, concerned that it could lead to illegal activities and make it harder to control the environment (Abrams and Anderson-Nathe, 2013; Cox, 2016), intervening in bonding and negotiation processes (Nurse, 2021). However, staff modelling positive behaviours and expectations can foster stronger, more respectful relationships and reduce violence (Cox, 2021). Shared activities like sports can build balanced social connections across diverse backgrounds, helping reduce violence (Parker *et al*, 2014; Fletcher *et al*, 2017). Importantly, staff cultural competence development and training can support respect and understanding of the diverse communities represented among incarcerated youth (REDACTED, 2024; Liefwaard *et al*, 2014).

Developing Trauma-Informed Practice

Many CYP entering the YCS have experienced trauma, neglect and mental illness (Day, 2021), with trauma strongly linked to subsequent violence (Boxer *et al*, 2023). While trauma-informed approaches can reduce violence by promoting understanding over punishment (Zettler, 2021), institutional practices often fail to adequately consider trauma histories, which reduces effectiveness (Day, 2021; Griffin *et al*, 2012). Trauma-informed models recognise that violence frequently stems from feeling threatened, emphasising the creation of environments where young people feel safe and understood (Griffin *et al*, 2012). Examples of trauma-informed approaches with CYP in custody include SECURE STAIRS, reflected in YCS policy (MoJ, 2020), which has been shown to change the culture and practices in the YCS to be more trauma-informed, attuned to the developmental stage, and psychologically-based (Edbrook-Childs *et al*, 2022). Staff must be fully engaged in understanding incidents and explaining the consequences to make sense of the triggers and educate CYP about alternative responses. Structure, predictability, fairness and safety within facilities are crucial in maintaining safety and reducing further trauma (Griffin *et al*, 2012).

Custodial staff also report high levels of anxiety and trauma symptoms, particularly in environments with high rates of violence (Lerman *et al*, 2022). Exposure to violent incidents can trigger a 'threat state' that reduces feelings of safety and social engagement as outlined in Polyvagal Theory (Porges, 2011). Supporting staff through passive approaches (such as quiet times and controlled breathing) and active approaches (including compassionate social interactions), alongside quality management supervision, can improve safety and well-being while protecting against negative outcomes (Lerman *et al*, 2022; Porges, 2011).

Stage one conclusion

The evidence review confirmed a range of causes, impacts, and prevention options for violence, many of which were amenable to change, identifying main areas for prevention at

a systemic level: causes, factors, and prevention approaches must be reflected at individual, peer, staff, institutional policy, and service levels; effective violence prevention is underpinned by interrelated, rather than isolated, factors; resolve misalignments between institutional policy and effective violence prevention. Policy adjustment should prioritise maintaining a sense of safety and recognising trauma impacts; help CYP and practitioners understand violence; identify effective strategies through the perspectives of CYP and frontline practitioners; and emphasise learning by evaluating policies and interventions.

Stage Two: Practice observations

After observing and speaking with staff and CYP, violence and safety were significant concerns with specific challenges to effective implementation identified. Relevant to the institutional context, the key themes identified through observed practice were: the impact of COVID; underutilisation and inconsistency in good practice; -missed opportunities; and the need for a single and strategic plan.

- 1) **The impact of COVID:** The COVID-19 outbreak led to increased isolation and the formation of small groups for socialisation. Even after restrictions lifted, conflicts between these groups continued, along with increased violence.
- 2) **Underutilisation and inconsistency in good practice:** Good practices consistent with policy and literature were evident (e.g. conflict resolution) but underutilised in practice. Staff attributed this to limits in communication and engagement. CYP exhibited awareness of inconsistent application of good practice, particularly when reflecting on their relationships with different staff members and teams, highlighting limits on procedural justice.
- 3) **Missed opportunities for prevention:** Deviation from prevention protocols or policies were commonly observed, which lead to creating opportunities for violence between CYP or conflict between staff and CYP and missed opportunities to prevent violence.
- 4) **Need for a single and strategic plan:** A clear and singular strategic plan was essential in preventing violence, although staff opinions varied on how to achieve this. CYP noted inconsistent actions and communications, particularly following a violent incident, which staff attributed to multiple practices being in place, creating uncertainty and an environment with a heightened risk of future violence.

Comments also identified four further themes which reflected areas for development including: compromised safety; staff support as central; a lack of faith in current schemes; and disconnection with senior leadership.

- 5) **Compromised safety:** Staff and CYP expressed concerns that safety was often compromised and suggested ways to improve the establishment's sense of safety. CYP noted a lack of perceived safety in communal spaces and while using hygiene facilities. Staff noted significant challenges regarding low staff morale and perceived lack of support. Recent incidents of serious violence among CYP and between CYP and staff exacerbated these concerns.

- 6) **Staff support as central:** The need for staff engagement, support, and development was emphasised, along with a more explicit strategic approach to promoting well-being and maximising good practice in this area.
- 7) **Lack of faith in current schemes:** Although many practices were consistent with the policy and 'in principle' acknowledged as positive, staff and CYP reported a lack of faith in the consistency of applying local policies in practice. This included limited processes for joined-up learning from incidents of violence at an individual or systemic level.
- 8) **Disconnect with senior leadership:** Staff reported a disconnect with senior leadership which undermined confidence, trust, and morale, although both parties agreed collaboratively action was needed to prevent violence.

This stage revealed that, although individual elements of practice were valued, there was a lack of faith across the establishment in the current approach's effectiveness due to inconsistent delivery and a lack of cohesion. There were calls for a more structured and strategic violence prevention approach, beyond initial response, with a stronger emphasis on learning and consistency to meet policy requirements. This phase also highlighted staff needs for well-being space and support and increased staff and CYP confidence and trust in the approaches.

Stage Three: The Quick-time, Slow-time model of violence prevention

Drawing from previous findings, this section presents the final 'Quick-time, Slow-time model of violence prevention' (QTSTM) which remaps existing policy and proposes best practice processes following violent incidents (see Figure 1).

The QTSTM was developed in response to persistent organisational challenges in implementing violence prevention policy within the establishment. Despite the presence of frameworks such as the Positive Behaviour Framework (MoJ, 2020) and SECURE STAIRS (Edbrook-Childs et al, 2022), staff and CYP reported inconsistent application, limited procedural clarity, and a lack of strategic cohesion. These issues are well-documented in the literature, highlighting how custodial environments often struggle to translate policy into practice due to cultural, structural, and systemic barriers (Cox, 2021). The QTSTM development was underpinned by organisational learning theory that recognised violence prevention as a multi-level process requiring both immediate operational responses and longer-term institutional learning (Garvin, 1993). The model remapped existing practice into a coherent, phased framework drawing on published and experiential evidence, emphasising reflection and continuous learning.

Fieldwork insights highlighted key leverage points including staff support, procedural clarity, and feedback mechanisms which were integrated into the model. In line with concerns around poor perceptions of safety and low staff morale, the model provides a structured process to follow after violent incidents that prioritises staff debriefing and support while promoting consistency. The QTSTM focused on three core outcomes:

(1) Focus on preventing violence, moving beyond a reactive approach

The model aligns with national behaviour management policies (MoJ, 2020) aimed to improve understanding and awareness of the causes and motivations behind violence, and improve reporting on individual's behaviour and patterns of violent incidents. Reflecting procedural justice principles (Fitzalan Howard and Wakeling, 2020) and trauma-informed practice (Griffin et al, 2012), it aimed to enhance consistency, promote fairness, and strengthen engagement among staff and children and young people (CYP), while fostering a culture of safety through transparent, structured processes; identified as key components of effective violence prevention (Maguire, 2018).

The model also adopts a personalised approach that balances reinforcement with appropriate consequences, acknowledging the counterproductive effects of punitive responses in YOI settings (Day, 2021).

(2) Ensure staff well-being and sense of safety, including reducing uncertainty and anxiety

The models improve prioritisation, availability, staff confidence, and engagement with support from the institution and senior leadership whilst also enhancing meaningful communication among staff, and between staff and CYP.

(3) Closing the loop on feedback and learning

The model improves staff confidence in effectively learning from violence to inform prevention at individual and establishment levels. To enhance the learning process and inform a strategic approach to prevention, to improve the effectiveness of current systems and approaches in preventing violence. The model facilitates a learning process informed by staged debriefing and feedback, underpinned by the good practice identified in the literature review.

Each phase has distinct but inter-connected roles: with immediate safety and rapid learning, followed by deeper incident analysis and individual assessment to inform strategic planning. Standardised recording and reporting mechanisms support all phases and are completed through meaningful engagement with CYP and staff across the institution. This looks to develop a unified, easy-to-follow strategy for violence prevention, reducing missed opportunities and strengthening connections between staff and CYP.

The model encapsulates three main phases, which work together as outlined in Figure 1.

<INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE>

Figure 1: Quick-time, Slow-time Model of Violence Prevention

Phase one: Pause, decompress and support

This phase emphasises the need to provide critical spaces for initial staff recovery, processing the immediate impacts, recording relevant details following a violent incident and providing initial support.

It addresses the high state of threat and reduced safety reported after a violent incident by staff, initially aiming to reduce heightened arousal. As reflected in Polyvagal Theory (Porges, 2011), it attends to the triggering of the person’s ‘threat state’, focussing psychologically and biologically on moving to a ‘safe and social’ state through the explicit placement of a ‘pause’ phase. This includes physically moving away from the location of the incident, pausing of duties and, where possible, a quiet place to decompress physically and psychologically. The focus should be on proactive support from colleagues or trained peers and factual debriefing to reduce anxiety and ensure suitable ongoing support is available.

Phase one also provides space to start the processing, internal to the individual and as part of a systemic response to understanding what happened around the event. In line with Caminiti, Febo and Pallagrosi (2021), staff undertake the immediate post-aggression debriefing, which documents the incident, focuses on ensuring staff safety, and provides emotional support. It provides time and space for the initial documentation of events in the immediate aftermath, something seen as beneficial and reflexive (Wood, 2004).

Phase two: Quick-time learning

This phase provides time for gathering new information, reviewing existing plans, and identifying short-term learning and development opportunities. This will inform and develop responses in the immediate aftermath, where timely, practical, and meaningful intervention can be pivotal to preventing future violence.

Quick-time learning ensures that early learning, risk management and behavioural management responses are implemented promptly. There are four steps: (1) Collate current knowledge of the incident, including a structured quick-time child debrief affording the CYP an opportunity to explain their understanding of why the act occurred, and staff to explain their actions; (2) Consult current knowledge of the CYP (from existing systems and plans); (3) Make decisions and act (including previously agreed-upon behavioural management plans and information gathered from steps 1 and 2). These steps ensure prompt action to ensure CYP support and management, de-escalate the incident, and document initial learning; (4) Share initial learning with staff involved in the incident.

This phase provides an opportunity to proactively understand events, explain outcomes, and support learning for all involved, especially relevant staff and the CYP. A shared understanding can reduce a sense of ongoing threat and prevent future violence (Maguire, 2018). When actions are poorly understood, explained, or deemed unfair, they can undermine the perceived legitimacy of the regime (Maguire, 2018). Therefore, the debrief should include listening, explaining staff actions, providing the CYP a chance to respond, and upholding principles of procedural justice.

Phase 3: Slow-time learning

This phase aims to embed deeper learning, personalised and improved effectiveness in response, and predictability for staff. It aims to inform effective strategic developments at the individual level (collating existing knowledge about the CYP's behaviour, situating the violent incident, and agreeing on a consistent, effective response plan and approach to mitigate any potential future violent incidents involving that CYP) and systemic level (establishment-wide learning regarding meaningful and systemic causes of violence and strategic action planning). In line with Caminiti, Febo, and Pallagrosi (2021), the Slow-time learning stage ensures that meaningful processes and changes are implemented for the child and the broader regime where necessary and appropriate.

Slow-time learning involves four main steps: (1) Violent incident learning reviews focus on a review of the incident(s) and seek to integrate all known information (including elements such as CCTV, reports, and alignment with policies and procedures). Their purpose is to ensure the safety of staff and CYP. These reviews should identify the contributing factors and inform child management plans and organisational strategic planning; (2) Slow-time CYP debrief provides an opportunity for a deeper reflection between the CYP and staff to explore the role and causes of the violence, develop a shared understanding and discuss any discrepancies. Research suggests that this can be the first time the CYP reflects on their violence, a process which they can find beneficial and reflexive (Wood, 2004). However, reflecting on their violence carries risks if not explored or challenged effectively (Shaw, 2004) e.g., if dominated or led by a staff perspective; (3) Multi-disciplinary team reviews of CYP management plans engage all professional groups in the collation of learning to support the development of shared pre-designed individual plans, which can be communicated to the CYP and professional groups. This approach is designed to improve consistency, procedural justice and effectiveness of practice; (4) Strategic violence prevention learning and planning good practice includes integrating a cross-organisational risk management strategy grounded in evidence and draws together information from across incidents, where risk assessments are conducted regularly and there is a clarity in monitoring those risks. To prevent violence, it is crucial to recognise the situational or contextual aspects which may be contributing to violence and look to address them (Gadon *et al*, 2006) and to provide a consistent approach across professional groups.

Discussion

This project demonstrated the feasibility of developing a simple process model, the Quick-time, Slow-time model (QTSTM), which improves the alignment of current practice with evidence-informed approaches in YCS (Objective 3). Informed by organisational learning principles (Garvin, 1993) and shaped through literature review and direct and collaborative engagement with staff across all levels of the YOI (Objectives 1 & 2), this structured multi-competent model aims to address both immediate and longer-term impacts of violent incidents while promoting systematic learning opportunities, built on three key phases, providing greater coherence in the institutional response to violence.

The QTSTM clarifies expectations around existing practices to address persistent challenges in implementing violence prevention policy. It aligns with national frameworks such as the Positive Behaviour Framework (MoJ, 2020), local practices e.g. conflict resolution teams, and the evidence-base for good practice in violence prevention. By integrating staff support, incident response, and both individual and systemic learning into a single, structured framework, the model seeks to enhance the coherence and effectiveness of each element while maximising their collective impact. These phases create a framework bridging the gap between reactive incident management and proactive violence prevention (Objective 2). This guided approach facilitates the development of a detailed understanding of violence and more effective responses through CYP-centred policy and practice, where personalised, meaningful and individual approaches are shown to be most effective (Menon and Cheung, 2018).

The QTSTM shares several similarities with established conflict resolution frameworks in its emphasis on structured de-escalation and reflective learning, whereby it seeks to transform incidents into opportunities for understanding and growth, rather than solely focusing on punitive responses (Parsons *et al*, 2017). However, the model extends beyond individual incidents by embedding violence prevention within a broader institutional and systemic context, aligned with international approaches to violence reduction (WHO, n.d.), creating a cohesive model through which existing policies and practices can be operationalised and reinforced.

The initial 'pause, decompress and support' phase prioritises addressing the impact on staff who have directly experienced violence or witnessed conflicts in custody. This acknowledges that working in custodial settings where interpersonal violence occurs can significantly affect staff well-being (Martinez-Iñigo, 2021, Ricciardelli *et al*, 2018), increasing rates of post-traumatic stress and burnout (Blitz *et al*, 2008, Boudoukha *et al*, 2013). This can create knock-on effects including increased staff shortages through sick leave or attempts to minimise conflict through rule-bending, leading to inconsistent treatment of CYP with additional strain extending to personal lives or on the remaining staff (Cox, 2021). It is necessary to ensure staff have sufficient opportunities for decompression, emotional regulation and access to meaningful support systems (Nylander *et al*, 2011), particularly given that staff members'

ability to regulate their emotional state will vary, and to mitigate immediate and long-term consequences (Goldblatt *et al*, 2020). While creating space can facilitate more constructive responses, implementation depends heavily on available resources, requiring adequate staffing levels and organisational support to be effective.

The second and third phases of the model emphasise a structured progression from immediate learning to systemic understanding, integrating CYP-centred approaches and organisational development. These phases reflect that effective violence prevention requires a combination of rapid response and deeper strategic learning (Caminiti *et al*, 2021).

The quick-time learning phase facilitates initial understanding through structured debriefing processes, recognising that staff and young people need prompt opportunities to process and learn from violent incidents. The CYP-centred debrief is crucial, providing young people a voice in developing a procedurally just understanding of the incident (Maguire, 2018). Contemporary custodial practice typically focuses on retrospective and risk-based approaches that can disengage recipients from constructive interventions (Case and Haines, 2015; Caminiti *et al*, 2021). However, when CYP feel respected, treated fairly, heard, and meaningfully involved in decision-making, they are more likely to engage with services and work toward positive change (Beijersbergen *et al*, 2015; Case and Haines, 2015).

In line with preventing future violence (Objective 2) understanding incidents from young people's perspectives can reveal important triggers and contributing factors that might otherwise be missed (Gadon *et al*, 2006). Central is recognising that CYP in custody often have complex trauma histories (Day, 2021; Zettler, 2021) and responses to violence must balance accountability with understanding. The model's emphasis on CYP-centred debriefing and learning reflects that young people need opportunities to understand and learn from their behaviour while feeling heard and supported (Griffin *et al*, 2012), reflective of policies across YCS and NHS (YCS, 2020). This approach can prevent future violence by developing young people's understanding of triggers and alternative responses while maintaining clear boundaries and consequences. Integration across the model builds upon trauma-informed approaches implemented through the NHS Framework for Integrated Care (SECURE STAIRS) representing a whole-systems approach to providing trauma-informed care within the youth secure estate that aims to create a psychologically informed environment through formulation-driven approaches to understanding each CYP's needs, risks and behaviours (Atkinson *et al*, 2023; Edbrook-Childs, *et al*. 2022).

The slow-time learning phase moves beyond the immediate response to develop a deeper systematic understanding that captures an understanding across individual and institutional factors (Gadon *et al*, 2006). This phase draws together learning from multiple sources, including incident reviews, CYP debriefs, and multidisciplinary perspectives, to inform individual CYP-focussed support plans and strategic development. By examining patterns across incidents and considering both operational and therapeutic perspectives, this phase enables the development of more nuanced and effective violence prevention strategies

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Objective 2). The transition from theoretical model to practical implementation can occur through the established mechanisms outlined in the Behavioural Management Strategy (MoJ, 2020) such as Support Teams Meetings, where multi-disciplinary teams can conduct deeper analysis of incidents and their implications. This phase is designed to integrate with existing processes like Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) openings for young people at risk, conflict resolution referrals where relationships have been damaged, and Enhanced Support Team referrals for those with exceptionally complex needs. The system-wide learning element recognises that violence prevention cannot rely solely on individual interventions but requires institutional adaptation and development (Cox, 2021).

The ongoing process of reflection and review creates valuable opportunities for institutional learning (Watts *et al*, 2007). This operates at two levels: organisational learning that asks, "What can we learn from these violent incidents to prevent future events?" and individual staff development that considers "What was effective in my response, what could I have done differently, and how might I approach similar situations in the future?". When applied systematically across the institution, these reflective processes enable a deeper understanding of the root causes of violence, informing more effective individual plans aligned with the positive behaviour framework policy (MoJ, 2020) and ultimately leading to improvements in safety and reductions in violent incidents.

The QTSTM's strength lies in its ability to serve as an integrated framework that supports and enhances coherence to existing policy initiatives, rather than replacing them (Objective 3). The development of the model recognised that youth custody settings operate within multiple policy frameworks, and successful violence prevention requires coordination between these approaches. The model aligns with the SECURE STAIRS framework, with both emphasising trauma-informed approaches and formulation-driven care. The Quick-time learning phase operationalises SECURE STAIRS principles by ensuring that immediate responses to violence consider CYP trauma histories and developmental needs. Integration with the 'Building Bridges' positive behaviour framework (YCS, 2020) occurs through the model's emphasis on learning and growth rather than punitive responses. The Slow-time learning phase specifically examines how incidents can inform individual support plans (e.g. through custody support plans) that reinforces positive behaviours and provides alternatives to violence, and aligns with Building Bridges' focus on developing positive relationships between staff and CYP.

While frameworks like SECURE STAIRS provide important principles, the QTSTM offers a practical process for ensuring these principles guide institutional responses to the violent incidents that continue to occur despite preventive efforts. This implementation focus addresses the persistent gap between policy development and operational practice and can support the effectiveness of violence prevention initiatives in youth custody settings.

Several limitations should be noted. The model was developed as part of a process mapping process within a single YOI and may not be directly replicated in establishments or sectors

without adaptation. However, its overall structure can support such an approach. Moreover, the approach draws upon principles from other secure forensic settings (see for example Caminiti et al 2020), reinforcing the wider applicability of the approach. The literature review was non-systematic and did not fully capture the vast literature on the causes of violence, custodial management and behavioural change. The model's development occurred at a specific time, and changing operational contexts, staffing levels, and institutional priorities may affect its implementation in other settings. While staff were consulted during development, there were limited CYP involvement in the model's creation and this limits the model's applicability from CYP perspectives regarding their specific needs, preferred support mechanisms, and effective post-incident responses. Future iterations should also consider neurodevelopmental approaches and personality disorder development trajectories, which may affect both violence causation and prevention effectiveness. Finally, as the model has not yet been implemented and evaluated, its effectiveness in practice remains to be established through robust evaluation methods.

In conclusion, this project demonstrated the feasibility of developing a single model which improves the alignment of current practices with evidence-based good practice and offers a practical tool for operationalising and integrating existing policies into practice. Through our collaborative approach with staff across all levels of the YOI, the QTSTM creates a structured framework that builds upon and aligns with existing systems while introducing a clear three-phase process that promotes staff well-being and systematic learning. By providing a structured approach to understanding and responding to violent incidents while maintaining flexibility for local adaptation, the model offers a template for enhancing violence prevention efforts within youth custodial settings. Future research should integrate CYP perspectives, reflect different developmental trajectories, examine the model's effectiveness in practice and explore its potential application across secure settings.

Summary of practice implications:

- The Quick-time, Slow-time model offers a phased and integrated framework for violent incidents which supports immediate safety and systemic learning.
- The model provides a practical tool for operationalising existing policy into everyday practice.
- The model recognises the emotional and psychological impact of violence on staff, providing space for supporting staff well-being and learning.
- Consistent, transparent processes and CYP-centred debriefs promotes procedural justice, fairness and legitimacy.
- The Slow-time phase facilitates systemic reflection and strategic planning, enabling institutions to identify patterns and address root causes of violence.

References

- Abrams, L.S. and Anderson-Nathe, B. (2013) *Compassionate confinement: A year in the life of Unit C*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Anna Freud Centre (n.d.) *The Framework for Integrated Care (SECURE STAIRS)*. Available at: <https://www.annafreud.org/research/past-research-projects/the-framework-for-integrated-care-secure-stairs/> (Accessed: 11 September 2025)
- Antonacci, G., Lennox, L., Barlow, J., Evans, L., & Reed, J. (2021). Process mapping in healthcare: a systematic review. *BMC health services research*, 21(1), 342. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06254-1>
- Atkinson, S., McKeown, A., Caveney, D., West, E., Kennedy, P. J., and Macinnes, S. (2023). The SECURE STAIRS Framework: Preliminary Evaluation of Trauma Informed Training Developments Within the Children and Young People's Secure Estate. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 59(6), 1129-1135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-023-01092-3>
- Barnert E. S., (2020) COVID-19 and Youth Impacted by Juvenile and Adult Criminal Justice Systems. *Pediatrics*, 146 (2), e20201299. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-1299>
- Bateman, T. (2020) Unjust Pains: The Impact of COVID-19 on children in prison, *Journal of Children's Services*, 15(4) pp.201-208 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCS-07-2020-0045>
- Beijersbergen, K. A., Dirkzwager, A. J. E., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., and Nieuwebeerta, P. (2015). Procedural Justice, Anger, and Prisoners' Misconduct: A Longitudinal Study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(2), 196-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814550710>
- Bengtsson, T.T. (2021) Boredom: A Key Experience of Youth Imprisonment, in A. Cox and L. Abrams (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Youth Imprisonment*, Cham: Springer pp.205-223 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68759-5_10
- Blaauw, E., Winkel, F.W., and Kerkhof, A.J.F.M. M. (2001). Bullying and Suicidal Behavior in Jails. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(3), 279-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854801028003002>
- Blitz C.L., Wolff, N., and Shi, J. (2008) Physical victimization in prison: the role of mental illness. *Int J Law Psychiatry*. 31(5):385-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2008.08.005>
- Boudoukha, A. H. *et al.* (2013) Inmates-to-Staff Assaults, PTSD and Burnout: Profiles of Risk and Vulnerability. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. [Online] 28 (11), 2332-2350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512475314>
- Boxer, P., Duron, J. F., Williams-Butler, A., Mattson, P., Algrim, K. (2023) Trauma and Gang Affiliation Increase Likelihood of Committing Assault among Juveniles Admitted to Secure Custody, *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology* 52 (4) p.570-577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2022.2034635>

Brooks, S., Johnson, P., Clarke, S., & Morton, L. (2019). *Youth Custody Service safeguarding review*. Ministry of Justice.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5d9716d840f0b668752e9239/YCS_Safeguarding_Review.pdf

Caminiti, M., Febo, R. D., and Pallagrosi, M. (2021). Post-aggression Debrief. In Biondi, M., Pasquini, M. and Tarsitani, L. (Eds.) *Empathy, Normalization and De-escalation*, Cham: Springer pp.133-147. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65106-0_8

Case, S., & Haines, K. (2015). Children first, offenders second: The centrality of engagement in positive youth justice. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 54(2), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12099>

REDACTED (2024)

Clements, C. B. (1982). The Relationship of Offender Classification to the Problems of Prison Overcrowding, *Crime and Delinquency*, 28(1), 72-81.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/001112878202800105>

Cox, A. (2021) *Juvenile Facility Staff: Research, Policy and Practice*. In Cox, A, and Abrams, LS (eds) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Youth Imprisonment*, Springer International Publishing AG, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68759-5_12

Cox, A. (2016). Fetishizing the will in juvenile justice policy and practice, in Jacobs, J. and Jackson, J. (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of criminal justice ethics*, London: Routledge.

Crewe, B., 2011. Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment. *Punishment and society*, 13(5), pp.509-529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511422172>

Crewe, B., Liebling, A., and Hulley, S. (2015). Staff-prisoner relationships, staff professionalism, and the use of authority in public-and private-sector prisons. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 40(2), 309-344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12093>

Day, A.M. (2021) *The experiences of children in custody: A story of survival*, *Safer Communities*, 20(3) pp.159-171. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-11-2020-0040>

Duron, J. F., Williams-Butler, A., Mattson, P., and Boxer, P. (2022) *Trauma Exposure and Mental Health Needs Among Adolescents Involved With the Juvenile Justice System*. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. [Online] 37 (17-18), NP15700-NP15725.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211016358>

Edbrook-Childs, J, *et al*, (2022) *Independent evaluation of the Framework for Integrated Care (SECURE STAIRS)*, available at *The Framework for Integrated Care (SECURE STAIRS)* | Anna Freud (accessed 1 November 2023)

Ehrenreich, S.E., Beron, K.J., Brinkley, D.Y. and Underwood, M.K. (2014) Family Predictors of Continuity and Change in Social and Physical Aggression From Ages 9 to 18, *AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR* 40(5), pages 421-43 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21535>

Fletcher, J., Spittal, M., Brophy, L., Tibble, H., Kinner, S., Elsom, S., and Hamilton, B. (2017). Outcomes of the Victorian Safewards trial in 13 wards: Impact on seclusion rates and fidelity measurement. *International journal of mental health nursing*, 26(5), 461-471. 196 <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12380>

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78-91.

Goldblatt, H., Freund, A., Drach-Zahavy, A., Enosh, G., Peterfreund, I., and Edlis, N., 2020. Providing Health Care in the Shadow of Violence: Does Emotion Regulation Vary Among Hospital Workers From Different Professions? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(9-10), 1908-1933 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517700620>

Gadon, L., Johnstone, L., and Cooke, D. (2006). Situational variables and institutional violence: A systematic review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26(5), 515-534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.02.002>

Gomes, S., Granja, R., 2021. (Dis)trusted outsiders: conducting ethnographic research on prison settings. *Etnográfica* 25(vol. 25 (1)), pp.5-22. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etnografica.8678>

Griffin, G., Germain, E. J., and Wilkerson, R. G. (2012). Using a trauma-informed approach in juvenile justice institutions. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma*, 5(3), pp.271-283. (p. 279) <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361521.2012.697100>

HMI Prisons. (2023a) Children in Custody 2023: An analysis of 12-18-year olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centres and young offender institutions. <https://www.justiceinspectores.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/11/Children-in-custody-web-2023-2.pdf> (accessed 3 Jan 2024).

Fitzalan Howard, F. and Wakeling, H., 2020. People in Prisons' Perceptions of Procedural Justice in England and Wales. *Criminal justice and behavior*, 47 (12), 1654–1676. 10.1177/0093854820964501.

Irwin J, Cressey D. (1962) Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Social Problems* 10(2): 145-147. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799047>

Klatt, T., Hagl, S., Bergmann, M.C. and Baier, D. (2016) Violence in youth custody: Risk factors of violent misconduct among inmates of German young offender institutions, *European Journal of Criminology* 13(6) pp.727-743. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370816643733>

Liefaard T., Reef J. and Hazelzet M.E. (2014), Report on Violence in Institutions for Juvenile Offenders. nr. 13 rev. Strasbourg: Council of Europe; Council for Penological Co-operation, p. 19.

Liévano-Karim, L. and Ritterbusch, A.E. (2021) Everyday Violence in El Rentador (Colombia) In Cox, A, and Abrams, LS (eds) 2021, The Palgrave International Handbook of Youth Imprisonment, Springer International Publishing AG, Cham pp.51-75
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68759-5_4

Johnson Listwan, S., Colvin, M., Hanley, D., and Flannery, D. (2010). Victimization, Social Support, and Psychological Well-Being: A Study of Recently Released Prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(10), 1140-1159 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810376338>

Maguire, J. (2018) Understanding prison violence: a rapid evidence assessment, available at [understanding-prison-violence.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330111111_Understanding_prison_violence_a_rapid_evidence_assessment) (accessed on 22nd Nov 2024).

Martinez-Iñigo, D. (2021) The role of prison officers' regulation of inmates affect on their exposure to violent behaviours and the development of PTSD symptoms. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*. [Online] 12 (1), 1956126-1956126.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20008198.2021.1956126>

Menon, S.E., Cheung, M. (2018) Desistance-Focused Treatment and Asset-Based Programming for Juvenile Offender Reintegration: A Review of Research Evidence. *Child Adolesc Soc Work J* 35, pp. 459–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-018-0542-8>

Millen, D.R. (2000) Rapid ethnography: time deepening strategies for HCI field research. In: Boyarski A, Kellogg W. A, (eds.) Proceedings of the 3rd conference on designing interactive systems: processes, practices, methods, and techniques. New York, NY pp.280–286.

Ministry of Justice and HMI Prisons (2024) Safety in the Children and Young People Secure Estate: Update to September 2023, available at Safety in the Children and Young People Secure Estate: Update to September 2023 - GOV.UK (accessed 17 July 2024).

Ministry of Justice (2022) Living with Covid-19: Prisons and youth custody settings, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/living-with-covid-19-prisons-and-youth-custody-settings> accessed 22nd Nov 2024

Ministry of Justice (2020) Building Bridges: A Positive Behaviour Framework for the Children and Young People Secure Estate. London: MoJ.

Ministry of Justice and Youth Justice Board for England and Wales. (2019). *Standards for children in youth justice services*. Ministry of Justice.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6363d2328fa8f50570e54222/Standards_for_children_in_youth_justice_services_2019.doc.pdf Moore, C. (2015) Moral Disengagement Current Opinion in Psychology, 6, pp.199-204 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.07.018>

Moule, P., Armoogum, J., Dodd, E., Donskoy, A., Douglass, E., Taylor, J. and Turton, P. (2016) Practical guidance on undertaking a service evaluation. *Nursing Standard*. 30, 45, 46-51. doi: 10.7748/ns.2016.e10277

Muller, Goebel-Fabbri, A. E., Diamond, T., and Dinklage, D. (2000). Social support and the relationship between family and community violence exposure and psychopathology among high risk adolescents. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 24(4), 449-464.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(00\)00117-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(00)00117-4)

Nurse, A.M. (2021) Friendship in the Juvenile Correctional Institution in A. Cox and L. Abrams (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Youth Imprisonment*, Cham: Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68759-5_11

Nylander, P., Lindberg, O., and Bruhn, A. (2011). Emotional labour and emotional strain among Swedish prison officers. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6), 469-483.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370811413806>

Parker, A., Meek, R. and Lewis, G. (2014) Sport in a youth prison: male young offenders' experiences of a sporting intervention, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17:3, pp. 381-396.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.830699>

Parsons, M., Gaudet, J. and Sajjad, A. (2017) *Conflict Resolution Resource Guide*, Lough Barnes Consulting Group

REDACTED (2022).

Porges, S. W. (2011). The polyvagal theory: Neurophysiological foundations of emotions, attachment, communication, and self-regulation. W W Norton and Co

Price, J. (2021) Violence, Control and Restraint: The Harms to Young Adults Particularly Upon Transition, *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice* 60(4) pp.511-528 28.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12418>

Ricciardelli, R. *et al.* (2018) Correctional officers in Canada: Interpreting workplace violence. *Criminal justice review* (Atlanta, Ga.). [Online] 43 (4), 458-476.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016817752433>

Shaw, R.L. (2004) Making sense of violence: a study of narrative meaning, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1(2), 131-151 [10.1191/1478088704qp009oa](https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088704qp009oa)

REDACTED (2018).

REDACTED (2022)

REDACTED et al (2020)

Redacted (2023)

Redacted et al (2025)

Van der Helm, P., Klapwijk, M., Stams, G., and Van der Laan, P. (2009). 'What works' for juvenile prisoners: the role of group climate in a youth prison. *Journal of Children's Services* 4(2) pp.36-48 99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17466660200900011>

Watts, J., Mackay, R., Horton, D., Hall, A., Hall, Douthwaite, B., Chambers, R. and Acosta, A. (2007) Institutional Learning and Change: An Introduction, ILAC Working Paper 3, available at <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/a53db13d-3a03-46b0-abea-1a176fccd719/content> (accessed 18 July 2024).

World Health Organization (2013) *WHO Evaluation Practice Handbook*, World Health Organization

World Health Organisation (n.d.) Violence Prevention Alliance approach, available via <https://www.who.int/groups/violence-prevention-alliance/approach>

Wood, J. T. (2004) Monsters and victims: Male felons' accounts of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21(5), 555-576. 39 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407504045887>

Youth Custody Service. (2020). *Building bridges: A positive behaviour framework for the children and young people secure estate*. Ministry of Justice. <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5e3a9df6ed915d093cbe4ee4/building-bridges-positive-behaviour-pf.pdf>

Youth Justice Board (2024) Youth Justice Statistics 2022-2023, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics-2022-to-2023/youth-justice-statistics-2022-to-2023-accessible-version> (accessed 17 June 2024).

Zettler, H. R. (2021). Much to do about trauma: A systematic review of existing trauma-informed treatments on youth violence and recidivism. *Youth violence and juvenile justice*, 19(1), 113-134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204020939645>

Model of Violence Prevention Process Map

