



Do offender characteristics affect the impact of short custodial sentences and court orders on reoffending?

Joseph Hillier and Aidan Mews
Analytical Services, Ministry of Justice

Custodial sentences of under 12 months without supervision on release are associated with higher levels of reoffending than sentences served in the community via 'court orders' (community orders and suspended sentence orders). This report examines whether this impact differs according to offenders' age, ethnicity, gender, and mental health. It also provides further analysis on the reoffending impact of suspended sentence orders compared with similar cases where community orders were given, whether the impacts vary according to the number of previous offences, and the impacts of mental health and alcohol treatment requirements.

Key findings

- Reductions in reoffending were associated with the use of court orders as compared with short-term custody. These effects:
 - Were greater for people with larger numbers of previous offences. For people with no previous offences, there was no statistically significant difference between the reoffending associated with short-term custody and that associated with court orders.
 - Differed according to an offender's age group, after controlling for the number of previous offences. The use of court orders was associated with relatively more benefit for those aged 18–20 and those over 50, and less benefit for those aged 21–29.
 - Differed according to identification of mental health issues, after controlling for the number of previous offences. The use of court orders was associated with more benefit for offenders with 'significant' psychiatric problems and those with current or pending psychiatric treatment.
 - Were similar across ethnic groups and for both males and females, after controlling for the number of previous offences.
- For those with identified mental health issues, mental health treatment requirements attached to court orders were associated with significant reductions in reoffending where they were used, compared with similar cases where they were not. The reoffending rate was around 3.5 percentage points lower over a one-year follow-up period.
- For those with identified alcohol use issues, alcohol treatment requirements were associated with similar or slightly lower reoffending where they were used compared with similar cases where they were not.
- Suspended sentence orders were associated with a reduced rate of reoffending (over a one year follow-up period) of around 4 percentage points compared with similar cases where community orders were given, with a smaller impact over longer follow-up periods. Suspended sentence orders were associated with more benefit in reducing reoffending as age increased and less benefit as the number of previous offences increased.

The views expressed in this Analytical Summary are those of the author, not necessarily those of the Ministry of Justice (nor do they reflect Government policy).



Background

Community orders and suspended sentence orders (collectively referred to in this report as 'court orders') are both sentences served in the community (see Criminal Justice Act, 2003; for a summary of these sentence options see the 'Key terms' section at the end of this report). Court orders represented just over 12% of all adult sentences imposed in 2014 in England and Wales.¹

Matching offenders given 'short' custodial sentences (under 12 months) without supervision on release² with those given court orders suggests that short-term custody is associated with higher levels of reoffending (Mews et al., 2015). While still present over a five-year follow-up period, the difference in binary reoffending outcomes (commonly known as the 'reoffending rate') seems to reduce year on year. An initial analysis (Ibid.) suggested that the beneficial reoffending impact of community and suspended sentence orders as compared with short-term custody was higher for people with more previous offences.

Different offender groups

Although the reoffending impact of short-term custody compared with court orders has been much analysed at an aggregate level, there is a lack of information relating to the impact for different types of offenders. Such information may be useful for identifying groups particularly at risk of reoffending.

Demographic characteristics of particular interest in the wider criminological literature (and for which data are held) include age, ethnicity, and gender. Mental health is also of interest, as evidence suggests that mental illness is more prevalent among offenders than the general population (see Ministry of Justice, 2013), yet relatively little is known about the reoffending outcomes of those with mental health issues.

Some limited information is available about the reoffending characteristics of these groups overall. National statistics of one year proven reoffending rates (Ministry of Justice 2014, 2015), indicate:

- Females re-offend less than males overall. Of those who were released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, or received a caution during the year ending June 2013, 18% of females re-offended, compared with 27% of males.

- Younger people re-offend more than older people overall. Of those who were released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, or received a caution during the year ending June 2013, 27% of those between 21 and 24 years old re-offended, compared with 13% of those aged 50 years or more.
- There is little difference between the reoffending of White and Black offenders overall, with Black offenders reoffending slightly more on average. Asian offenders re-offend slightly less on average than other ethnic groups. Of those who were released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, or received a caution during the year ending December 2012, 28% of Black offenders re-offended, compared with 26% of White offenders and 20% of Asian offenders.

These figures do not control for other differences that may be a factor in reoffending (such as the number of previous offences), and so may not be comparing offenders on a like-for-like basis. They therefore provide no indication of the potential impact of particular sentences for these groups of offenders.

Aims of current analysis

This report explores the reoffending impact of short-term custodial and court order sentences on different groups of offenders using data from 2008–11, asking whether the reoffending impact differs according to age, ethnicity, gender, and identified mental health issues. It also further extends previous analyses in two ways. Firstly, it uses all four years' data to look at reoffending impact according to the number of previous offences, which previous analyses suggested might be an important factor in reoffending impacts (Mews et al., 2015). Secondly, it examines the overall reoffending impacts of community orders compared with suspended sentence orders using the more thorough matching process used to compare short-term custodial and court order sentences (Mews et al., 2015).³

Methodology

Reoffending datasets were used in the analysis, containing details of adult offenders released from a custodial sentence of under 12 months or commencing a court order in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Unless otherwise stated, this report used all years in the

¹ 144,156 of 1,177,681 adult sentences; <<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2014>>

² Supervision on release is now provided for those given short custodial sentences (Offender Rehabilitation Act, 2014). Reoffending data for this cohort are not yet available.

³ Previous analysis has indicated that suspended sentence orders were associated with reduced reoffending (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

analysis, generating a large sample size (almost 780,000 records). Following linking with DWP / HMRC records where possible⁴ and matching to fully completed Offender Assessment System (OASys) records, around 353,000 offence-level records remained for analysis. Although over half the records were discarded, previous analyses indicate that this had little impact on the results of comparisons between short-term custody and court orders and between suspended sentence orders and community orders, suggesting the findings in this report are broadly representative.

Propensity Score Matching (PSM) was used to generate datasets of similar offenders given short-term custody, community orders and/or suspended sentence orders, using around 130 variables as set out in Mews et al. (2015). These included demographic information, offending history, employment history and OASys variables.⁵ Any requirements attached as part of court orders were also used in the matching for the suspended sentence orders versus community orders analyses. The (treatment group) numbers in these datasets of similar offenders given short-term custody, community orders and/or suspended sentence orders are shown in Table 1, with breakdowns by previous offending, age, ethnicity, gender and mental health.

Additional matched datasets were produced for examining the reoffending of female offenders, offenders identified as having mental health issues (through OASys) to look at Mental Health Treatment Requirements, and offenders identified as having alcohol use issues (through OASys) to look at Alcohol Treatment Requirements. The purpose of this separate matching was to generate new impact figures for wider use. For the remaining analyses, it was only necessary to test for differences between the groups to answer the research aims. Logistic regression analyses were therefore performed using the overall matched datasets to further examine the impacts of different sentences on groups differentiated by age, ethnicity, gender, and mental health issues.

Epanechnikov Kernel matching was used in the PSM, with a bandwidth of 0.03 for all comparisons apart from one involving the addition of mental health treatment requirements (for which a bandwidth of 0.06 was favoured as this improved the quality of matching). None

of the standardised (mean) differences were above 5 and very low numbers of the treatment groups were lost in the matching (less than 1% in all comparisons). This suggests that the matching process created well-balanced and representative groups.

As highlighted in previous analyses, reoffending varies according to offender history (i.e. offenders with a large number of previous offences have a higher rate of proven reoffending), and the impacts of the different sentences also depend on offender history. Because of this, the logistic regression analyses reported in this report include controlling for previous offences to take account of the different offending profiles of each group.⁶

Reoffending was mostly examined over a one-year follow-up period, with a further six months allowed for cases to go through the courts (following analytical guidelines; Ministry of Justice, 2012). For the suspended sentence order versus community order analysis, longer follow-up periods were used (e.g. the 2008 cohort was examined over five years) to give a longer-term view. Cautions and convictions constitute reoffending. The follow-up period for reoffending starts from sentencing for community and suspended sentences and from prison release for the custodial sentences, thereby taking into account time spent in the community.

This method raises a number of points to consider when interpreting results:

- In order to explore mental health issues, the analysis used variables in the OASys reports relating to mental health. While the reports are completed by (non-medical) professionals, the variables provide only a rough impression of mental health issues. The reliability, accuracy and consistency of the mental health variables are not known. Because of this, special care should be taken when interpreting the mental health-related results.
- Similarly, while data on alcohol consumption is available from OASys, this is based on official records and/or the offender's self-report. As above, the reliability, accuracy and consistency of these variables are not known, meaning care should be taken when interpreting the alcohol treatment-related results.

⁴ These enabled the use of employment and benefit variables in the analysis. For more details of the DWP / HMRC data, see <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/experimental-statistics-from-the-2013-moj-dwp-hmrc-data-share>

⁵ OASys reports completed up to 30 days before / after the conviction date were used. Where two or more complete OASys reports were available for a single case, preference was given to the one closest to the conviction date.

⁶ A sensitivity analysis was performed controlling for additional variables, which showed very similar results. For ease of interpretation we therefore present the findings only controlling for previous offences.

- Reoffending alone is a narrow measure of impact, and subject to limitations – for example, it only accounts for proven offences (those detected by police and admitted by offenders / proven in court).
- Logistic regression models demonstrate association between factors, but cannot determine cause and effect.
- Since February 2015 there have been changes in the way community sentences have been delivered, due to Transforming Rehabilitation reforms. At the heart of the reforms is the extension of supervision to offenders who are released from short-term custody. Such changes may reduce the gap in reoffending outcomes between short-term custody and court orders for certain types of offender.

Despite every care being taken in the matching process and the large number of variables used, it is not possible to discount completely the influence of an unmeasured factor that has not been controlled for. For a more detailed discussion of general limitations of PSM in this context, see Mews et al. (2015).

Results

Suspended sentence orders and community orders (All offenders)

Sentencers may order short custodial sentences to be served in the community ('suspended'), with imprisonment brought into effect if reoffending occurs or conditions of the court's order are breached. Suspended sentence orders were associated with a statistically significant reduction in reoffending compared with similar cases where community orders were given (Table 2). The proven reoffending rate was around 4 percentage points lower over a one-year follow-up period.

Looking at the 2008 cohort only, this difference reduced slightly to 2.4 percentage points over three years follow-up, and to 2 percentage points over five years follow-up (Table 3). Over five years, 67% of those given suspended sentence orders and 69% of those given community orders re-offended. Most of those who went on to re-offend over the five years did so in the first year for both sentences (Table 4).

The analysis showed a reduction in the difference between proven reoffending rates over time, similar to previous studies (e.g. Mews et al., 2015). Unlike in previous studies, however, the impact in terms of the average number of re-offences per re-offender decreased rather than increased over time. Suspended sentence orders resulted in 0.18 fewer re-offences per re-offender after one year and 0.11 fewer re-offences per

re-offender after five years. There is no clear explanation for this effect from the data alone.

It is notable that for these court order analyses there was no statistically significant difference between the results when OASys variables were included in the Propensity Score Matching process and when they were not. This finding contrasts with analyses involving comparisons of short-term custody with court orders, where significant differences were found (Mews et al., 2015). A possible explanation would be that comparisons between community orders and suspended sentence orders involve more similar offenders than do comparisons between short-term custody and court orders.

Previous offences

While previous research has shown overall higher levels of reoffending associated with short-term custody compared with court orders, there was considerable variation according to the number of previous offences (Mews et al., 2015). The relative effectiveness of court orders in reducing reoffending compared with short-term custody was greater when offenders had committed more previous offences. This pattern was replicated by the present analysis (using a greater amount of data than previously), and remained evident when examining the impact of short-term custody compared with community orders and suspended sentence orders separately. This can be seen by the odds ratios provided in Table 6, which show that:

- For those with no previous offences, there was no statistically significant difference in the odds of reoffending where short-term custody rather than a court order was given.
- For those with more than 50 previous offences, the odds of reoffending were 36% *higher* where short-term custody rather than a court order was given.

The court order was, therefore, associated with similar reoffending outcomes to short-term custody for those with no previous offences, and had benefits for those with a large number of previous offences.

The reoffending impact of suspended sentence orders as compared with community orders also varied according to the number of previous offences (see Table 6). Suspended sentence orders were associated with lower levels of reoffending than community orders in general, and were most effective for those with no previous offences, and least effective for those with large numbers of previous offences.

- For those with no previous offences, the odds of reoffending were 27% lower where a suspended

sentence order rather than a community order was given.

- For those with more than 50 previous offences, the odds of reoffending were 9% lower where a suspended sentence order rather than a community order was given.

Table 5 includes more information about the logit model estimates from which the odds ratios in Table 6 are calculated.

*Age*⁷

Using short-term custody rather than court orders was least effective in reducing reoffending for the youngest and oldest age groups (18–20 and 50 and over) and most effective for those aged 21 to 29. This pattern remained the same when examining the impact of short-term custody compared with community orders and suspended sentence orders separately.

The level of the effects for particular age groups varied according to offending history (as shown by the variation in the estimated previous offending by treatment interaction coefficients provided in Table 7). **Among those with no previous offences**, the odds of reoffending where short-term custody rather than a court order was given were (as shown by the odds ratios in Table 8):

- 7% lower for 18–20-year-olds,
- around 22% lower for 21–49-year-olds, and
- 6% higher for those over 50.

In contrast, **among those with more than 50 previous offences**, the odds of reoffending where short-term custody rather than a court order was given were (Table 8):

- 50% higher for 18–20-year-olds,
- around 27% higher for 21–49-year-olds, and
- 72% higher for those over 50.

Amongst court orders, the relative effectiveness of suspended sentence orders in reducing reoffending compared with community orders broadly increased with age (as shown by Table 8). The level again varied according to offending history. **Among those with no previous offences**, the odds of reoffending where a suspended sentence order rather than a community order was given were:

- 22% lower for 18–20-year-olds,
- around 26% lower for 21–49-year-olds, and
- 36% lower for those over 50.

Among those with more than 50 previous offences, the odds of reoffending where a suspended sentence order rather than a community order was given were:

- 4% lower for 18–20-year-olds ,
- around 10% lower for 21–49-year-olds, and
- 22% lower for those over 50.

Ethnicity

Regression analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant effect of ethnicity (comparing Asian, Black, and other ethnicity offenders with White offenders as the reference category) on the reoffending impact of short-term custody compared to court orders, after controlling for offender history (see Table 9, which shows the logit model estimates including the significance of the ethnicity by treatment interaction effects). This was also the case when examining the impact of short-term custody compared with community orders and suspended sentence orders separately, and the impact of suspended sentence orders compared with community orders.

Gender

Similar to findings for the overall offender population (Mews et al., 2015), for female offenders short-term custody is associated with statistically significant higher levels of reoffending compared to court orders (see Table 10). There was around 5 percentage points increased incidence of reoffending over a one-year follow-up period.

Regression analysis indicated that there was no significant effect of gender on the reoffending impact of short-term custody compared to court orders (considered altogether, or with community orders and suspended sentence orders separately) or on the reoffending impact of suspended sentence orders compared to community orders, after controlling for offender history (see Table 11, which shows the logit model estimates including the significance of the gender by treatment interaction effects).

Mental health

As noted above, there are relatively few variables in the OASys data that flag mental health issues and their

⁷ Age was examined as a categorical variable. As noted above, offender history was controlled for, so does not confound the analysis.

reliability is not known, so findings in this section should be interpreted with caution.

Regression analysis indicated statistically significant effects of mental health on the reoffending impact of short-term custody compared to court orders (see Tables 12 to 14, which show the logit model estimates including the significance of the mental health by treatment interaction effects). The relative effectiveness of court orders (regardless of whether considered altogether or separately as community orders and suspended sentence orders) in reducing reoffending compared with short-term custody was greater for those with identified mental health issues (as shown by the odds ratios provided in Table 15). In particular:

- **Among those with no previous offences**, the odds of reoffending for those assessed to have 'significant' current psychiatric problems were 11% higher where short-term custody rather than a court order was given, compared to 10% lower for those assessed to have no current psychiatric problems.

Again for those with no previous offences, the odds of reoffending for those assessed to have current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending were 5% higher where short-term custody rather than a court order was given, compared to 10% lower for those assessed not to have current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending.

- **Among those with more than 50 previous offences**, the odds of reoffending for those assessed to have 'significant' current psychiatric problems were 67% higher where short-term custody rather than a court order was given, compared to 34% higher for those assessed to have no current psychiatric problems.

Again for those with more than 50 previous offences, the odds of reoffending for those assessed to have current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending were 58% higher where short-term custody rather than a court order was given, compared to 34% higher for those assessed not to have current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending.

For those with identified mental health issues, mental health treatment requirements were associated with significant reductions in reoffending where they were used compared with similar cases where they were not (Table 16). Over a one-year follow-up period, there was a reduction of around 3.5 percentage points in the incidence of reoffending where such requirements were used as part of a community order, and of around 5 percentage points when use as part of a suspended sentence order.

Alcohol use

For those with identified alcohol misuse issues, alcohol treatment requirements were associated with similar or slightly lower reoffending where they were used compared with similar cases where they were not (Table 17). Over a one year follow-up period, the binary reoffending rates were similar where such requirements were used as part of a community order or suspended sentence order. The number of reoffences per offender was also similar where such requirements were used as part of a suspended sentence order, but was lower by 0.08 where such requirements were used as part of a community order.

Conclusions

This analysis shows that the impact of court orders in reducing reoffending compared with short-term custody (with no supervision on release) increases with the number of previous offences. For those with no previous offences, reoffending was lower where short-term custody rather than a court order was given, although this was not statistically significant. In contrast, reoffending was around the same or higher for those with at least one previous offence. The odds of reoffending for those with more than 50 previous offences (i.e. the more prolific offenders) were around a third higher where short-term custody rather than a court order was given.

It is unclear from the data alone why such effects are apparent, but they may indicate diminishing returns of the potential 'short shock' deterrence that may be associated with short-term custody as offenders become more acclimatised to the criminal justice system. This is supported by the finding that suspended sentence orders (which carry the threat of custody) were also relatively more effective in reducing reoffending, as the number of previous offences decreased compared to similar cases where community orders were used.

It is also possible that there is some complex interaction between the number of previous offences, the type of qualifying offence recorded and reoffending that renders these analyses too simplistic. However, re-running the regression analyses additionally controlling for the type of qualifying offence did not alter the results.

After controlling for the number of previous offences, there was no significant effect of ethnicity or gender on the reoffending impact of short-term custody compared to court orders (or of suspended sentence orders compared to community orders). This means that the reoffending benefits of court orders compared to short-term custody can be considered equal across these groups.

These findings imply parity in sentencing outcomes that may initially be seen to contradict previous work emphasising particular groups' vulnerabilities. For example, a number of reports have noted disproportionate effects of prison on women (e.g. Corston, 2007). The present report found no difference in impact based on gender, but only focused on a relatively narrow outcome and sentencing context. For example, there was no examination of impacts according to whether the offender did or did not have children, or whether domestic abuse victimisation was a factor in the offence, and reoffending was the only outcome measure used. This approach may, therefore, tend to mask wider inequalities identified by other studies.

Differences in reoffending impact were found on the basis of age after controlling for the number of previous offences: the youngest and oldest age groupings benefited particularly from the use of court orders compared to short-term custody. In contrast to the short-term custody versus court orders comparisons, the impact of suspended sentence orders in reducing reoffending as compared with community orders generally increased with age.

Again, it is not possible from the data alone to fully explain these findings. One potential explanation, however, may be that aspects of the prison environment may affect the age groups differently, which could account for the effects seen. Similarly, the positive effects of an offender being with their family (which may be increased for court orders relative to custodial sentences) may be particularly influential at certain ages. Further work would be necessary to provide clarity in this area.

Differences in impact were also found on the basis of mental health – those assessed as having significant psychiatric problems or current or pending psychiatric treatment benefited particularly from the use of court orders compared to short-term custody after controlling for the number of previous offences. (There was no evidence of differential benefit from suspended sentence orders as compared with community orders.) While these data are associated with substantial caveats, the analysis indicates that again there may be particular consequences of the prison and/or community environment for this group in terms of their reoffending (it should be reiterated that this study has not looked at other outcomes which may be relevant, such as those related to health). For instance, part of the difference might be explained by treatment available in the community compared to that available in custody, and the effects of custody and community sentencing on treatment compliance. Compliance with treatment

regimes may also be affected by formal sanctions for non-compliance via mental health treatment requirements.

Findings on mental health treatment requirements presented above provide further information about their effectiveness. Previous studies have found insufficient evidence to determine the impact on reoffending of mental health treatment requirements (e.g. Ministry of Justice, 2013). Despite the limitations of the data, analysis reported in the present report provides an initial indication that mental health treatment requirements can be effective in reducing reoffending.

Alcohol treatments requirements were found to be associated with similar or slightly lower reoffending where they were used for those with alcohol misuse issues. However, focusing on reoffending as a sole impact measure for these cases does not take account of the potential wider benefits of the programmes on offender health through the reduction of alcohol consumption. Therefore, while the results have a positive, albeit small, impact overall in reducing future criminality (and are in-line with the wider evidence base on the effectiveness of alcohol treatment; e.g. Baldwin & Duffy, 2010; McSweeney & Bhardwa, 2011; Ralstrick et al. 2006) there may also be wider impacts that, while positive for the offenders and wider society, are not the focus of the present study.

Key terms

<i>Community order</i>	A sentence carried out in the community, subject to conditions. Breach can lead to the order being revoked and the offender being resentenced.
<i>Propensity Score Matching</i>	A technique for generating comparison groups by identifying those with a similar likelihood of receiving treatment based on observed characteristics, but where some were treated and others were not.
<i>Reoffending</i>	A proven conviction or caution, measured by either frequency or rate (i.e. whether an offender re-offends or not).
<i>Short-term custody</i>	A prison sentence of under 12 months. Offenders sentenced to custody are usually released from prison at the halfway point of their sentence. Following the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014, adults released from a short custodial sentence are now subject to supervision on release (supervision was not available for the cohort analysed in this report).
<i>Suspended sentence order</i>	Where a prison sentence between 14 days and 2 years (6 months in a magistrates' court) is suspended for up to 2 years. This means that the offender does not go to prison immediately, but is given an opportunity to stay out of trouble and to comply with requirements which the court may impose on an offender. If the requirements are breached, the offender will be sent to prison unless there are strong mitigating reasons.

Corston, J. (2007). *The Corston Report: A review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the Criminal Justice System.* London: Home Office.

McSweeney, T. & Bhardwa, B. (2011). *The impact and delivery of alcohol treatment requirements in the Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust area.* London: Institute for Criminal Policy Research. Available online
<<http://www.icpr.org.uk/media/31437/LRPT%20ATR%20summary.pdf>>

Mews, A., Hillier, J., McHugh, M. and Coxon, C., (2015). *The impact of short custodial sentences, community orders and suspended sentence orders on reoffending.* Ministry of Justice. Available online
<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399389/impact-of-short-custodial-sentences-on-reoffending.PDF>

Ministry of Justice (2012). *Proven reoffending statistics: definitions and measurement.* London: Ministry of Justice. Available online
<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/192407/proven-reoffending-definitions-measurement.pdf>

Ministry of Justice (2013). *Transforming Rehabilitation: a summary of evidence on reducing reoffending.* Available online
<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/243718/evidence-reduce-reoffending.pdf>

Ministry of Justice (2014). *Proven reoffending (January 12-December 12).* Available online
<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/368424/annex-c-proven-reoffending-jan12-dec12-tables.xls>

Ministry of Justice (2015). *Proven-reoffending (July 2012-June 2013).* Available online
<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/424827/proven-reoffending-jul12-jun13-tables.xls>

Ralstrick, D., Heather, N. & Godfrey, C. (2006). *Review of the effectiveness of treatment for alcohol problems.* National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse. Available online:
<http://www.nta.nhs.uk/uploads/nta_review_of_the_effectiveness_of_treatment_for_alcohol_problems_fullreport_2006_alcohol2.pdf>

References

Baldwin, H. & Duffy, P. (2010). *Evaluation of the alcohol treatment requirement in five sites across the Lancashire Probation Area.* Liverpool: Centre for Public Health. Available online <<http://www.cph.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/evaluation-of-the-alcohol-treatment-requirement-in-five-sites-across-the-lancashire-probation-area.pdf>>

Appendix A: Results

For all tables, **STC = Short-term custody, CO = Court orders, SSO = Suspended sentence orders, COM = Community orders, Sig = significance level (<0.05 interpreted as 'statistically significant')**. Binary = the proportion of offenders who re-offend; Freq = the number of re-offences per offender

Table 1: Treatment group numbers for the matched STC-CO, STC-COM, STC-SSO and SSO-COM comparisons with breakdown by previous offending, age, ethnicity, gender, and mental health

Characteristic	STC vs. CO	STC vs. COM	STC vs. SSO	SSO vs. COM
All Treatment	48,509	48,426	48,323	96,656
<i>Previous Offences</i>				
None	1,251	1,250	1,250	8,138
1–2	1,589	1,589	1,589	9,680
3–5	2,458	2,458	2,458	11,068
6–10	4,508	4,506	4,506	13,609
11–15	4,595	4,596	4,592	9,700
16–25	7,753	7,742	7,730	12,996
26–50	12,143	12,111	12,078	16,185
>50	14,212	14,174	14,120	15,280
<i>Age</i>				
18–20	7,783	7,762	7,748	13,862
21–24	9,270	9,250	9,236	18,720
25–29	9,680	9,666	9,645	18,702
30–34	7,493	7,482	7,468	14,148
35–39	5,865	5,856	5,847	11,557
40–44	4,092	4,086	4,084	8,812
45–49	2,346	2,344	2,335	5,689
50+	1,980	1,980	1,960	5,166
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
White	41,979	41,908	41,805	82,343
Black	3,850	3,843	3,845	7,987
Asian	2,012	2,007	2,006	4,631
Other	668	668	667	1,695
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	43,450	43,369	43,273	84,291
Female	5,059	5,057	5,050	12,365
<i>Current psychological problems</i>				
None	28,296	28,260	28,202	58,815
Some	13,661	13,627	13,606	24,967
Significant	6,552	6,539	6,515	12,874
<i>Current psychiatric problems</i>				
None	40,036	39,969	39,905	81,459
Some	5,407	5,396	5,379	9,649
Significant	3,066	3,061	3,039	5,548
<i>Current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending</i>				
No	45,584	45,508	45,411	91,060
Yes	2,925	2,918	2,912	5,596

Table 2: Proven reoffending impact of giving suspended sentence orders compared with community orders

Matching to OASys and including OASys vars

	Matched treatment (SSO) group size	Binary 1Yr	Freq 1Yr	Binary 2Yr	Freq 2Yr	Binary 3Yr	Freq 3Yr
2008	23,978	-3.9 % pts	-0.21	-3.0 % pts	-0.23	-2.4 % pts	-0.24
2009	26,831	-3.5 % pts	-0.22	-2.8 % pts	-0.27	-2.4 % pts	-0.27
2010	24,801	-3.3 % pts	-0.22	-2.6 % pts	-0.30	-	-
2011	21,046	-4.0 % pts	-0.26	-	-	-	-

Matching to OASys but excluding OASys vars

	Matched treatment (SSO) group size	Binary 1Yr	Freq 1Yr	Binary 2Yr	Freq 2Yr	Binary 3Yr	Freq 3Yr
2008	23,988	-3.7 % pts	-0.21	-2.8 % pts	-0.22	-2.2 % pts	-0.22
2009	26,838	-3.5 % pts	-0.23	-2.8 % pts	-0.27	-2.4 % pts	-0.27
2010	24,800	-3.5 % pts	-0.24	-2.7 % pts	-0.33	-	-
2011	21,044	-3.9 % pts	-0.27	-	-	-	-

Table 3: Proven reoffending over 5 years (2008 cohort) of those given suspended sentence orders compared with community orders

Follow-up	Binary			Frequency (per offender)			Frequency (per re-offender)		
	SSO	COM	Impact	SSO	COM	Impact	SSO	COM	Impact
1 Year	40.2%	44.1%	-3.9 % pts	1.35	1.56	-0.21	3.35	3.53	-0.18
2 Years	53.3%	56.3%	-3.0 % pts	2.50	2.73	-0.23	4.69	4.86	-0.17
3 Years	60.3%	62.7%	-2.4 % pts	3.56	3.79	-0.24	5.90	6.05	-0.15
4 Years	64.7%	66.8%	-2.1 % pts	4.52	4.77	-0.25	6.99	7.14	-0.16
5 Years	67.5% ¹	69.4%	-2.0 % pts	5.40	5.64	-0.24	8.01	8.13	-0.11

Notes: Impact estimates are based on pre-rounded scores, and as such may not exactly match the rounded reoffending levels provided.

1. Figure reported in text as 67% due to rounding (figure to 6dp is 67.453499%)

Table 4: Breakdown of proven reoffending over 5 years (2008 cohort) of those given suspended sentence orders as compared with community orders

Follow-up	Binary								
	Proportional breakdown			Rate for those who did not re-offend in previous year(s)			Frequency (per offender)		
	SSO	COM	Difference	SSO	COM	Difference	SSO	COM	Difference
1 Year	59.6%	63.5%	-4.0 % pts	40.2%	44.1%	-3.9 % pts	1.35	1.56	-0.21
2 Years	19.4%	17.5%	1.9 % pts	21.9%	21.8%	0.2 % pts	1.15	1.18	-0.02
3 Years	10.4%	9.2%	1.2 % pts	15.1%	14.7%	0.4 % pts	1.06	1.06	0.00
4 Years	6.5%	6.0%	0.5 % pts	11.0%	11.1%	-0.1 % pts	0.96	0.98	-0.02
5 Years	4.1%	3.8%	0.3 % pts	7.8%	7.9%	-0.1 % pts	0.88	0.87	0.02
All	100.00%	100.00%					5.40	5.64	-0.24

Table 5: Regression analysis of previous offending by treatment interaction effects on binary reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment and previous offending (reference category = no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.10	0.11	0.34	-0.18	0.11	0.11
1–2 previous	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.05	0.00
3–5 previous	1.53	0.03	0.00	1.51	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.97	0.03	0.00	1.98	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.31	0.04	0.00	2.27	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.63	0.03	0.00	2.62	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.05	0.03	0.00	3.04	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.67	0.03	0.00	3.62	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.13	0.41	0.12	0.13	0.35
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.12	0.39	0.12	0.12	0.33
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.19
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.24	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.02
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.41	0.11	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.42	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.41	0.11	0.00	0.47	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.32	0.03	0.00	-2.25	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.06	0.12	0.61	-0.31	0.06	0.00
1–2 previous	0.94	0.07	0.00	0.83	0.04	0.00
3–5 previous	1.52	0.06	0.00	1.37	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.93	0.06	0.00	1.77	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.38	0.06	0.00	2.07	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.68	0.06	0.00	2.34	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.14	0.06	0.00	2.72	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.80	0.06	0.00	3.25	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.14	0.41	0.14	0.07	0.04
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.39	0.09	0.06	0.17
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.34
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.12	0.18	0.11	0.06	0.09
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.35	0.12	0.00	0.18	0.06	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.31	0.12	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.02
>50 previous * Treatment	0.28	0.12	0.02	0.21	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.48	0.06	0.00	-2.32	0.04	0.00

Table 6: Odds ratios of reoffending¹ with breakdown by the number of previous offences

Previous offences	STC vs. CO		STC vs. COM		STC vs. SSO		SSO vs. COM	
	Odds ratio	Sig ²	Odds ratio	Sig ²	Odds ratio	Sig ²	Odds ratio	Sig ²
0	0.90	-	0.84	-	1.06	-	0.73	-
1–2	1.00	0.41	0.95	0.35	1.19	0.41	0.84	0.04
3–5	1.00	0.39	0.94	0.33	1.18	0.39	0.80	0.17
6–10	1.06	0.14	0.98	0.19	1.30	0.10	0.78	0.34
11–15	1.14	0.04	1.10	0.02	1.25	0.18	0.82	0.09
16–25	1.34	0.00	1.26	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.88	0.00
26–50	1.35	0.00	1.28	0.00	1.45	0.01	0.85	0.02
>50	1.36	0.00	1.34	0.00	1.40	0.02	0.91	0.00

Notes:

1. Treatment sentence relative to control sentence.
2. Compared to odds ratio for no previous offences.
3. The regression model is as implied by Table 5.

Table 7: Regression analysis of age by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, age, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being age 18–20 and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.08	0.11	0.50	-0.14	0.12	0.23
Age 21–24	-0.41	0.02	0.00	-0.39	0.02	0.00
Age 25–29	-0.66	0.02	0.00	-0.64	0.03	0.00
Age 30–34	-0.87	0.02	0.00	-0.88	0.03	0.00
Age 35–39	-1.12	0.02	0.00	-1.11	0.03	0.00
Age 40–44	-1.30	0.03	0.00	-1.29	0.03	0.00
Age 45–49	-1.40	0.03	0.00	-1.42	0.04	0.00
Age 50+	-1.58	0.04	0.00	-1.58	0.05	0.00
Age 21–24 * Treatment	-0.15	0.04	0.00	-0.18	0.04	0.00
Age 25–29 * Treatment	-0.18	0.04	0.00	-0.21	0.04	0.00
Age 30–34 * Treatment	-0.12	0.05	0.01	-0.12	0.05	0.02
Age 35–39 * Treatment	-0.06	0.05	0.23	-0.06	0.05	0.22
Age 40–44 * Treatment	-0.12	0.05	0.02	-0.13	0.06	0.02
Age 45–49 * Treatment	-0.04	0.07	0.56	-0.02	0.07	0.80
Age 50+ * Treatment	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.12	0.08	0.10
1–2 previous	0.81	0.04	0.00	0.81	0.05	0.00
3–5 previous	1.32	0.04	0.00	1.30	0.05	0.00
6–10 previous	1.73	0.04	0.00	1.75	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.08	0.04	0.00	2.05	0.05	0.00
16–25 previous	2.45	0.03	0.00	2.44	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	2.98	0.03	0.00	2.96	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.84	0.04	0.00	3.79	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.12	0.13	0.36	0.12	0.13	0.35
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.09	0.22	0.12	0.08
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.27	0.11	0.02	0.26	0.12	0.03
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.33	0.11	0.00	0.37	0.12	0.00
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.48	0.11	0.00	0.50	0.12	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.47	0.11	0.00	0.48	0.12	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.48	0.11	0.00	0.53	0.12	0.00
Constant	-1.52	0.03	0.00	-1.46	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.06	0.12	0.62	-0.25	0.06	0.00
Age 21–24	-0.45	0.03	0.00	-0.42	0.02	0.00
Age 25–29	-0.71	0.04	0.00	-0.67	0.02	0.00
Age 30–34	-0.90	0.04	0.00	-0.90	0.02	0.00
Age 35–39	-1.14	0.04	0.00	-1.12	0.02	0.00
Age 40–44	-1.33	0.05	0.00	-1.31	0.03	0.00
Age 45–49	-1.44	0.06	0.00	-1.47	0.03	0.00
Age 50+	-1.71	0.07	0.00	-1.62	0.04	0.00
Age 21–24 * Treatment	-0.12	0.05	0.02	-0.06	0.03	0.06
Age 25–29 * Treatment	-0.14	0.05	0.01	-0.08	0.03	0.01
Age 30–34 * Treatment	-0.09	0.06	0.11	-0.02	0.04	0.49
Age 35–39 * Treatment	-0.03	0.06	0.58	-0.08	0.04	0.03
Age 40–44 * Treatment	-0.09	0.07	0.18	-0.09	0.04	0.04
Age 45–49 * Treatment	0.00	0.08	0.98	-0.03	0.05	0.60
Age 50+ * Treatment	0.26	0.09	0.01	-0.20	0.06	0.00
1–2 previous	0.78	0.07	0.00	0.73	0.04	0.00
3–5 previous	1.31	0.06	0.00	1.23	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.70	0.06	0.00	1.64	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.16	0.06	0.00	1.99	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.50	0.06	0.00	2.30	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.07	0.06	0.00	2.80	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.97	0.06	0.00	3.53	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.15	0.14	0.29	0.10	0.07	0.16
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.21	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.23
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.30	0.13	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.37
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.25	0.13	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.12
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.44	0.12	0.00	0.18	0.06	0.01
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.37	0.12	0.00	0.14	0.06	0.03
>50 previous * Treatment	0.34	0.12	0.01	0.21	0.06	0.00
Constant	-1.66	0.06	0.00	-1.58	0.04	0.00

Table 8: Odds ratios of reoffending¹ with breakdown by age for those with no previous offences and with over 50 previous offences

Age	STC vs. CO			STC vs. COM		
	Odds ratio			Odds ratio		
	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²
18–20	0.93	1.50	-	0.87	1.48	-
21–24	0.79	1.28	0.00	0.73	1.24	0.00
25–29	0.77	1.25	0.00	0.71	1.20	0.00
30–34	0.82	1.33	0.01	0.78	1.32	0.02
35–39	0.87	1.41	0.23	0.82	1.39	0.22
40–44	0.82	1.33	0.02	0.76	1.29	0.02
45–49	0.89	1.44	0.56	0.86	1.45	0.80
50+	1.06	1.72	0.06	0.99	1.68	0.10

Age	STC vrs SSO			SSO vrs COM		
	Odds ratio			Odds ratio		
	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²
18–20	1.06	1.49	-	0.78	0.96	-
21–24	0.95	1.33	0.02	0.74	0.90	0.06
25–29	0.93	1.30	0.01	0.72	0.89	0.01
30–34	0.97	1.37	0.11	0.76	0.94	0.49
35–39	1.03	1.45	0.58	0.72	0.88	0.03
40–44	0.97	1.37	0.18	0.72	0.88	0.04
45–49	1.06	1.49	0.98	0.76	0.93	0.60
50+	1.38	1.93	0.01	0.64	0.78	0.00

Notes:

Regression model is as implied by Table 7.

1. Treatment sentence relative to control sentence.
2. Compared to odds ratio for age 18–20.

Table 9: Regression analysis of ethnicity by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, ethnicity, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being White and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.10	0.11	0.34	-0.18	0.11	0.11
Black	-0.03	0.02	0.24	-0.04	0.03	0.18
Asian	-0.19	0.03	0.00	-0.22	0.04	0.00
Other	-0.17	0.05	0.00	-0.12	0.06	0.06
Black * Treatment	-0.01	0.04	0.82	0.00	0.05	1.00
Asian * Treatment	-0.03	0.06	0.64	0.01	0.06	0.93
Other * Treatment	0.08	0.10	0.40	0.04	0.11	0.74
1-2 previous	0.94	0.04	0.00	0.92	0.05	0.00
3-5 previous	1.52	0.03	0.00	1.50	0.04	0.00
6-10 previous	1.95	0.03	0.00	1.97	0.04	0.00
11-15 previous	2.29	0.04	0.00	2.25	0.04	0.00
16-25 previous	2.62	0.03	0.00	2.60	0.04	0.00
26-50 previous	3.03	0.03	0.00	3.01	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.65	0.03	0.00	3.59	0.04	0.00
1-2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.40	0.12	0.13	0.34
3-5 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.12	0.38	0.12	0.12	0.32
6-10 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.11	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.18
11-15 previous * Treatment	0.24	0.11	0.04	0.28	0.12	0.02
16-25 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.41	0.11	0.00
26-50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.42	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.41	0.11	0.00	0.47	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.29	0.03	0.00	-2.21	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.07	0.12	0.56	-0.32	0.06	0.00
Black	0.05	0.04	0.17	0.05	0.02	0.04
Asian	-0.12	0.05	0.02	-0.09	0.03	0.01
Other	-0.25	0.09	0.00	-0.24	0.05	0.00
Black * Treatment	-0.08	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.19
Asian * Treatment	-0.09	0.07	0.23	0.08	0.05	0.09
Other * Treatment	0.17	0.12	0.18	-0.02	0.08	0.84
1-2 previous	0.93	0.07	0.00	0.82	0.04	0.00
3-5 previous	1.51	0.06	0.00	1.36	0.04	0.00
6-10 previous	1.92	0.06	0.00	1.76	0.04	0.00
11-15 previous	2.36	0.06	0.00	2.06	0.04	0.00
16-25 previous	2.66	0.06	0.00	2.32	0.04	0.00
26-50 previous	3.12	0.06	0.00	2.71	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.78	0.06	0.00	3.24	0.04	0.00
1-2 previous * Treatment	0.12	0.14	0.40	0.14	0.07	0.04
3-5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.39	0.09	0.06	0.16
6-10 previous * Treatment	0.21	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.33
11-15 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.12	0.19	0.11	0.06	0.08
16-25 previous * Treatment	0.35	0.12	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.00
26-50 previous * Treatment	0.31	0.12	0.01	0.15	0.06	0.02
>50 previous * Treatment	0.27	0.12	0.03	0.22	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.46	0.06	0.00	-2.31	0.04	0.00

Table 10: Proven reoffending of females given prison sentences of less than 12 months compared to court orders (CO) – community orders (COM) and suspended sentence orders (SSOs)

Treatment	Control	Matched treatment size & Off support	Matched control size	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Treatment)	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Control)	Impact estimate
STC	CO	5,059	44,026	68.10%	63.58%	4.5%pts***
		7		3.91	3.06	0.85***
STC	COM	5,053	31,655	68.06%	64.29%	3.8%pts***
		13		3.90	3.12	0.78***
STC	SSO	5,029	12,371	67.93%	61.65%	6.3%pts***
		37		3.89	2.89	1.00***
SSO	COM	12,343	31,654	34.29%	38.58%	-4.3%pts***
		26		1.27	1.48	-0.21***

* = significant at 0.1 level, ** = significant at 0.05 level, *** = significant at 0.01 level. Impact estimates are based on pre-rounded scores, and as such may not precisely match the rounded reoffending levels provided in the tables.

Table 11: Regression analysis of gender by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, gender, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being male and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.11	0.11	0.30	-0.19	0.11	0.09
Female	0.12	0.02	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.00
Female * Treatment	0.04	0.04	0.28	0.06	0.04	0.15
1-2 previous	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.05	0.00
3-5 previous	1.54	0.03	0.00	1.52	0.04	0.00
6-10 previous	1.98	0.03	0.00	1.99	0.04	0.00
11-15 previous	2.32	0.04	0.00	2.27	0.04	0.00
16-25 previous	2.64	0.03	0.00	2.62	0.04	0.00
26-50 previous	3.06	0.03	0.00	3.04	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.68	0.03	0.00	3.62	0.04	0.00
1-2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.38	0.13	0.13	0.31
3-5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.12	0.34	0.13	0.12	0.28
6-10 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.11	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.16
11-15 previous * Treatment	0.24	0.11	0.03	0.28	0.12	0.02
16-25 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.42	0.11	0.00
26-50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.42	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.41	0.11	0.00	0.47	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.34	0.03	0.00	-2.26	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.06	0.12	0.63	-0.30	0.06	0.00
Female	0.13	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.50
Female * Treatment	0.03	0.05	0.46	-0.05	0.03	0.06
1-2 previous	0.95	0.07	0.00	0.83	0.04	0.00
3-5 previous	1.53	0.06	0.00	1.37	0.04	0.00
6-10 previous	1.94	0.06	0.00	1.77	0.04	0.00
11-15 previous	2.39	0.06	0.00	2.08	0.04	0.00
16-25 previous	2.69	0.06	0.00	2.34	0.04	0.00
26-50 previous	3.15	0.06	0.00	2.72	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.82	0.06	0.00	3.25	0.04	0.00
1-2 previous * Treatment	0.12	0.14	0.40	0.13	0.07	0.05
3-5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.38	0.08	0.06	0.20
6-10 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.40
11-15 previous * Treatment	0.17	0.12	0.18	0.10	0.06	0.11
16-25 previous * Treatment	0.34	0.12	0.01	0.18	0.06	0.00
26-50 previous * Treatment	0.31	0.12	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.03
>50 previous * Treatment	0.28	0.12	0.02	0.21	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.51	0.06	0.00	-2.33	0.04	0.00

Table 12: Regression analysis of current psychological problems by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, current psychological problems, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being no current psychological problems and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.12	0.11	0.29	-0.19	0.11	0.09
Some probs	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.02	0.00
Sig probs	0.02	0.02	0.35	0.01	0.02	0.57
Some probs * Treatment	0.04	0.03	0.12	0.04	0.03	0.14
Sig probs * Treatment	0.06	0.04	0.13	0.06	0.04	0.11
1–2 previous	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.05	0.00
3–5 previous	1.53	0.03	0.00	1.51	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.97	0.03	0.00	1.98	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.31	0.04	0.00	2.27	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.63	0.03	0.00	2.61	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.05	0.03	0.00	3.03	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.67	0.03	0.00	3.61	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.40	0.12	0.13	0.35
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.12	0.41	0.11	0.12	0.35
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.11	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.21
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.23	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.02
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.38	0.11	0.00	0.40	0.11	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.41	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.46	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.33	0.03	0.00	-2.26	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.04	0.12	0.73	-0.30	0.06	0.00
Some probs	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.00
Sig probs	0.00	0.03	0.94	0.02	0.02	0.31
Some probs * Treatment	0.06	0.03	0.07	-0.03	0.02	0.23
Sig probs * Treatment	0.08	0.04	0.09	-0.04	0.03	0.18
1–2 previous	0.94	0.07	0.00	0.83	0.04	0.00
3–5 previous	1.52	0.06	0.00	1.37	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.93	0.06	0.00	1.77	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.38	0.06	0.00	2.07	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.68	0.06	0.00	2.33	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.14	0.06	0.00	2.72	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.80	0.06	0.00	3.24	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.14	0.41	0.14	0.07	0.04
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.41	0.09	0.06	0.17
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.34
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.12	0.20	0.11	0.06	0.09
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.34	0.12	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.30	0.12	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.02
>50 previous * Treatment	0.26	0.12	0.03	0.22	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.49	0.06	0.00	-2.34	0.04	0.00

Table 13: Regression analysis of current psychiatric problems by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, current psychiatric problems, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being no current psychiatric problems and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.11	0.11	0.32	-0.18	0.11	0.11
Some probs	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.00
Sig probs	-0.02	0.03	0.41	-0.03	0.03	0.33
Some probs * Treatment	-0.03	0.04	0.47	-0.03	0.04	0.45
Sig probs * Treatment	0.21	0.05	0.00	0.23	0.06	0.00
1–2 previous	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.05	0.00
3–5 previous	1.53	0.03	0.00	1.51	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.97	0.03	0.00	1.98	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.31	0.04	0.00	2.27	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.63	0.03	0.00	2.61	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.05	0.03	0.00	3.03	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.67	0.03	0.00	3.61	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.13	0.43	0.12	0.13	0.37
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.12	0.41	0.11	0.12	0.35
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.11	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.21
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.23	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.02
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.40	0.11	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.41	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.46	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.32	0.03	0.00	-2.25	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.06	0.12	0.64	-0.31	0.06	0.00
Some probs	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.02	0.00
Sig probs	-0.02	0.04	0.64	0.00	0.02	0.93
Some probs * Treatment	-0.01	0.05	0.77	-0.01	0.03	0.78
Sig probs * Treatment	0.21	0.06	0.00	-0.04	0.04	0.26
1–2 previous	0.94	0.07	0.00	0.83	0.04	0.00
3–5 previous	1.52	0.06	0.00	1.37	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.93	0.06	0.00	1.77	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.38	0.06	0.00	2.07	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.68	0.06	0.00	2.33	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.14	0.06	0.00	2.72	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.80	0.06	0.00	3.25	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.14	0.43	0.14	0.07	0.04
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.41	0.09	0.06	0.17
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.34
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.12	0.20	0.11	0.06	0.09
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.34	0.12	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.30	0.12	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.02
>50 previous * Treatment	0.27	0.12	0.03	0.21	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.48	0.06	0.00	-2.33	0.04	0.00

Table 14: Regression analysis of current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending by treatment interaction effects on reoffending outcomes controlling for treatment, current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending, previous offending and previous offending by treatment interaction effects (reference categories being no current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending and no previous offences)

	Treatment=STC, Control=CO			Treatment=STC, Control=COM		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	-0.11	0.11	0.31	-0.18	0.11	0.10
Psychiatric	-0.08	0.03	0.00	-0.08	0.03	0.01
Psychiatric * Treatment	0.16	0.05	0.00	0.16	0.05	0.00
1–2 previous	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.93	0.05	0.00
3–5 previous	1.53	0.03	0.00	1.52	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.97	0.03	0.00	1.98	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.31	0.04	0.00	2.27	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.63	0.03	0.00	2.62	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.05	0.03	0.00	3.04	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.68	0.03	0.00	3.62	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.13	0.42	0.12	0.13	0.36
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.10	0.12	0.39	0.12	0.12	0.34
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.11	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.20
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.23	0.11	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.02
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.39	0.11	0.00	0.41	0.11	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.42	0.11	0.00
>50 previous * Treatment	0.41	0.11	0.00	0.46	0.11	0.00
Constant	-2.31	0.03	0.00	-2.24	0.04	0.00

	Treatment=STC, Control=SSO			Treatment=SSO, Control=CO		
	Coefficient	S.E	Sig	Coefficient	S.E	Sig
Treatment	0.05	0.12	0.67	-0.31	0.06	0.00
Psychiatric	-0.11	0.05	0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.23
Psychiatric * Treatment	0.20	0.06	0.00	-0.04	0.04	0.30
1–2 previous	0.94	0.07	0.00	0.83	0.04	0.00
3–5 previous	1.52	0.06	0.00	1.37	0.04	0.00
6–10 previous	1.93	0.06	0.00	1.77	0.04	0.00
11–15 previous	2.38	0.06	0.00	2.07	0.04	0.00
16–25 previous	2.68	0.06	0.00	2.34	0.04	0.00
26–50 previous	3.14	0.06	0.00	2.72	0.04	0.00
>50 previous	3.81	0.06	0.00	3.25	0.04	0.00
1–2 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.14	0.42	0.14	0.07	0.04
3–5 previous * Treatment	0.11	0.13	0.40	0.09	0.06	0.17
6–10 previous * Treatment	0.20	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.34
11–15 previous * Treatment	0.16	0.12	0.19	0.11	0.06	0.09
16–25 previous * Treatment	0.34	0.12	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.00
26–50 previous * Treatment	0.31	0.12	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.02
>50 previous * Treatment	0.27	0.12	0.03	0.21	0.06	0.00
Constant	-2.47	0.06	0.00	-2.32	0.04	0.00

Table 15: Odds ratios of reoffending¹ with breakdown by mental health for those with no previous offences and with over 50 previous offences

Mental Health	STC vs. CO			STC vs. COM		
	Odds ratio			Odds ratio		
	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²
<i>Current psychiatric problems³</i>						
No	0.90	1.34	-	0.84	1.32	-
Some	0.87	1.31	0.47	0.81	1.28	0.45
Significant	1.11	1.67	0.00	1.05	1.66	0.00
<i>Current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending⁴</i>						
No	0.90	1.34	-	0.83	1.32	-
Yes	1.05	1.58	0.00	0.98	1.55	0.00

Mental Health	STC vs. SSO			SSO vs. COM		
	Odds ratio			Odds ratio		
	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²	No prev	>50 prev	Sig ²
<i>Current psychiatric problems³</i>						
No	1.06	1.38	-	0.74	0.91	-
Some	1.04	1.36	0.77	0.73	0.90	0.78
Significant	1.31	1.71	0.00	0.70	0.87	0.26
<i>Current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending⁴</i>						
No	1.05	1.38	-	0.73	0.91	-
Yes	1.28	1.68	0.00	0.71	0.87	0.30

Notes:

1. Treatment sentence relative to control sentence.
2. Compared to odds ratio for no current psychiatric problems/no current psychiatric treatment or treatment pending.
3. Regression model is as implied by Table 13.
4. Regression model is as implied by Table 14.

Table 16: Impact of adding a mental health requirement to court orders for those with current psychological or psychiatric problems or who have current or pending psychiatric treatment

Type of order	Matched treatment size & Off support	Matched Control Size	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Treatment)	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Control)	Impact estimate
CO	2,465 15	125,379	34.08% 1.07	37.58% 1.18	-3.5%pts*** -0.11*
COM	1,820 18	87,813	35.27% 1.13	38.63% 1.26	-3.4%pts** -0.13*
SSO	636 6	37,566	30.82% 0.93	36.03% 1.04	-5.2%pts** -0.11

* = significant at 0.1 level, ** = significant at 0.05 level, *** = significant at 0.01 level. Impact estimates are based on pre-rounded scores, and as such may not precisely match the rounded reoffending levels provided.

Table 17: Impact of adding an alcohol treatment requirement to court orders for those with a current alcohol use problem

Type of order	Matched treatment size & Off support	Matched Control Size	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Treatment)	1-Yr Binary & 1-Yr Frequency (Control)	Impact estimate
CO	19,927	117,535	50.23%	49.75%	0.5%pts
	23		1.85	1.91	-0.05*
COM	13,688	82,300	51.41%	51.08%	0.3%pts
	9		1.96	2.04	-0.08**
SSO	6,227	35,235	47.68%	46.36%	1.3%pts
	26		1.62	1.58	0.03

* = significant at 0.1 level, ** = significant at 0.05 level, *** = significant at 0.01 level. Impact estimates are based on pre-rounded scores, and as such may not precisely match the rounded reoffending levels provided.

Analytical Services exists to improve policy making, decision taking and practice by the Ministry of Justice. It does this by providing robust, timely and relevant data and advice drawn from research and analysis undertaken by the department's analysts and by the wider research community.



© Crown copyright 2018

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

First published 2018

ISBN 978-1-84099-721-7

Contact info: mojanalyticservices@justice.gsi.gov.uk