

Chapter 2:

Systematic Literature Review

Chapter 2: Systematic Literature Review

Abstract

Ex- adult offenders can face barriers to societal reintegration following incarceration. A dearth of literature exists documenting public opinion and attitudes towards such individuals re-entering the community upon their release (Hirschfield & Piquero, 2010; Pager, 2003; Leverentz, 2011). However public attitudes and opinions towards juvenile reintegration are rather less known (Reynolds, Craig & Boer, 2013). Moreover, even less is known regarding the perceptions of young offenders themselves (Massey, Gebhardt & Garnefski, 2008). Therefore, the current systematic review aimed to explore the literature over the last twenty years with a specific focus on both public opinion and the personal views and attitudes of the young offenders themselves.

A pool of 89 research papers documenting public opinion, attitudes and beliefs regarding young offenders resulted from an initial search utilising eight electronic databases spanning the period January 1995 to December 2015. Of these, a final pool of 18 articles were retained for review. From these, two main themes emerged; the majority of studies reported public concern with youth sentencing, culpability and accountability, or the effects of labelling theory and how it relates to re-offending. A distinct paucity of studies reporting personal perceptions, attitudes and opinions of juvenile offenders was evident, suggesting a need for research directed towards this area, particularly given that within the 18 studies reviewed, public opinion favoured juvenile reform.

Introduction

The overarching objective of this review was to explore the documented extant literature for the purpose of identifying public and personal opinions towards juvenile crime. Within this broad aim, there are four specific objectives; (1) to identify the attitudes and perceptions of the general public towards young offenders, (2) to ascertain the attitudes that young offenders perceive the public to hold and the attitudes they personally hold towards youth offenders themselves, (3) to explore whether or not these attitudes (either knowingly or unknowingly) lead to negative consequences for young offenders, and (4) to assess the quality and methodological rigour of which these attitudes, perceptions and consequences are measured and reported within the existing literature.

Public opinion and attitudes towards adult offending is well documented (Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle & McPherson, 2004; Hardcastle, Bartholomew and Graffam, 2011), with findings centred on public characteristics, offender characteristics and the nature of the offence (Brade, Desmarais and Mitchell, 2016). Two public characteristics which are important influences on attitudes to offending are political stance and levels of interpersonal contact (Lyons, 2006; Sander, Sharkey, Olivarri, Tanigawa & Mauseth, 2010), whereas typical offender characteristics found to influence public attitudes ranged from ethnicity and race to gender and appearance

(Hirshfield & Piquero, 2010; Varma, 2006). Of particular importance is the nature of the crime; which, in the case of a sexual offence, has the potential to outweigh all other variables, including violence, drug-related crimes or those committed under the umbrella of diminished responsibility (Mila & Luther, 2013; Walby, Allen & Simmons, 2004). Historically however, much less attention has been afforded to an exploration of public attitudes and opinions towards juvenile crime; an area largely neglected until the latter part of the twentieth century and the initial findings of Schwartz, Guo & Kerbs (1993). Moreover, the early studies were more concerned with improving public knowledge and awareness of the youth justice system in general, than with an emphasis upon the welfare and rehabilitation of the young offenders themselves (Scott, Reppucci, Antonishak & DeGennaro, 2006).

Educating and improving the juvenile justice knowledge base within the general population has the capacity to instigate positive change, however to date, little knowledge exists of how the juvenile population believe they are perceived by others and the impact that this may have on their subsequent criminogenic behaviour (Fitzpatrick, McGuire & Dickson, 2014). Whilst labelling theory and the resultant self-stigma or self-fulfilling prophecies have occasionally been reported in the adult offending population (Benson, Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2011; LeBel, 2011), reports of

the effects of perceived discrimination and self-stigma within the juvenile arena are largely few (Fitzpatrick et al.,).

In order to consolidate the existing findings in relation to public opinion, personal perception and self-stigma, the current study employed a systematic literature review aimed at synthesising the psychological literature relating to public perceptions, opinions, attitudes and stigma towards young offenders and the personal perceptions of young offenders themselves, over a period of the last twenty years.

Method

The search process

In order to conduct a thorough examination of the literature, eight electronic databases were selected for use. The databases comprised of PsycINFO, EBSCOhost, Science Direct, JSTOR, Wiley, Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse and Criminal Justice Abstracts (CJA). ProQuest Dissertation and Theses electronic databases were searched for studies using the AACODS grey checklist (Tyndall, 2010). Search criteria utilised a combination of the terms reported in table 1, with full use of Boolean operators in order to maximise search sensitivity. Reference lists of included studies were checked manually to ensure that all relevant research was identified.

The purpose of the current systematic review is to explore both public and personal perceptions towards youth offending and the potential consequences that these perceptions may imply. As a result four basic search terms were applied to the electronic search (Refer to table 1.) All possible combinations of search items were utilised, consisting of at least one attitudinal term paired with a descriptor term associated with youth offending. For each included record, cited references were screened against inclusion criteria to ensure all relevant records were identified.

Table 1. Search terms

Facets	Search terms
Public attitudes	Public opinion, public views, public perceptions, public beliefs, public concerns, public attitudes, public knowledge, public fear.
Personal attitudes	Self-stigma, self-fulfilling prophecy, self-belief, self-concept, self-efficacy.
Stigma	Labelling, prejudice, stereotyping, social distance, discrimination.
Young offenders	Youth offending, juvenile offending, juvenile crime, juvenile delinquency, juvenile delinquent.

Note: All facets combined with AND: all terms within facets combined with OR.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

In order to reflect contemporary empirical findings representative of recent social climates and to account for the relative paucity of literature devoted to stereotyping, labelling and stigma in juvenile offending, the database search included all non-published and published empirical research between the dates of January 1995 and December 2015. The following inclusion criteria were applied: (1) at least one of the outcome variables was specifically identified and defined as a measure of attitude, opinion, prejudice, stigma, labelling, social distance or discrimination, (2) the study included data that allowed for comparison on at least one variable, (3)

participants were representative of the general public, including current and/or previous young offenders and college or university students, (4) the research was written in English (or translation was available), (5) the research was of direct relevance to juvenile offending or taken from research involving prior youth offenders and (6) the findings were reported in peer-reviewed journals, theses or government reports.

For the purpose of this study, the terms `juvenile offending` or `youth offender` refers to those individuals who when aged between 10 and 18, were cautioned or convicted of committing a crime (Ministry of Justice, 2016). However, given the diversity within justice systems across the continents and the differential ages used in order to define the point at which juvenile offenders become adults, no precise upper age limit was specified. Rather, young offenders were identified by their position within the justice system; juvenile as opposed to correctional. The inclusion of quantitative and mixed methods data collection techniques was deemed appropriate, with no restrictions placed on country of research origin.

Eight exclusion criteria were applied to the search process; (1) studies lacking sufficient methodological detail or irrelevant focus, (2) studies referring to the adult offending population based on the premise that these studies will likely involve very different issues to those of interest in the

current study. Likewise, studies reporting juvenile involvement with sex-based offences (3) were excluded as were those reporting acts of severe violence (4). Studies reporting on the delivery of either a life sentence or the death penalty were also excluded (5) based on the potential for confounding emotive effects.

Opinions relating to general sentencing, accountability and culpability were included, unless there was a focus on the physical appearance of the defendant, in which case these studies were omitted. A higher risk of mental health problems within the offender population is well documented, with young offenders being up to three times more likely to have a mental health problem than the general population (Leon, 2002). Disentangling the co-occurrence of criminality and mental illness is problematic; therefore studies with a focus on mental illness were also excluded (6). Studies utilising purely qualitative data collection methods (8) were excluded, as they would not allow for data comparison. This resulted in all retrieved documents for review being selected on the basis of content within the title or abstract in order to evaluate suitability for inclusion in the final review.

Initial literature researches revealed a pool of 89 content-relevant studies from the databases, of which many were duplicates and subsequently removed. Studies not fully meeting the inclusion criteria were excluded, with

the most common reasons for exclusion relating to violent or sexually related offences and to those published in America and specific to life sentencing or the death penalty. As a result of this process a final total of 18 studies remained for quality assessment, screening and coding.

Quality assessment, screening and coding

Each content-relevant study was assessed a second time for inclusion in the review based on the quality of the research by following the format of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-P; Moher, et al., 2015). This included consideration of the overall quality of the design and execution of the study, data collection processes, the principle measures obtained and the risk of bias. Consequentially, studies were judged as weak, moderate or strong, based on their methodological rigour. Where possible, reliability measures of .7 or above using Cronbach's alpha were sought, with a similar figure being observed for validity. Similarly, those studies lacking any consideration for measures of validity and reliability were deemed to be of poor quality and as such were excluded from further analysis.

A data extraction chart was compiled (Table 2), detailing the country of study, study design, method of data collection and study sample. Potential

moderating variables such as publication bias, sampling bias, year of publication and country of origin were assessed where sufficient data was available as attitudes toward ex-offenders may vary internationally.

Table 2 Summary characteristics of studies reporting public and personal perceptions of juvenile offending ($n = 18$)

Reference, date and Country	Design and focus	Method	Sample and setting	Key findings and outcomes	Quality and comments
Adams, Robertson, Gray-Ray and Ray (2003), Mississippi.	Quantitative: Exploring the impact of juvenile perceptions of formal and informal labelling.	Self-report questionnaire. Correlation and regression analyses.	Juvenile offenders aged between 10 and 18 years, in the custody of the Mississippi Youth Services, State Schools (N = 277).	Teacher and peer labelling were significant predictors of delinquency.	Moderate to strong reliability on all subscales: Cronbach's alpha for subscales varied from .82 to .92
Baron and Hartnagel (1996), Canada.	Quantitative: A test of the predictive value of a theoretical model of punitive-ness towards young offenders.	Random telephone survey comprising 5 key variables. Regression analyses.	Canadian households, (N = 499).	Partial support for model: conservative social values but not fear or victimisation was associated with stronger punitive attitudes.	Weak to moderate: Reliability not reported as used single item measures.
Bernburg and Krohn (2003), New York.	Mixed methods: To explore the impact of official labelling and	Interviews at regular time intervals with adolescent and	Stratified random sample of male 'at risk of delinquency or drugs' youths	Official intervention and labelling in adolescence	Strong, robust measures of reporting.

	intervention in youth and its effect on crime in adulthood.	primary care giver, face to face or over the telephone. Data collection from schools, police, courts and social service agencies. Longitudinal panel data analysis and regression analyses.	aged approximately 13 years at first wave of study and 22 by final wave. (N = 529).	increases involvement in crime in early adulthood and is mediated by educational achievement and employment.	
Bernburg, Krohn and Rivera (2006), Rochester, New York.	Quantitative: Investigating labelling effects on delinquency, gang membership and substance abuse.	Self-report questionnaire.	Adolescents taken from a selection of schools in Rochester who received official police intervention at ages 13 or 14, compared to those who did not. Followed up one year later, (N = 870).	The earlier the involvement with official intervention, the more likely they were to be delinquent and to be members of a criminal gang. Relationship between substance abuse and delinquency was	Strong robust reporting.

				just below significance.	
Bouley and Wells (2001), Georgia.	Quantitative: An exploration of public views on rehabilitation versus punishment and if juvenile offenders should be tried as adults.	Telephone survey: Stratified random sample: Modified version of National Opinion Survey.	Random sample of households, (N = 387).	The majority of people sampled were in favour of training, education and counselling for juvenile offenders but effects are modified by income and education. Higher levels of education and income reflected stronger preference for education and training. The lower the income, the more punitive the response.	Weak: No statistical analysis; purely percentages reported on 5 basic questions.

Ghetti and Redlich (2001), California.	Quantitative: Experimental design comprising the manipulation of scenarios and the subsequent effects on perceptions of juvenile accountability and legal competence.	3 x 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects ANOVA.	Psychology undergraduates, equal number of male and female participants. (N = 480).	The type of crime and the outcome significantly affected sentence severity awarded by participants. Age did not reach significance and participants did not take this into account when sentencing, yet it was acknowledged that younger individuals would be less likely to understand the court processes.	Moderate: Cronbach's alpha figures ranged between .63 and .82
Goidel, Freeman and Procopio (2006), Louisiana.	Quantitative: Survey exploring the links between amount and type of television viewing,	Self-report survey obtained via random digit dialling sampling.	Louisiana households contacted over a period of one year. (N = 498).	Significant media effects impacted perceptions of juvenile crime and effectiveness of judicial system:	Moderate to weak: correlational research, reliability not reported.

	perceptions of youth crime and the efficacy of incarceration or rehabilitation.			greater television exposure led to misperceptions of an increase in the amount and severity of youth crime, and the misplaced view that incarceration works.	
Jackson and Hay (2013), Florida.	Quantitative: Investigating potential mediating effects of family warmth and attachment between labelling and subsequent delinquency.	Self-report questionnaire for delinquency and family warmth/attachment scale (CAR). Regression analyses.	Youths aged 11-13 from five 'high-risk' neighbourhoods, visited in 3 waves: baseline, at age 14 and 1 year later. (N = 562).	Family attachments 1 <i>SD</i> above the mean will reduce the arrest-delinquency relationship by about 40% and increased to approximately 60% on subsequent waves.	Robust: Cronbach's alpha figures of between .81 and .87
McGrath (2009), Australia.	Quantitative: Examining the effects of	Longitudinal survey and	Young offenders interviewed post	Participants with prior convictions who reported	Moderate to strong.

	perceived certainty and severity of arrest, and re-integrative shaming on deterrence (as measured by recidivism rates over time).	Multivariate analyses.	sentencing hearing, (N = 206).	feeling stigmatized by the hearing were more likely to reoffend, compared to those who reported the likelihood of future arrest as high and sentence as severe, were less likely to offend.	
McGrath (2014), Australia.	Quantitative: Exploring the emotional impact of sentencing and stigma on subsequent reoffending.	Self-report questionnaire for feelings of stigmatisation by gender. Recidivism data from ROD. Regression analysis.	Young offenders, mean age 16.8 years, (N = 394).	Having feelings of stigmatisation post sentencing was a significant predictor of reoffending for young girls but not in boys. Young men with prior convictions who reported feeling stigmatized were	Moderate to strong.

				less likely to reoffend.	
Mears, Pickett and Mancini (2014), USA.	Quantitative: An assessment of attitudes towards balanced youth justice, rehabilitation and punishment.	Self-report questionnaire, multi-nominal logistic regression.	Criminology undergraduate students from two institutions in Florida and New York. (N = 866).	The majority of participants supported balanced youth justice for violent juveniles, one third supported a rehabilitation focused approach and the remainder a punitive approach.	Strong: robust reporting, excellent control of variables and methodological rigour.
Nagin, Piquero, Scott and Steinberg (2006), Pennsylvania.	Quantitative: A comparison of public's willingness to pay for competing policies of incarceration	WTP: `willingness to pay` survey: Contingency valuation.	Public opinion from Pennsylvanian residents.	When participants are promised comparable crime reductions between rehabilitation and incarceration, they were as least as in	Weak: most responses yes/no options to a cost-benefit analysis.

	versus rehabilitation.			favour for rehabilitation as for incarceration.	
Piquero and Steinberg (2010), Pennsylvania.	Quantitative: A repeat of the Contingency valuation study one year earlier, this time with a larger population.	Random digit dial telephone survey: contingency valuation study.	Households across four states: Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania and Washington. (N = 2,282)	In three of the four states, WTP for rehabilitation was voted as more favourable than for incarceration. In all states, unwillingness to pay more in taxes for additional incarceration was evident regardless of the extent of actual amounts.	Moderate: improvement to design following on from previous study.
Piquero, Cullen, Unnever, Piquero and Gordon (2010), Pennsylvania.	Quantitative; exploring attitudes to rehabilitation in juvenile justice. Is there an	Random digit dial telephone survey over a period of 6 months. Multivariate	Pennsylvanian households (N = 1502).	The public hold a broad consensus of optimism and the belief that juvenile offenders are not	Moderate to strong, multiple items used in scale: reliability figure of 0.77

	optimum age for treatment and is there more potential in youths for reform?	regression analyses.		beyond redemption.	
Roberts and Hough (2005), England.	Quantitative: Exploring public opinion to the sentencing of young offenders in England and Wales.	Face to face interviews using the British Crime Survey (BCS).	Random sample of adults from England and Wales, (N = 1692).	Public opinion favours belief that sanctions are too lenient; however there is an overall preference for rehabilitation and restoration over incarceration.	Weak: only percentages provided.
Schwalbe, Ibrahim, Brewer, MacKenzie and Gearing (2013), Columbia.	Quantitative: Examining the impact of various juvenile justice interventions and the reduction of social stigma.	Experimental vignette street survey, followed by a stigma and social acceptance survey. ANCOVA and regression analysis.	Adult population in Amman, Jordan. (N = 137).	Far greater acceptance of juveniles following completing a rehabilitation style intervention compared to a	Moderate.

				detention style approach.	
Sprott (1996), Canada.	Mixed methods: Exploring media, public and professional perceptions of youth crime.	Content analysis of 113 media reports, professional analysis of 51 court cases and chi square analyses of a public perception survey.	Opportunity sample of Canadian respondents, (N = 198).	Professionals working within the CJS focus on the charge, the youth and the disposition whereas the public focus on the media content relating to the seriousness and nature of the crime, and the impact on others.	Weak: single item questions, limited analysis.
Scott, Reppucci, Antonishak and DeGennaro (2006), Virginia.	Quantitative: Exploring public attitudes of culpability and the punishment of young offenders.	Experimental manipulation involving vignettes and attitude scales. ANCOVA and regression analyses.	Volunteer sample of adults from a local community, (N = 604).	Public perception of young offenders acknowledges immaturity as a contributory factor and a resulting preference for the differential	Strong: Cronbach's alpha 0.82

treatment of
juveniles & adults.

Results and Discussion

Overview of selected papers

Despite an extensive search for public and personal perceptions of juvenile delinquency, the results of the systematic review were rather limited and only two main themes emerged. Of the eighteen studies reviewed, eleven centred on public opinion, attitudes and views in respect to sentencing, culpability and accountability, with the remaining seven documenting labelling theory and the relationship with subsequent recidivism. The quality of the studies varied considerably across both themes, with many studies demonstrating only weak to moderate methodological rigour. Moreover, empirical evidence relating to self-stigma and perceived labelling amongst the youth offending population was scarce.

Public opinion, sentencing, culpability and accountability

On closer inspection the papers reviewed within this theme reported the general public consensus of a criminal justice system that is 'too soft' on youth offending (Baron & Hartnagel, 1996; Bouley & Wells, 2001; Mears, Pickett & Mancini, 2015). The majority of studies recognise the importance of public opinion and its influence on criminal justice policy, however the

overall levels of public support for a rehabilitative system outweighs the misperception of public demand for 'get tough' incarceration regimes (Mears, Pickett & Mancini; Nadin, Daniels & Piquero, 2006). In contrast, one of the earliest studies within the review (Baron & Hartnagel) reported high levels of public support for punitive responses to juvenile crime and a belief in court leniency. However they explained this finding as a response to the existing political climate at the time and the disproportionate media reporting of crime and not as a result of personal experience or fear. These findings were reiterated some five years later by Ghetty and Redlich (2001), who commented on the unfair media portrayal of youth offending as violent and on the rise. Using a scenario based approach, their study aimed to establish whether crime severity determined punishment regardless of defendant age and secondly, to assess how the defendants age impacted on perceptions of their competency. The findings clearly demonstrated that youth crime is not a simple phenomenon; in addition to defendant age, competency and outcome severity, there are numerous potential mediating variables which warrant consideration. Additionally they acknowledged that using scenarios or vignettes may not be the most appropriate methodology to use, given the unrealistic nature of the task. Moreover, the study utilised undergraduate students as their participants who arguably are of a similar age to both victim and defendant, and are not necessarily a diverse

population and almost certainly not representative of general public opinion (Peterson, 2001).

Indeed, one of the eleven papers focused solely on the impact of television viewing on public perceptions of juvenile crime (Goidel, Freeman & Procopio, 2006), concluding that greater exposure to media is associated with greater misperceptions of youth crime. In a mixed method approach, Sprott (1996) compared media accounts, public perceptions and official emphasis on juvenile delinquency and reported that both the media and general public focused on very different elements of the crime. These findings highlight the difficulty of evaluating a general public response to youth offending per se, given the complexities of the variables involved.

The British Crime Survey (BCS) systematically explores public opinion on youth crime in England and Wales. Roberts and Hough (2005) analysed the results of the BCS and found that although public opinion concurred with the earlier findings of Baron and Hartnagel, there was a distinct public preference for rehabilitation compared to incarceration. This was mirrored in Nadin, Piquero, Scott and Steinberg's (2006) cost-benefit study, however both papers relied purely upon descriptive measures, therefore a more robust methodology would lend further support to their claims. Two follow-up studies (Piquero & Steinberg, 2009; Piquero, Cullen, Unnever, Piquero & Gordon, 2010) employed multivariate and regression analyses thus

confirming the earlier results of a broad consensus of optimism within the public domain and the belief that youth offenders are not beyond redemption and have the potential for reform.

Finally, Mears, Pickett and Mancini (2014) conducted a novel investigation into 'balanced' juvenile justice; the opportunity for respondents to consider the relative merits of both rehabilitation and punishment consecutively, compared to 'either or' decisions. Results indicated that over half of respondents favoured a combination approach, with a further 30% opting for primarily rehabilitation focused justice and only 15% selecting a punishment focused regime. This study provides greater insight into public perceptions of sanctioning and youth offending and lends further support to the argument in favour of rehabilitative justice. Moreover, the methodology employed within this study was robust in nature, identifying variables for control and reporting measures of reliability. It is disappointing to note however, that the participant pool is comprised of criminology undergraduates; which may reduce the validity of the findings considerably.

Labelling effects, self-stigma and recidivism

Seven studies investigated the effects of labelling in total, either from an individual self-labelling perspective or as a result of being labelled officially or formally. Three studies explored the effects of feeling stigmatised

as a young offender. Adams, Robertson, Gray-Ray and Ray (2003) found that youth offenders who select negative labels for their self-concept will report more frequent involvement in delinquent behaviours. Moreover, they reported that the most influential factors in the labelling process arose from teachers and perceived 'officials' rather than family or peers, but this did vary according to the severity of the crime. Likewise, McGrath (2009) concluded that individuals who felt stigmatised following their court hearing or sentencing were more likely to reoffend, unless they believed that they were at a high risk of apprehension from future offending. If this were the case their recidivism rate was seen to reduce in subsequent years.

In a follow up study, McGrath (2014) explored the mediating effects of emotional responses to sentencing and future engagement in crime. The results demonstrated that for women, feeling stigmatised led to a 90% increase in reoffending, whilst for men there was no such effect. However, for those men who held prior convictions and reported feeling stigmatised, their likelihood of reoffending reduced. Clearly the labelling process is not a simple one and operates very differently across various sub-groups of the population. Furthermore, the authors acknowledged that their measure of stigma was rather crude and therefore may impact of the quality of data collection overall.

In a longitudinal study spanning eight years, Bernburg and Krohn (2003) reported that official intervention (and labelling) in adolescence impacted on recidivism by triggering processes which resulted in negative consequences for educational achievement and employment. Thus receiving official intervention as a juvenile has a negative effect on subsequent life chances and adult criminality. This was further supported by Krohn and Rivera (2006) who also found support for the negative effects of intervention, labelling and future crime. However Jackson and Hay (2013) point to the role of family attachment and warmth as a potential moderating factor, showing that strong family ties can mediate the effects of negative labelling and reduce the likelihood of future offending and arrest. Therefore, whilst it would appear that feeling stigmatised can be criminogenic, arising from a change in one's self-concept and an increase in crime, there is the potential for positive reform.

Conclusion

Prior to the current review, there was an expectation of sourcing an abundance of empirical research documenting public attitudes and opinions towards juvenile crime. Given the dearth of attitude scales populating the psychological literature, it was assumed that there would exist a multitude of measures devoted to juvenile criminality. In contrast, there was limited empirical evidence, resulting from a methodologically diverse database, often dominated by public opinion surveys with little in the way of robust statistical analyses and an operationalised design.

Methodological issues were abound; with many of the analyses correlational in nature, or using values obtained from single item scales. In many studies there was a clear lack of underlying psychological constructs. Furthermore, only a handful of studies controlled for demographic or other key variables and few considered previous exposure to criminality or the effects of media reporting on juvenile crime.

Consequently, there is clearly a gap in public knowledge of youth offending and a lack of public knowledge of the youth justice system in general (Scott, Reppucci, Antonishak & DeGennaro, 2006; Scott & Steinberg, 2003). The majority of studies are directed towards improving public

knowledge and awareness in relation to sentencing and accountability, with much less emphasis placed upon welfare and reform.

There is no doubt that public knowledge and opinion of the youth justice system is important, given that it has the potential to affect policy agenda (Roberts, 1992) and influence juvenile reform. Offender perceptions of stigma and discrimination clearly have the potential to impact on an individual's well-being and their future life prospects, yet this review found relatively little empirical investigation has taken place. These results are surprising, particularly since those studies which are included, have demonstrated that the greater the knowledge of youth justice, the more in favour of rehabilitation and restorative justice the general public are (Piquero & Steinberg, 2010; Nagin, Piquero, Scott & Steinberg, 2006).

As a result, the scarcity of research suggests the need for a psychometrically validated measure of personal and perceived stigma within young offenders. This would hopefully contribute towards the first steps in unravelling the complex effects of labelling and self-stigma in juvenile crime.

References

- Abadía-Barrero, C. E., & Castro, A. (2006). Experiences of stigma and access to HAART in children and adolescents living with HIV/AIDS in Brazil. *Social science & medicine*, 62(5), 1219-1228.
- Adams, M. S., Robertson, C. T., Gray-Ray, P., & Ray, M. C. (2003). Labeling and delinquency. *Adolescence*, 38(149), 171.
- Baron, S. W., & Hartnagel, T. F. (1996). Lock'em up: Attitudes toward punishing juvenile offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 38, 191.
- Benson, M. L., Alarid, L. F., Burton, V. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2011). Reintegration or stigmatization? Offenders' expectations of community re-entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(5), 385-393.
- Bernburg, J. G., & Krohn, M. D. (2003). Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1287-1318.
- Bernburg, J. G., Krohn, M. D., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency a longitudinal test of labeling theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43(1), 67-88.
- Bouley, E. E., & Wells, T. L. (2001). Attitudes of citizens in a southern rural county toward juvenile crime and justice issues. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 17(1), 60-70.
- Brade, C. B., Desmarais, S. L., & Mitchell, R. E. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Public Attitudes Toward Ex-Offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 0093854816655837.
- Copenhaver, A., Edwards-Willey, T. L., & Byers, B. D. (2007). Journeys in social stigma: The lives of formerly incarcerated felons in higher education. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 268-283.
- Fitzpatrick, E., McGuire, J., & Dickson, J. M. (2014). Personal goals of adolescents in a youth offending service in the United Kingdom. *Youth Justice*, DOI: 1473225414543484.

- Ghetti, S., & Redlich, A. D. (2001). Reactions to youth crime: Perceptions of accountability and competency. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 19(1), 33-52.
- Goidel, R. K., Freeman, C. M., & Procopio, S. T. (2006). The impact of television viewing on perceptions of juvenile crime. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 50(1), 119-139.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B., & Mcpherson, W. (2004). Variables affecting successful reintegration as perceived by offenders and professionals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(1-2), 147-171.
- Hardcastle, L., Bartholomew, T., & Graffam, J. (2011). Legislative and community support for offender reintegration in Victoria. *Deakin Law Review.*, 16, 111.
- Hirschfield, P. J., & Piquero, A. R. (2010). Normalization and legitimation: modelling stigmatizing attitudes towards ex-offenders. *Criminology*, 48(1), 27-55.
- Jackson, D. B., & Hay, C. (2013). The conditional impact of official labeling on subsequent delinquency considering the attenuating role of family attachment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 50(2), 300-322.
- Kumar, A., Hessini, L., & Mitchell, E. M. (2009). Conceptualising abortion stigma. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 11(6), 625-639.
- LeBel, T. P. (2011). If One Doesn't Get You Another One Will: Formerly Incarcerated Persons' Perceptions of Discrimination. *The Prison Journal*, DOI: 0032885511429243.
- Leverentz, A. (2011). Neighborhood context of attitudes toward crime and reentry. *Punishment & Society*, 13(1), 64-92.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual review of Sociology*, 363-385.
- Lyons, C. J. (2006). Stigma or sympathy? Attributions of fault to hate crime victims and offenders. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(1), 39-59.

- Mashek, D., Meyer, P., McGrath, J., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. P. (2002). *Inmate Perceptions and Expectations of Stigma (IPES)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Massey, E. K., Gebhardt, W. A., & Garnefski, N. (2008). Adolescent goal content and pursuit: A review of the literature from the past 16 years. *Developmental Review*, 28(4), 421-460.
- McGrath, A. (2009). Offenders' perceptions of the sentencing process: a study of deterrence and stigmatisation in the New South Wales Children's Court. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 42(1), 24-46.
- McGrath, A. J. (2014). The Subjective Impact of Contact With the Criminal Justice System The Role of Gender and Stigmatization. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(6), 884-908.
- Mears, D. P., Pickett, J. T., & Mancini, C. (2015). Support for balanced juvenile justice: Assessing views about youth, rehabilitation, and punishment. *Journal of quantitative criminology*, 31(3), 459-479.
- Mela, M., & Luther, G. (2013). Fetal alcohol spectrum disorder: Can diminished responsibility diminish criminal behaviour?. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 36(1), 46-54.
- Ministry of Justice (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/types-of-offender/juveniles>
- Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., & Stewart, L. A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic reviews*, 4(1), 1.
- Moses, T. (2009). Self-labeling and its effects among adolescents diagnosed with mental disorders. *Social science & medicine*, 68(3), 570-578.
- Nagin, D. S., Piquero, A. R., Scott, E. S., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Public preferences for rehabilitation versus incarceration of juvenile offenders: Evidence from a contingent valuation survey. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(4), 627-651.

- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American journal of sociology*, 108(5), 937-975.
- Peterson, R. A. (2001). On the use of college students in social science research: Insights from a second-order meta-analysis. *Journal of consumer research*, 28(3), 450-461.
- Piquero, A. R., Cullen, F. T., Unnever, J. D., Piquero, N. L., & Gordon, J. A. (2010). Never too late. Public optimism about juvenile rehabilitation. *Punishment & Society*, 12(2), 187-207.
- Piquero, A. R., & Steinberg, L. (2010). Public preferences for rehabilitation versus incarceration of juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 1-6.
- Puhl, R. M., & Latner, J. D. (2007). Stigma, obesity, and the health of the nation's children. *Psychological bulletin*, 133(4), 557.
- Reynolds, N., Craig, L. A., & Boer, D. P. (2013). Public attitudes towards offending, offenders and reintegration. *Public Opinion Criminal Justice: Context, Practice and Values*, 166.
- Roberts, J. V. (1992). Public opinion, crime, and criminal justice. *Crime and justice*, 99-180.
- Roberts, J., & Hough, M. (2005). Sentencing young offenders: Public opinion in England and Wales. *Criminal Justice*, 5(3), 211-232.
- Sander, J. B., Sharkey, J. D., Olivarri, R., Tanigawa, D. A., & Mauseth, T. (2010). A qualitative study of juvenile offenders, student engagement, and interpersonal relationships: Implications for research directions and preventionist approaches. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(4), 288-315.
- Schwalbe, C. S., Ibrahim, R. W., Brewer, K. B., MacKenzie, M. J., & Gearing, R. E. (2013). Is program structure related to stigma and community acceptance of justice-involved adolescents?. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35(5), 871-876.
- Scott, E. S., Reppucci, N. D., Antonishak, J., & DeGennaro, J. T. (2006). Public attitudes about the culpability and punishment of young offenders. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, 24(6), 815-832.

- Scott, E. S., & Steinberg, L. (2003). Blaming youth. *Texas Law Review*, 81, 799.
- Schwartz, I. M., Guo, S., & Kerbs, J. J. (1993). The impact of demographic variables on public opinion regarding juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(1), 5-28.
- Sprott, J. B. (1996). Understanding Public Views of Youth Crime and Youth Justice System. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 38, 271.
- Tyndall, J. (2010). AACODS checklist. Adelaide Flinders University.
- Varma, K. N. (2006). Face-ing the Offender: Examining Public Attitudes Towards Young Offenders 1. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9(2), 175-187.
- Walby, S., Allen, J., & Simmons, J. (2004). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.