

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
<b>Early Intervention</b>					
Combined high quality day care, preschool programme and family support services	Reduced incidence and seriousness of offending	Meta-analysis (Karoly et al 1998)	Treatment vs control group		
Syracuse Study - Home visits and day care – prenatal to age 5	6% of participant children referred to probation vs 22% of control group	Single study of 108 families (Greenwood et al 1998)	Treatment vs control group and ten year follow up		
<b>Interventions for at-risk youth</b>					
Job Corp - Training and counselling services, including academic education, vocational training, health care and education, recreation and job placements	Reduced likelihood of arrest, conviction, incarceration and smaller number of reported arrests and convictions	Several evaluations of Job Corp (Karoly 2003)	Randomised control trials	Job Corp is a residential programme (i.e. participants based in campuses)	
Quantum Opportunities Programme – educational incentives	Significantly increased graduation rates and reduced crime; observed arrests for participants three tenths that of control group	Single study of QOP (Karoly 2003; Feinstein and Sabates 2005)	Treatment vs control groups		
Educational Maintenance Allowance – post 16-education participation incentive	Juvenile crime reduction, reduced male conviction rates for burglary and theft	Single study of EMAs (Feinstein and Sabates 2005)	Comparison between EMA areas vs non-EMA areas	Did not have strong effect on reduction of serious crime	

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
<b>Coercive Interventions</b>					
Anti-Social Behaviour Orders – targeted prohibition	In terms of breaches of ASBOs, out of 40 people given an order, 36% breached it, and 30% committed further offences by follow up	Review of ASBOs (Campbell 2002)	Wide-ranging Home Office review including observation, statistics, follow-up to assess breach of ASBOs	Limited value of findings due to lack of control groups, longer –term follow up, small sample size, controlling for other variables	
Incarceration, imprisonment, ‘scared straight’ interventions	Nil or negative effect on reducing recidivism	Meta-analysis (Prior and Paris 2005; YJB 2001)	Treatment vs control groups		
<b>Developmental Interventions</b>					
Cognitive behavioural approaches	One of the most effective interventions to reduce recidivism (up to 40% reduction rate)	Meta-analysis (Lipsey and Wilson 1998; Lipsey 2000)	Treatment vs control groups		
Cognitive Behavioural approaches	Significant but inconclusive finding: 20% reduction in recidivism	National Evaluation of YJB programmes, UK (Feilzer, 2004)	Recorded observations without control groups	Evaluation not Methodologically rigorous	
Individual counselling, behavioural programmes and inter personal skills training	Each type of intervention shown to reduce recidivism by about 40%	Meta-analysis of interventions to reduce recidivism (Lipsey and Wilson, 1998)	Treatment vs. control groups		

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
Family-based interventions – including multi-systemic therapy and parenting training	Significant reduction in the risk of juveniles (aged 10-17 years) being re-arrested on to three years after completion of the programme (family & parenting interventions)	Meta-analysis (Woolfenden et al 2004)	Randomised control trials (749 aged 10-17 years)	Also found to have a positive effect in reducing sibling delinquency	
Intensive Fostering	Reduced offending and less serious offences committed. However, after 12 months sample reconviction level similar to control group but more likely to be in education, employment or training	(Ross et all, 2011)	Sample vs control group (12 month follow up)		Data limitation prevented a full cost benefit analysis to be undertaken but analysis suggests social care savings
Restorative justice – including Family Group Conferencing	E.g. 75% success rate for those cases where only one offence under consideration with Referral Orders, but findings inconclusive due to lack of control groups or comparability to other reconviction studies	National evaluations – Home Office and YJB (Prior and Paris, 2005; Kurki, 2000)	Recorded observations without control groups	In New Zealand, for example, FGC found not to meet needs of offenders, especially in mental health, drug and alcohol abuse, managing anger, interpersonal relations, or educational opportunities amongst others (Maxwell and Morris, 2006)	

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
Restorative justice (RJ)	Reduced frequency of reconviction on average by 27%. No significant difference between RJ and control groups in terms of severity of reconviction	Meta-analysis (Ross et al, 2011)	Comparison between study groups (RJ) and controls	Most rigorous evaluation studied RJ across 18-59 and found no significant effect of age on findings	For every £1 spent on RJ conferences £9 saved on lowering cost of offending (not age specific)
Halt Scheme – Restorative justice process in the Netherlands	Over 60% of participants reduced re-offending or cease to offend altogether, vs. 25% less offending in comparison group	Single study of intervention (Coester, 2002)	Comparison of HALT pilot group with non-HALT group	Evaluations with control/comparison groups can no longer be conducted due to national roll-out of scheme	
KrAmi Programme – educational and vocational training for offending youth and adults in Sweden	Increased participation in labour force and decreased incidence of self-reported criminal activity, but findings inconclusive due to short time-span for follow up, unreliability of self-report results, and lack of control group	Single study of intervention (Nyostrom, 2003)	Evaluation of participant outcomes, and comparison with on-KrAmi group		
Dundee Families Project – individual and couple counselling, family support and group work (to avoid eviction or be restored to satisfactory tenancy arrangements)	59% of active cases deemed a success (no longer homeless or at severe risk of homelessness as a result of anti-social behaviour)	Single study of intervention (Dillane et al, 2001)	Qualitative analysis. Sample of families (31 parents and 22 children) interviewed after a 12 month period	No control group and small numbers	£117,600 savings per year for project agencies

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
Family Recovery Programme – ‘whole family’ approach aimed at causes rather than symptoms of entrenched social problems (e.g. ASB)	48% of neighbours reported a reduction in ASB after families registered with programme	Single study of intervention (Westminster City Council, 2010)	Evaluation of participant outcomes (50 families). Research compares data at start and finish of project	No control group and small numbers	Estimated £1.45m costs avoided
Intensive Intervention Projects for Young People (intensive family support model applied to address the behaviour and other problems of young people)	60% of young people had fewer crime and ASB issues (based on 790 young people who had exited the program or had been working with it for at least 8 months)	National evaluation of 20 projects (Lloyd et al, 2011)	Evaluation of participant outcomes. Research compares data at start and finish of project and uses logical regression to explore factors associated with successful/unsuccessful outcomes	No control group and no follow up after exiting programme	
Monitoring and evaluation of family intervention services and projects between 2007 and 2011	81% families had crime/ASB problems at start of referral but only 34% at exit  71% of families sustained positive crime/ASB outcomes 14 months after intervention	National evaluation of 3,675 families (between 2007-2011) exited programme (Lloyd et al, 2011)	Evaluation of participant outcomes (470 families) compared with control group (56 families with similar problems). Uses logical regression to explore factors associated with successful/unsuccessful outcomes. Results should be treated with caution because of small size of the control sample	Study also identified factors more likely to influence success (higher levels of crime & ASB at start of intervention/longer intervention) and less likely to influence success (greater number of risk factors/any child subject to a child protection plan/more hours of support per week)	

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
<b>Situational and Diversionary Interventions</b>					
Improved street lighting	20% reduction of recorded crime	Systematic review of evaluations (Farrington and Welsh 2002)	Rigorously selected evaluations which included outcome measures for crime and before and after data in experimental and control areas	Other positive outcomes include increased community cohesion and social control	
After school patrols (aimed at ASB at school closing on school bus routes and transport inter-changes)	No evidence of intervention impacts only monitoring information on number of young people reached	(Ross et al, 2011)	N/A	N/A	
Operation Stay Safe	Remove vulnerable young people from the streets late at night and take them to a designated safe place	No evaluations identified. Only monitoring service data (Ross et al, 2011)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Street Team	Tackling ASB by engaging disaffected young people on the streets and diverting them in to positive activities, training and support				
Open Drive	Activities available to young people when most needed (Friday and Saturday night)				

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP)	Reduction in frequency, rate and gravity of offences for young people engaged in programme	Single observational study (Ross et al, 2011)	Targeted 8-19 year olds at risk of social exclusion, committing crime/victims of crime		
Contribution of organised youth sport on anti-social behaviour and personal behaviour of adolescent athletes	8% variance in adolescents in a sporting environment	Multi-level regression analysis (Rutten et al, 2007)	Evaluation of 260 male and female adolescent (12-18 years) football players/competitive swimmers	Good relationship with coaches reduced ASB	
<p>Positive Futures evaluation:</p> <p>Westminster project - sports based arts and sports activities targeted at 8-19 year olds in deprived wards</p> <p>Babergh District Council (access to tailored sports and leisure activities)</p> <p>Solihull (mobile activity sessions in hotspots; sporting &amp; learning opportunities; holiday activity programmed; work training programme)</p>	<p>Westminster project - 50% reduction in youth crime (2006)</p> <p>Babergh District Council – reported reduction in ASB in 2 areas targeted</p> <p>Solihull – 11% crime reduction in neighbourhood targeted</p>	Observational studies of 3 national pilot sites (Sports England, 2008)	Recorded observations without control groups and follow up		

Appendix One - Evidence Review of Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions (May 2015)

Type of Intervention	Positive outcomes	Type of study	Evaluation	Other observations	Cost Benefit Analysis
Impact of physical activity	Sports participation shown to be associated with less anti-social behaviours such as drinking alcohol, use of illicit drugs, and engagement in violent activities	Meta-analysis (Jones-Palm et al, 2004)			