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This presentation covers:
- Young person Street Talk evaluation framework.
- Street Talk sample.
- CRAFFFT screening findings.
- Pre and post intervention findings.
- Follow up findings.
- Limitations and further work.
- Conclusion.
**Evaluation Framework**

**Participants (Sample):**
Young people.
10 - 19 years of age.
Identified as being at-risk of substance misuse and social vulnerability by grass root organisations.

**Evaluation Design:**
Pre and post intervention and short term follow up.
Reliable & valid quantitative measures.
Mobile and web-based data collection.

**Analysis:**
Descriptive, parametric and non-parametric analyses to establish:
1. Knowledge & confidence outcomes.
2. Intention to change behaviour outcomes.
3. Wellbeing outcomes.

---

**Screening**
CRAFFT Tool

**Pre Intervention**
Knowledge / Confidence Q
Wellbeing Q

**Brief Motivational Interviewing Intervention**

**Post Intervention**
Knowledge / Confidence Q
Intention to change behaviour Q

**Follow Up**
Wellbeing & SelfEsteem Q
Substance Use Q
Offending & Anti-Social Behaviour Q
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 2196
CRAFFT Screening
CRAFFT Part B: Percentage of young people who disclosed risky behaviours (N=807)

CRAFFT Screening......

- Car driven under influence: 55.9%
- Using to relax: 73.8%
- Using when alone: 45%
- Forgetting when using: 60.6%
- Family/friends concerned: 43%
- Getting into trouble: 49.1%
Brief Motivational Interviewing Intervention
Pre and Post Intervention Findings: Knowledge and Confidence

- **PRE Int. Knowledge**:
  - Some: 54.3%
  - Neutral: 23%
  - None: 22.7%

- **PRE Int. Confidence**:
  - Some: 64.6%
  - Neutral: 24.4%
  - None: 11%

- **POST Int. Knowledge**:
  - Some: 72.4%
  - Neutral: 27.6%
  - None: 0%

- **POST Int. Confidence**:
  - Some: 71.4%
  - Neutral: 28.6%
  - None: 0%
Intervention Findings: Intention to Change Behaviour

- Attitude toward the behaviour
- Subjective norm
- Perceived behavioural control
- Intention
- BEHAVIOUR
Intervention Findings: Intention to Change Behaviour
Follow-Up Findings: Wellbeing

The chart shows the comparison between the intervention and non-intervention groups on various wellbeing metrics. The metrics include:

- Feeling Optimistic
- Feeling Useful
- Feeling Relaxed
- Dealing with Problems
- Thinking Clearly
- Feeling Close to Other People
- Making Own Mind Up

The bars indicate a generally higher score for the intervention group compared to the non-intervention group.
## Comparison Group Findings: Substance Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Non Intervention Group</th>
<th>Intervention Group*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Use</strong></td>
<td>66% No Alcohol</td>
<td>34% No Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% 1-2 Days Per Week</td>
<td>42% 1-2 Days Per Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% &gt; 2 Days</td>
<td>24% &gt; 2 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cannabis</strong></td>
<td>92% No Cannabis</td>
<td>65% No Cannabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% 1-2 Days Per Week</td>
<td>16% 1-2 Days Per Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% &gt; 2 Days</td>
<td>19% &gt; 2 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Other” Substances</strong>*</td>
<td>97% No “Other” Use</td>
<td>95% No “Other” Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% “Other” Use</td>
<td>5% “Other” Use &gt; 2 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison Group Findings: Offending and Anti-Social Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Non Intervention Group</th>
<th>Intervention Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop lifting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling Drugs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud/ Stolen Goods</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault/ Violence</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud in Public</td>
<td>44% (5% Unsure)</td>
<td>68% (4% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Riding</td>
<td>8% (3% Unsure)</td>
<td>11% (3% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour Complaints</td>
<td>17% (2% Unsure)</td>
<td>20% (4% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a Weapon</td>
<td>7% (0.4% Unsure)</td>
<td>14% (2% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>9% (1% Unsure)</td>
<td>14% (2% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist Comments</td>
<td>10% (0.4% Unsure)</td>
<td>11% (1% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble with Friends</td>
<td>30% (2% Unsure)</td>
<td>44% (3% Unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Future Solution and Further Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No structured intervention follow-up.</td>
<td>Wide range of follow up measures as a non-targeted attempt.</td>
<td>Structure a follow-up, significantly reduce number of measures and measure actual behaviour change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an RCT (randomised control trial).</td>
<td>Maintenance of a comparison group.</td>
<td>Conduct an RCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of involvement and clarity around technology and evaluation</td>
<td>Support when possible, inclusive and flexible approach.</td>
<td>Manualised approach, evaluation toolkit at the start of the project, YP accreditation, consultation and more training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• 571/2196 (26%) of young people did not disclose substance use.
• 1056 (48%) disclosed the use of 1 substance.
• 423 (19%) disclosed the use of 2 substances (Poly Use).
• 146 (7%) disclosed the use of 3 substances. (Poly Use).
• Of the 1625 young people who used substances, 50% disclosed no/low other risks. 18% disclosed medium risk taking levels, 22% disclosed high risk taking levels and 10% disclosed severe risk taking levels. Thus, 807 (or 50%) of those young people who used substances were eligible for the brief motivational interviewing intervention.
• Statistically significant increases in knowledge and confidence about accessing support and making safer decisions. No statistically significant increase in overall wellbeing. The majority of young people disclosed a consistent and high intention to change their behaviour.
• The screening and intervention had a significant impact upon engaging young people, demonstrating the utility of innovative technology and eliciting positive outcomes in raising awareness and empowering young people with the potential and intention to engage in safer, less risky behaviour.
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