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INTRODUCTION

StreetChance is a programme that has the dual aims of promoting cricket in economically and socially disadvantaged areas and helping young people from those areas improve their life chances. The programme is a partnership between the Cricket Foundation and Barclays Spaces for Sports. It runs weekly cricket sessions for young people in some of the most deprived areas of the UK. The sessions are often supplemented by informal education classes that address topics such as gangs, knife crime and drug abuse, delivered by partner charities and individuals with experiences relevant to these issues. In some areas representatives of the local police force participate in the sessions. To date, more than 38,000 children and young people have participated in StreetChance projects.

StreetChance commissioned New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) to help the charity assess its impact. The charity is particularly interested in understanding the attitudes of young people and the potential benefits that StreetChance brings to the local communities and public sector agencies in the areas in which it runs its programmes.

This report describes NPC’s findings from surveys of participants, and looks at the areas where StreetChance can have a positive impact. It complements three largely qualitative evaluations conducted by Loughborough University.¹

¹ The three reports, StreetChance Evaluation 2011, StreetChance Dewsbury Evaluation 2012, StreetChance Evaluation 2013, can be found at http://www.chancetoshine.org/media/reports-brochures.
BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

StreetChance is committed both to improving the lives of young people through cricket and to finding out what difference it makes. But proving the impact of sports participation on young people’s social outcomes is very difficult. Academic and grey literature focuses on potential benefits in four main outcome areas of sport development programmes:

1) reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour;
2) increased community cohesion,
3) improved educational attainment; and
4) improved physical and mental health.

However, there is little definitive evidence of a direct causal relationship between participating in sports and better social outcomes in any of these areas. Even where there is a correlation between better social outcomes, such as better health or better education, and participating in sports, it is not always clear which causes which or if something else causes both. There are many other individual and environmental factors that influence whether and how participating in sports affects social outcomes. It is difficult to disentangle these to know who benefits from participating in sports and how.

The literature on the effect of participating in sports is summarised briefly below. Particularly useful sources are:

- Summary papers of the role of sports written for Sports England by Professor Fred Coalter. These summaries cover: crime reduction and community safety; economic impact and regeneration of local communities; education and lifelong learning; physical fitness and health; psychological health and well-being; and social capacity and cohesion.

Crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB)

Some evidence suggests that interscholastic sports programmes reduce disturbances and increase levels of cooperation and pro-social behaviour among the participants. However, there is also some evidence that suggests certain power sports—such as boxing and weightlifting—can encourage higher levels of anti-social behaviour. The general view is that sport can help attract young people “at risk” to a development programme that may influence their behaviour and attitudes. Coaches are important in these programmes, as they provide positive role models to at risk young people, countering anti-social views expressed by peers. Sports programmes
are often presented as diversionary programmes, but often the goals of such programmes are rather vague and hence difficult to assess.

**Community cohesion**

Different studies, including some from the UK, have found substantial correlations between national measures of social capital and levels of participation in sports. The international research also suggests the potential for sports to increase social networking, community identity, sense of place, health and the development of both the strength of relationships within a homogenous group (i.e., bonding social capital) and the strength of relationships across different groups (i.e., bridging social capital), especially in areas of economic decline. Whether any particular programme builds bonding capital or bridging capital or both depends on the local context and the implementation of the programme. Thus much research in this area is still developmental, trying to identify the specific ways in which sports can help promote community cohesion in different areas.

**Education**

Research into the impact of sports participation on education is inconclusive. While a number of studies have revealed a positive correlation between education attainment and participation in sports, critics question the causal direction and whether there are other factors that cause both. The extent of the impact of participating in sports on education can be influenced by the nature and type of exercise, the type of participants, the nature of the cognitive tests and the methodological quality of the study. As the robustness of the research decreases, estimates of the size of the impact increases. This suggests there is an optimism bias in some of the research.

**Health**

Evidence suggests that participating in sports can have a positive impact on both mental and physical health. One study showed that increases in *life aspirations* help explain the positive relationship between participation in recreational and competitive sport and psychological well-being. A US study showed that especially for white females, participation in sports teams may enhance physiological and psychological well-being, contributing to life satisfaction. Other studies refer to lower frequency of mental ill-health and eating and dietary problems as well as decreased likelihood of smoking and use of drugs. Shy children demonstrated a significant decrease in social anxiety and increase in self-esteem. In turn, increases in self-esteem and mental health have been linked to reduction in ASB, suggesting that these four outcome areas are somewhat interdependent.
STREETCHANGE THEORY OF CHANGE

StreetChance provides structured cricket coaching and competitive opportunities for young people. It offers free cricket coaching in community venues such as leisure centres, sports halls, youth clubs and housing estates. StreetChance community and estates projects run year round with regular competitions in every school holiday. Sessions are held on weekday evenings, combining cricket coaching with an outreach hour where young people can discuss local issues with their peers and their coach. In some areas local police participate in these sessions.

Through these sessions StreetChance aims to:

- Positively engage pupils marginalised within schools;
- Provide a diversionary activity that engages young people in communities affected by youth crime and anti-social behaviour;
- Break down barriers between diverse communities which have previously struggled to integrate, contributing to community cohesion; and
- Work towards positive outcomes for young people: participation leading to training, volunteering or secured employment.

The programme works in urban areas lacking in green spaces where cricket is less accessible. Sessions are targeted towards areas of social deprivation; areas with large black and minority ethnic communities; and neighbourhoods identified by police where youth crime and anti-social behaviour are prevalent.

There are currently over 50 projects in seven cities: London, Birmingham, Bristol, Dewsbury, Liverpool, Hull and Manchester. All but a few areas in which projects are run are in deprived and high-crime areas. Table 1 provides an overview of StreetChance projects in the most disadvantaged areas.

The ethnic and religious mix of the participants differs by area but across all projects there is significant number of Asian and Muslim participants. The variation is illustrated by Sutton, where approximately two-thirds of the participants are white British; Moss Side, where almost half of the participants in Moss Side are Afghans who tend not to be involved in other community activities; and Saltley and Sparkhill in Birmingham which are comprised almost entirely of players from a Pakistani background.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Ethnicity / nationality</th>
<th>Area IMD ranking (out of 32,482 where 1 is the most deprived)</th>
<th>Area IMD crime ranking (out of 32,482 where 1 has highest crime)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>58% white British; remainder mixed</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (6,477)</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (6,196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>50% Pakistani; remainder Sri Lankan, Indian, black Caribbean, Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (5,641)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (3,123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>55% Pakistani; 28% Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,820)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (1,347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>100% Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (1,288)</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (3,953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>46% Sri Lankan; 22% black Caribbean; 10% white British; remainder South Asian</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,696)</td>
<td>Lowest 25% (6,742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>37% Pakistani; 37% Indian; 17% Afghan; 9% Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Lowest 30% (8,826)</td>
<td>Lowest 30% (9,745)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>22% White British; 15% black African; 15% black Caribbean; rest mixed</td>
<td>Lowest 15% (3,555)</td>
<td>Lowest 30% (9,431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>88% Indian</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (1,296)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White City</td>
<td>31% Pakistani; 23% White; 23% Bangladesh; rest mixed</td>
<td>Lowest 15% (3,463)</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (6,088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>64% white British; 14% Sri Lankan; 14% Indian</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (17,844)</td>
<td>crime Lowest 25% (7,562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>66% black African, Caribbean, and mixed ethnicity; 19% white British</td>
<td>In worst 25% (7,885)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Saltley</td>
<td>96% Pakistani</td>
<td>Lowest 1% (224)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (3,166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparkhill</td>
<td>95% Pakistani</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (1,011)</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (6,038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>75% Pakistani; 12% Indian; 12% Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Lowest 20% (4,993)</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (14,506)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Cheetham Hill</td>
<td>94% Pakistani</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,861)</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (11,287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moss Side</td>
<td>43% Afghan; 24% Pakistani; 19% Black Caribbean</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (905)</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (14,307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Trafford</td>
<td>49% Pakistani; 49% Indian</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,910)</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (13,213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longsight</td>
<td>74% Pakistani; 10% Indian; 10% white British</td>
<td>Lowest 15% (3,948)</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>43% Pakistani; remainder mixed</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,962)</td>
<td>lowest 1% (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hengrove</td>
<td>96% white British</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (2,962)</td>
<td>lowest 1% (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitchurch</td>
<td>74% white British; 11% Pakistani 7% black Caribbean</td>
<td>Mid-ranking (21,845)</td>
<td>Lowest 25% (4,957)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most participants are aged between 8 and 19, with an average age of 13.5, though not all areas run programmes across this whole age range. Girls make up a minority².

Participation in StreetChance is voluntary. Thereby the programme attracts and retains young people who have a new or established interest in cricket. People find out about the programme through outreach programmes, such as taster sessions that are run in schools, and word of mouth. Because the programme is voluntary and the projects are located in relatively high crime areas and designed to be accessible to children and young people who are marginalised and disaffected, StreetChance is wary of trying to collect sensitive data that the young people may feel could be used against them (for example if it was shared with the police or other government agencies).

The diversity of demographics and local context means that it is not easy to generalise about the benefits of the programme across all projects. Figure 1 presents a theory of change that StreetChance and NPC developed to help identify what coaches felt the main benefits of the programme are, and how these mapped to the stated aims of StreetChance. However, the specific programmes differ by area according to local needs, the demographics of the area, the strength of the relationship with the police, and local partnerships such as other youth clubs or other community and sports programmes. Therefore the benefits are likely to be different for different areas.

In parallel with the weekly sessions, StreetChance runs an apprenticeship programme to train young coaches. Many coaches were once participants in the sessions. The programme helps these young coaches improve their employment prospects through providing them with skills and experience. The impact of StreetChance on the coaches is not included in this analysis.

**Figure 1: Diagram of StreetChance’s theory of change**

² 1 in 5 and 1 in 20 based on 2012 and 2013 surveys respectively.
**Collecting data from programme participants**

To estimate the potential benefits of StreetChance on reducing crime and anti-social behaviour, we had to determine the baseline risk of participants committing crime and anti-social behaviour. We did this by trying to estimate their likelihood of committing a crime in the near future based on their self-reported attitudes and behaviour.

We adapted StreetChance’s existing survey by adding questions developed by the Youth Justice Board to assess the risk that young people will engage in criminal behaviour.

We developed one survey for a younger group (8-11) that focused on capturing attitudes towards crime and anti-social behaviour, and one for an older group (12-18) that captured attitudes and actual behaviour. For instance, in addition to asking if they thought committing crime was wrong, we asked if they have committed it.

We compared the attitudes and self-reported behaviour to five factors that might affect these:

1. How long they’ve been with StreetChance
2. How often they attend it
3. Age
4. Police attendance over the past 6 months
5. City

The table below shows the sub-groups that we analysed for each of the five factors across the two cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Sub-groups used in the survey analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1yr and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a (the vast majority attended for less than a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stages 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a (not enough age range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police attendance over the past 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey was launched in July 2013. The data was collected between July and October during the cricket sessions and the National Competition. Each participant filled in the survey only once. About 25% of the StreetChance community project³ population participated in the survey, a good response rate. These young people came from all the seven cities where StreetChance operates. Responses from participants in London, Birmingham, Bristol and Manchester dominated the sample⁴.

Almost all participants in the StreetChance survey were boys between the ages of 8 and 18. Though they came from different ethnic backgrounds, the majority were from South Asia (seven in every ten)⁵, while only two in ten were white.

---

³ Community project is the StreetChance’s main project. In addition StreetChance also runs outreach programmes in local schools which offer taster sessions to street cricket, and in turn serve to attract more young people to the community project.

⁴ They made up 90% of it.

⁵ Pakistan, Bangladesh and India (41%, 16% and 12% respectively or 69% altogether)
ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR OF STREETCHANCE PARTICIPANTS

This section discusses the attitudes and reported behaviour of the StreetChance participants who responded to the survey.

Differences in levels of risk

As described, StreetChance runs projects in socially deprived areas that are typically within the worst 20% in the UK. But based on the survey results, StreetChance mainly works with young people who hold pro-social attitudes and report pro-social behaviour:

- four out of five respondents felt connected with their local area
- eight out of ten respondents said they do not get involved with gangs (Figures 2 and 3);
- the majority of the young people neither had friends who used drugs nor committed crime because of peer pressure.

Generally the respondents showed strong consistency in their answers towards pro-social attitudes. This is consistent with the Loughborough evaluations of StreetChance. One report noted that participants were more likely to be victims of crime than perpetrators.

However, there is a small but significant group who are at risk of committing crime and anti-social behaviour. When asked how similar they are to young people who are involved in gangs, they reported they are “just like me” or “quite like me” (Figure 3). This group forms about 10-20% of the total number of respondents and are different to the pro-social cohort (Figure 6). For example, 8-11 year olds from this group are more likely to think that it is OK to get into fights or commit crime if their friends do it compared to their more pro-social peers. Similarly, the majority of 12-18 year olds in the high risk group say that it is easy for them to get drugs and that they have committed crime because they were on drugs. Some of these young people report they may plan to commit an offense in the near future and have a higher sense of bravado. But a higher proportion of them feel positive about their future and that they have a greater say in life, compared to their pro-social peers.
Important for this analysis six percent of all 12-18 year old respondents to the survey said that they were “just like” young people who were planning to offend in the near future. If we include young people who say they are “quite like” or “a bit like” such young people (Figure 4), the figure rises to 34%. This pattern is repeated when StreetChance participants were asked how similar they were to young people who commit crimes because they were drunk or on drugs.

Figure 4. Proportion of YP at StreetChance who think they will offend in the near future

![Proportion of YP at StreetChance who think they will offend in the near future](chart1)

**Figure 5.** Proportion of YP at StreetChance who commit crime because they were drunk or on drugs

![Proportion of YP at StreetChance who commit crime because they were drunk or on drugs](chart2)
The high-risk group also displayed a more hostile attitudes towards the police than the more pro-social group. A higher proportion of them expressed negative attitudes and a lack of trust towards the police. Two in five said it was a good choice when asked “If your friend or someone in your family said she or he wanted to become a police officer, what would you say to them?” This compares to over half among their pro-social peers. About a third said they either hated the police or did not trust them at all.

---

This high-risk group is based on the following filtering approach. Those 8-11 year olds who answers just and quite like me to the question if it is ok to be part of a gang were included in the high-risk group. Similarly, 12-18 year olds who said just or quite like me to the question if some young people get involved with gangs were included. Clearly there is a limitation to this approach because it is based only on a response to one question. However, if one filters the responses using different question(s), we will see similar results. So on average the high risk group proportion ranges between 10-20% depending on the question or a set of questions applied.
As a check on our estimate of the size of this high-risk group we compared our data to the Youth Justice Board report on risk and protective factors that we used as a source for some of the survey questions. That report analysed risk and protective factors of two groups, one group (agency group) that was made up of young people who were involved with youth offending teams, pupil referral units, young offender institutions, agencies working with young asylum seekers, and similar agencies, and another group (school group) made up of young people from schools and colleges. When these groups were asked how similar they are to young people who are likely to commit a crime in the near future, 7% of the agency group said “just like me” compared to 4% of the school group. Using this and other risk factors, StreetChance participants appear to in between these two groups in terms of their level of risk, but generally closer to the agency group in their risk profile than the school group.

The high-risk group does not cluster in one or two projects but is spread out across the country. Typically this group makes up between 10 to 20% of the participants of any project. This suggests members of the high-risk group are surrounded by the pro-social majority. The survey results also suggest that the majority of young people from the high-risk group were able to make friends with people outside their immediate network including new peers and coaches.

Another difference between the younger and the older high-risk groups is that the younger cohort (8-11) have been with StreetChance for less than a year (Figure 6), but two thirds of 12-18-year-old high-risk group have been with StreetChance for at least a year and about 40% of those have attended StreetChance for two years or more. This suggests that StreetChance is able to retain many of the high-risk 12-18-year-old group, but may not be able to shift their attitudes. We do not know how many young people who hold pro-social attitudes originally would have been part of the high-risk group when they started.

---

7 The sample for 8-11 high-risk young people was too small (n=11) to be compared to their pro-social peers
8 The agency and the school cohorts comprised of 362 and 893 participants respectively. They came from 27 different locations across England and Wales. The majority of the agency group were male between the ages of 10-18. The school cohort comprised of half females. The main difference with the StreetChance cohort with the agency group one was that the latter was made up of white young people (74%) vs. 17% at StreetChance.
9 Not every project necessarily has a young person at high risk in it but similarly in some projects the proportion of high-risk participants rises to 30%.
10 However, given this is based only on self-reported data, these results ought to be interpreted with care and more qualitative research is required to determine how reliable they are.
11 To figure this out, longitudinal (ie, overtime) data collection is required.
Differences between areas

The survey data revealed additional differences in the StreetChance participants besides the ethnic mix described previously. For example, participants in Bristol have highest risk of anti-social behaviour. Participants there have the greatest exposure to drugs, crime and gangs out of the four areas surveyed. About two thirds of young people from Bristol felt they lived in an area with a lot of crime compared to only a third in London or Birmingham (Figure 8). The proportion of participants involved with gangs was about one in every four participants in Bristol, similar to London and Birmingham (Figure 9). Bristol also has a higher proportion of younger Key Stage 3 (KS3) people compared to participants in London or Birmingham and gang involvement seems to jumps up between KS3 and KS4 (Figure 10 and 11). In cities like Bristol with particularly high exposure to crime and drugs, StreetChance may want to tailor its programme to address these particular issues.

By contrast, participants in Manchester felt the least as part of the local area but displayed the least signs of anti-social behaviour. Most young people from Manchester responded in a very pro-social way towards gangs involvement, drugs and crime (Figure 8 and 9) while in their local areas drug abuse and crime were prevalent issues. The Muslim faith and upbringing of these young people is probably an important factor that explains this.

---

12 StreetChance runs five projects in Manchester. The average crime rankings in those areas are high based on official statistics. At least one of the districts is ranked in the highest 10% for overall crime rates, anti-social behaviour and drug related crime.
Differences associated with different levels of engagement with police

Interestingly the younger cohort (i.e., people aged 8-11) whose sessions were attended by the police felt more part of their local community than those who had no police involvement (22% vs. 3% respectively, Figure 13). This does not prove that police attendance increases the likelihood that young people feel part of their local community—correlation does not prove causality and sessions with higher police engagement may be in areas where the young people are already predisposed towards more pro-social attitudes—but it does suggest that the engagement with the police should be explored further.

Figure 12. Attitudes of 12-18 year olds living in different cities towards their local area

Figure 13. Attitudes of 8-11 year olds whose sessions were attended by the police and those not towards their local area

Young people who took part in sessions where the police recently attended were less likely to think it is OK to get into fights if provoked in comparison to the group whose sessions were not attended by the police (3% vs 20% respectively—Figure 14). In other words, the former were more likely to have pro-social attitudes than the latter group. But there was not a significant difference between these two groups when asked what they thought about being in the police as a career.

Figure 14: Attitudes towards fights between those young people whose sessions were attended by the police and those not
POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF STREETCHANCE

This section discusses the potential benefits of StreetChance in the three outcome areas that are related to StreetChance’s theory of change (see Figure 1)—namely its impact on community cohesion, crime and anti-social behaviour, and health.

Community cohesion

Social capital—how well people relate to their area and the people within it—can prevent anti-social behaviour. The majority of young people who participate in StreetChance do feel connected to their local area, yet a small minority do not. There are several possible reasons for this.

First, the high-risk group feels less as part of their local area in comparison to its pro-social peers. This is discussed in the previous chapter.

Secondly, as StreetChance works with different ethnic minority groups, some young people may feel simply less integrated within their broader local communities. For example, we noticed a stark difference between Manchester and some of the other main cities (Figure 5). Half of participants surveyed in Manchester said they did not quite feel as part of their local community. The majority of them were from Pakistan. According to the local coaches, there is indeed little engagement by some of these young people at the sessions. They also only play cricket and not other sports, unlike a typical StreetChance participant. However, as described below, this lack of integration is not linked with crime rates directly, unlike for the high-risk group.

According to Loughborough University’s report from 2011\(^\text{13}\), StreetChance can help promote community cohesion in two ways:

1) By getting young people engaged in a positive activity rather than hanging around with nothing to do. This can reduce fear of crime and engage young people in diversionary activities.

2) By providing a way for young people from different backgrounds to come together and engage with each other through cricket.

Because of the attitudes of the young people described above, the impact of the former of these is likely to be relatively weak, and is probably better expressed in any case as preventing crime, rather than fear of crime. This is discussed below.

For the latter, StreetChance does appear to bring young people together in some areas, but will not in areas that are mono-culture, such as Saltley. In mono-culture areas, there is still the potential for increased community cohesion, but this would be through increasing bonding social capital (relationships within a group) rather than bridging capital (relationships across different groups).

Thus, the difference that StreetChance can have on social cohesion depends on the specific contexts in which it operates. The programme should therefore be geared to those contexts and what can be achieved within them.

Crime and anti-social behaviour

The literature on crime and anti-social behaviour shows that close and frequent association with gangs and crime is a major factor that influences people’s own anti-social attitudes and ultimately their behaviour. Therefore StreetChance can reduce crime and anti-social behaviour through three effects.

Firstly, by providing diversionary activities it can reduce the likelihood that young people will offend simply by reducing the opportunity for such behaviour.

Secondly, the 10-20% of children and young people who have the more anti-social attitudes and are most of risk of offending are exposed to new relationships with people outside their normal criminal network and they may be influenced by this majority pro-social group. StreetChance can also make a difference by providing young people in this group who want to disassociate themselves from gangs, with an opportunity to continue to stay away from external negative influences.

Thirdly, StreetChance can provide a safe haven for the majority of children and young people who hold generally pro-social attitudes, thereby reducing the risk that any of them will get involved in crime and anti-social behaviour over time. Many participants choose not to get involved with gangs and StreetChance helps them with that choice.

These three effects are cited in the other evaluations of StreetChance, suggesting that these really do happen.

Because of the nature of most StreetChance participants, we expect that the biggest impact of StreetChance on crime and anti-social behaviour is likely to apply only to 10-20% of them that are at highest risk. This group displays more anti-social attitudes towards the police than their pro-social peers. Many of them said they commit crimes. Coaches believe this is petty crime such as shoplifting, vandalism or egging somebody’s house. However, there may be more serious cases. For instance, one coach in East London said that one of his groups has been known for their involvement in fights and it was a point of pride and honour for them to stick up for each other14.

Health

Improving health is not one of StreetChance’s stated aims. However, StreetChance coaches note that some young people say they feel fitter and healthier as a result of the programme. Also, academic and grey literature suggests that sports can affect physical and mental health, particularly through decreased smoking and drug-taking and improved well-being. Therefore StreetChance may play a role in improving both physical and mental health.

StreetChance may help reduce potential problems with drug and alcohol abuse. This issue is sometimes addressed during the educational classes that accompany the sports sessions. Among the four main cities, participants in Bristol appear to have the highest exposure to drugs. Seven in every ten of the participants from Bristol who responded to the survey reported drugs are easy to come by (Figure 13). Coaches across all four cities believe that marijuana is the most accessible drug, but a few also reported that some young people may have also been exposed to cocaine, though none knew of young people using the drug.

Alcohol abuse was also an issue in certain cities including Bristol. As a significant portion of StreetChance participants are of Muslim faith, the alcohol consumption was mostly associated with white young people who make up 17% of the total cohort.

When asked whether they do things that are bad for their life, similar to anti-social attitudes, most StreetChance participants do not exhibit risky behaviour. Most do not think they do things that are bad for their life, but there are some differences among the different age bands. About a third of KS4 group thought that what they did was bad

---

14 They are not necessarily armed fights, though a knuckle-duster was sported among one of the participants.
for their life in comparison to only 25% for KS5 and 17% for KS2 (Figure 14). But the vast majority of StreetChance participants believe the programme has had a positive effect on them (Figure 15).

**Figure 13. Accessibility of drugs by city**

| 12-18 / Living in an area where it’s easy to get drugs |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| London          | Birmingham      | Bristol         | Manchester      |
| Just/Quite like me | A bit/not like me | Just/Quite like me | A bit/not like me |
| 67%             | 80%             | 29%             | 94%             |
| 33%             | 20%             | 71%             | 6%              |

**Figure 14. Attitudes towards life by age group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12-18 / do things that are bad for their life**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just/Quite like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15: Attitudes towards StreetChance by age group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8-18 / Attending Street Chance had a positive effect on their life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just/Quite like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NPC recommendations apply to the programme design.

Programme design

- The programmes should be tailored to local needs. These might differ by area. In some cities or neighbourhoods, community cohesion will be a more pertinent issue than anti-social behaviour. For example, in Manchester given a high Muslim community among the young participants, crime prevention is less of an issue in comparison to community integration. The case is different in Bristol where a high proportion of young participants are exposed to drugs and crime.

- StreetChance should continue to work with young people, particularly focusing on 8-11 age group. Sixty-one percent of all StreetChance young people are below the age of 15. As crime and gang involvement rise with age, the preventative aspects of StreetChance’s work are likely be strongest with the youngest participants. In some cities, such as Bristol, most of young participants fall under the age of 11, yet we know that Bristol cohort has a particularly high exposure to drugs and crime.

- StreetChance should consider working with other partners such as YOTs, other charities, and refugee agencies to customise its local programmes to local needs. Developing such partnerships may help StreetChance better address local needs and may provide access to data about the young people it works with.
NPC is a charity think tank and consultancy which occupies a unique position at the nexus between charities and funders, helping them achieve the greatest impact. We are driven by the values and mission of the charity sector, to which we bring the rigour, clarity and analysis needed to better achieve the outcomes we all seek. We also share the motivations and passion of funders, to which we bring our expertise, experience and track record of success.

**Increasing the impact of charities:** NPC exists to make charities and social enterprises more successful in achieving their missions. Through rigorous analysis, practical advice and innovative thinking, we make charities’ money and energy go further, and help them to achieve the greatest impact.

**Increasing the impact of funders:** NPC’s role is to make funders more successful too. We share the passion funders have for helping charities and changing people’s lives. We understand their motivations and their objectives, and we know that giving is more rewarding if it achieves the greatest impact it can.

**Strengthening the partnership between charities and funders:** NPC’s mission is also to bring the two sides of the funding equation together, improving understanding and enhancing their combined impact. We can help funders and those they fund to connect and transform the way they work together to achieve their vision.