

A Structured Multi-Criteria Assessment of Knife-Crime Policy Alternatives in Bristol

Alusine Diamond-Suma¹

¹University of Bristol

Publication Date: 2026/08/17

Abstract: This analysis presents a proposal for policy analysis on “External Shocks and Youth Crime: Proposing an Analytical Approach for Evaluating Knife Crime Policy Options in Bristol”. It is intended for the Bristol City Council, Avon & Somerset Police, local youth organisations, and relevant national departments, such as the Home Office and Department for Education. It focuses on the problem of Knife Crime Policy Options in Bristol and offers recommendations to support new policy recommendations for a more inclusive and preventive strategy in contrast to the current approach with the Avon & Somerset Violence Reduction Units (Widdowson, 2025)

How to Cite: Alusine Diamond-Suma (2026) A Structured Multi Criteria Assessment of Knife Crime Policy Alternatives in Bristol. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(8), 771-777. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26aug473>

I. INTRODUCTION

Youth knife crime in Bristol has become an increasingly urgent and complex policy challenge, shaped by the interaction of individual vulnerabilities, structural inequalities, and the destabilising effects of recent external shocks. As noted in the paper, young people under 25 have experienced rising exposure to knife-related harm, particularly in communities marked by socioeconomic deprivation and limited institutional support. Austerity-driven cuts to youth services have intensified these trends, as has the COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing cost-of-living crisis, each of which has disrupted traditional support structures and weakened local resilience. As this paper states, “each of these shocks has disrupted traditional youth support structures, limited access to educational and employment opportunities, and contributed to increased exposure to criminal influences.” Existing responses, which are centred largely on policing interventions through the Avon & Somerset Violence Reduction Units, are more reactive, short-term, and insufficiently adaptive to sudden disruptions.

This paper argues that addressing knife crime in Bristol requires a fundamental reframing of the problem. Rather than viewing youth violence solely through a criminal justice lens, the analysis positions knife crime as a symptom of broader systemic disruption, governance fragility, and declining institutional capacity under conditions of shock. As the paper highlights, “the manner in which a problem is presented shapes the level of interventions it attracts,” underscoring the need for a framing that recognises interdependence, inequality, and institutional gaps. Building on this reframing, the paper proposes a structured Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) to evaluate policy alternatives that integrate

preventive, adaptive, and community-centred approaches. By combining insights from systems thinking, policy instrument analysis, and shock-sensitive governance frameworks, the study offers a methodological foundation for generating and prioritising policy options that have proven capacity to strengthen resilience and reduce youth knife crime in Bristol.

II. POLICY PROBLEM

Youth knife crime in Bristol has emerged as a complex and pressing social problem, reflecting both individual vulnerabilities and structural inequalities (‘BCYC Report, 2024’, no date). In recent years, children and young people below 25 years have seen increases in knife-related incidents, particularly those in areas of socioeconomic deprivation (Cordeiro, 2025). However, these trends have been exacerbated by external shocks, including austerity cuts to youth services, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the ongoing cost-of-living crisis (Barnes, 2024; Sanders-McDonagh, 2024). Each of these shocks has disrupted traditional youth support structures, limited access to educational and employment opportunities, and contributed to increased exposure to criminal influences.

Existing policy responses have been primarily reactive. The Avon & Somerset Violence Reduction Units (VRUs) focus on policing interventions, including targeted stop-and-search operations, knife amnesties, and outreach programs (Widdowson, 2025). The National Serious Violence Strategy provides additional funding and guidance, but implementation often depends on local capacity, partnership and coordination. While these measures are important, they tend to be short-term, reactive, and insufficiently resilient to sudden disruptions (Cairney, 2021). These limitations

advance the need for new approaches; the reactive nature of existing policies makes it challenging for adaptation in most cases. However, it does not sufficiently explain how austerity and shocks challenged the effectiveness of local institutions in response to youth violence.

This proposal applies an exogenous shocks lens to examine how sudden disruptions reshape local policy agendas and create opportunities for policy innovation. The analysis aims to identify methods for evaluating alternative policy solutions for youth knife crime, integrating both preventive and adaptive approaches. Drawing on the Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) (Atar, 2022) and structured problem-solving frameworks, the study provides a methodological approach for generating, evaluating, and prioritising policy options that account for structural shocks.

III. REFRAMING THE POLICY PROBLEM

Reframing the current policy problem is critical in introducing a new set of policy options. The current policy on knife crime is structured as criminal justice, which has narrowed down solution opportunities and focuses the current policy towards police interventions (“Home Office – Serious Violence Strategy, April 2018,”). The manner in which a problem is presented shapes the level of interventions it attracts (Bacchi, 2025). In the case of Bristol’s knife crime, its principal framing affects the broader socio-economic and institutional impacts that put young people at risk. A framing that recognises knife crime amongst young people as a problem that arises from systemic disruption, governance gaps, and declining institutional resilience (McConnell, 2010; Cairney, 2021) affected by shocks that undermine youth services and deepening inequality (Barnes, 2024) would be a productive perspective.

This perspective will agree with the insight from Cairney’s multi-criteria analysis that emphasises the opening of new policy agendas informed by disruptive events (Cairney, 2019), and from systems thinking approaches that understand the importance of interconnected causes rather than isolated incidents. Based on this reframed understanding, knife crime will be seen not as the outcome of an isolated criminal act but the symptom of a broader structural disruption that will settle young people’s socioeconomic environment.

This framing has broadened the space for decision-makers to embark on a range of policy interventions available. It provides structural collaboration that strengthens the relationship across local councils and their departments, police, schools, and community organisations. However, using the multi-criteria Analysis helps to focus on an innovative, context-sensitive, and ethically grounded approach to youth violence. Additionally, it analyses the case why certain issues gain traction, and others are ignored, noting the importance of timing, framing, and institutional context (Capano and Howlett, 2020).

IV. POLICY OPTIONS

This section presents a useful range of policy options to support addressing knife crime among young people in Bristol. Every option presented in this section is considered as a coherent package that discusses what the policy is, its instrument mix and why it is chosen. Also, they respond to gaps identified in the policy environment, and offer an actionable guide that aligns with broader governance frameworks (Howlett and Rayner, 2013)

➤ *Community Partnership and Coordination (CPC)*

This option promotes the establishment of a permanent multi-agency coordination network (MAC-Net) that formally links the Bristol City Council, Avon and Somerset Police, Schools, Health Services and Community Organisations, supported by basic standard operating procedures. The intention is to create a standing community resilience platform (CRP) that enables partners to share information, coordinate interventions, and mobilise resources more efficiently.

The collaborative nature of this option means it relies heavily on light informal support—that is, routine communication, voluntary cooperation, and shared problem-solving rather than rigid hierarchical control. This is important because recent COVID-19 shock and funding cuts have produced economic stress and inconsistent institutional responses amongst local agencies. Evidence from systems thinking literature shows that when institutions face external shocks, coordination failures often emerge due to fragmented mandates, siloed operations, and limited adaptive capacity (Meadows, 2008; Rahman, Wellstead and Howlett, 2019). A standing CRP can mitigate these weaknesses by reducing duplication of effort, enabling flexible reallocation of resources, and strengthening collective situational awareness.

If effectively implemented, CPC is expected to improve inter-agency coordination, enhance preventive services, and support gap assessment, which allows partners to identify unmet needs and mobilise community-led responses. However, two key risks require explicit consideration:

- **Bureaucratic complexity:** Multi-agency networks often struggle with unclear decision-making authority, overlapping responsibilities, and slow administrative processes. Studies of local governance networks in the UK show that coordination bodies can become procedurally heavy, which delays action during crises and reduces partner engagement (Lowndes and Skelcher, 1998; Huxham and Vangen, 2005).
- **Political buy-in:** Sustaining cross-agency collaboration requires consistent political commitment. Evidence from urban health and resilience initiatives indicates that when political priorities shift or leadership changes, multi-agency platforms risk losing support, legitimacy, or funding. Without strong political sponsorship, CPC may struggle to survive beyond initial implementation.

- These risks do not rule out the effectiveness of the CPC option, but highlight the need for deliberate design choices - clear governance arrangements, streamlined procedures, and early political endorsement which ensures the network remains functional and resilient.

➤ *Innovation Funds for Violent Prevention (micro-grant model)*

This policy option proposes setting up local administrative funds (micro-grants) to support community groups in piloting a project co-created with young people. This option suggests the utilisation of economic, collaborative and informational instruments to enable co-creation and a rapid evaluation model. The motivation is that local actors and agencies understand how external shocks affect their community; hence, soft and quick-fix funding promotes local ownership and experimentation (Meadows, 2008b; Rahman, Wellstead and Howlett, 2019b). The value of this funding promises rapid, low-cost, local-led response to the issues. However, there are concerns that implementation might be distorted if it's not managed by clear mechanisms to scale up successful pilot interventions. A case study of the Scotland Community Funds project in 2022 supported local authorities in distributing small grants to grassroots organisations to pilot interventions which address socio-economic shocks and gang activities (GOV.Scot, 2022).

➤ *Catch Them Young*

This option is a behavioural and knowledge revolution mechanism that can be delivered through schools and youth life skills centres. Reports have shown that 20% of teenagers in England and Wales are victims of violence (YEF.-Education-Systems-Guidance, 2025). Hence, this option invests in both informational instruments - curricula on conflict resolution, digital rights and safety- with collaborative support by having restorative justice facilitators and on-site counsellors. This rationale empowers in-school children/teenagers and out-of-school youth with non-violent conflict support and strengthens informal social controls aimed at reducing the demand for knife use as a means of protection or status (WHO, 2019; Taub, Pearrow and Walker, 2023). Schools as universal learning institutions provide a platform for the knowledge revolution, which transforms into resilience (World Bank Document, 2016). Scaling up this option depends on staff capacity and the efficiency of its specialist referral mechanisms.

The options proffered should not be viewed in isolation but rather can and should be combined into a policy mix. The community partnership coordination programme, for example, provides appropriate governance mechanisms through which the innovation violence funds and catch them young can be effectively coordinated and scaled up. According to Howlett and Rayner, (2013), policy mixes are most effective when designed as a coherent set of mutually reinforcing instruments rather than as isolated or fragmented interventions. Similarly (Capano and Howlett, 2020)'s journal on policy instruments analysis emphasises that governance is highly dependent on an integrated approach that promotes adaptability under conditions of shock. This

clearly aligns with (Cairney, 2021)'s notion of "politics of expertise", which promotes institutional capacity to be effectively coordinated through robust governance mechanisms and policy windows.

Case Study: The Life Skills Training in the United States demonstrates how structured school-based education can reduce violence through behavioural and knowledge intervention in 52 states (Botvin and Griffin, 2014).

V. APPLYING MCA TO KNIFE CRIME POLICY OPTIONS

➤ *Reframing the Problem*

In order to narrow criminal justice framing of young people and knife crime in Bristol, the first step proposed is to admit that the cause of the problem is as a result of governance fragility that leads to systemic disruption and vulnerability especially under shock circumstances. This framing will consider that this analysis captures structural drivers like pandemic disruption, deprivation, and austerity (Cairney, 2021; UK GOV, 2023). The MCA evaluates options on the capacity to build resilience and its ability to adapt to shocks rather than enforcement outcomes.

➤ *Criteria Selection Based on Values and Contextual Environments*

The policy options are evaluated against nominated values and the local context of Bristol, ensuring that the assessment reflects the city's social realities and governance priorities. Letter-coding is used for clarity and for cross-referencing in Section 4.4. The selected criteria are as follows:

- Effectiveness in reducing knife-crime incidents in Bristol
- Equity in dealing with vulnerable groups
- Feasibility in institutional capacity (including resources)
- Community Ownership, emphasising a contextual policy analysis grounded in (Scott, 2010) value propositions—adaptability, fairness and inclusion.

While all four criteria are important, inclusion is foregrounded as a dominant evaluative lens because knife-crime prevention in Bristol is deeply shaped by disparities in neighbourhood experiences, youth engagement, trust in institutions, and access to support services. Inclusion therefore operates not merely as a sub-value within community ownership but as a cross-cutting principle that determines whether policy options meaningfully reach marginalised groups, incorporate community voice, and avoid reproducing existing inequalities. In this context, inclusion strengthens the legitimacy, responsiveness and long-term sustainability of any intervention, making it a central criterion for evaluating policy options.

➤ *Assign Weight to Criteria*

In assigning weights to these criteria, stakeholders should collaborate effectively to make these allocations based on their priorities. Here is an example: let's say resilience and effectiveness are given a higher rate of 30% each to emphasise the need for impactful and more robust policy, whilst feasibility, community ownership and resilience share

the remaining allocation of 40%. This is a clear reflection of the importance of designing policies that have an upgrade impact and also can survive shocks (Roy, 2009; Gamper and Turcanu, 2015).

➤ *Score Each Alternative on Each Criterion Based on Evidence*

The table below shows how each option is scored against the criteria. The five criteria listed in section 4.2 above, as coded in the bullet points A to E, are translated in the table below for easier reference.

Table 1 Alternative Score

Policy Options	A	B	C	D	E	Evidence and Criteria Analysis
Community Partnership and Coordination			Medium	High	High	This options stands high on coordination (D) and resilience (E) and moderate on feasibility (C) due to bureaucratic risks (Meadows, 2008; Rahman et al., 2019).
Innovation Funds (Micro-grants)	High			High	Medium	This option is high on rapid effectiveness (A) and community ownership (D) and (Chivers et al., 2023), moderate on resilience (E), lower on scalability without clear mechanisms.
Catch Them Young	High	High	Medium			Appears strong on equity (B) and prevention (A) and (WHO, 2019; Taub et al., 2023; World Bank, 2016), moderate on feasibility (C) due to institutional capacity constraints (staff and referrals). Trade-offs can be systematically compared using the outranking methods (Bouyssou, 2001).

- Community Partnership and Coordination analysed based on (Meadows, 2008b; Rahman, Wellstead and Howlett, 2019b)
- Innovation Funds (Micro-grants): analysed based on (Chivers et al., 2023)
- Catch Them Young: analysed based on (WHO, 2019; Taub, Pearrow and Walker, 2023) , and the outranking method (Bouyssou and Pirlot, 2003)

➤ *Deliberations*

From a critical standpoint, MCA is best positioned as a structured deliberation framework rather than a mechanical ranking tool. The inclusion of all relevant stakeholders - local council, school, police and community groups ensures that final policy choices have strong legitimacy and buy-in, which takes into cognisance the structural sensitivity of the issue (Varone, Jacob and Bundi, 2023)

According to (Howlett and Rayner, 2013), a coherent policy mix maximises effectiveness when policy options are implemented collectively rather than fragmented interventions. The analysis in Table 1 highlights key complementarities, in cognisance with other scholarship emphasising the importance of how instruments interact and the policy mix.

- The Community Partnership Coordination provides a governance backbone.
- The Innovation Funds will enable the experimentation of local ideas through pilot interventions.
- Whilst catch them young creates an opportunity for prevention and resilience.

VI. LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPOSED POLICY OPTION ANALYSED

Throughout this analysis, the MCA approach has been regarded as a valuable analytical tool in policy analysis. Despite its effectiveness in the policy process, some limitations must be acknowledged. Discussing these limitations is reflective of the realities of conducting policy analysis in complex systems. However, they do not compromise the validity of the three proposed policy options in this analysis. A condition to navigate is that policy analysis is often shaped by political constraints and uncertainty (Bardach and Patashnik, 2020). Under the knife crime which is a wicked problem must also be considered as political institutional challenges that require system framing (McConnell, 2017).

➤ *Causal attribution challenge*

The issue of knife crime in Bristol is defined by multiple factors – social, economic and institutional that do not follow linear processes and interactions. This makes it difficult to differentiate the cause and impact of a single intervention; even quasi-experimental designs cannot fully disregard other factors that affect the process (Varone, Jacob and Bundi, 2023). The accuracy in identifying the cause can be limited, hence the need to adopt mixed methods to provide more actionable insights (Meadows, 2008).

➤ *Data Availability and Quality Constraints*

Generating administrative data on youth violence, youth exclusion and services is often confronted by data inconsistency, leading to data gaps that reflect on the institutions or agencies. The gaps identified in the data

collection process have been discussed as a universal challenge in social policy (Best, 2013). Hence, the establishment of data sharing platforms and ethical standards is expected to address those gaps. These inconsistencies in data availability, however, do not undermine implementation, as policy decisions also rely on trend evidence and ethically administered data-sharing initiatives.

➤ *Political and Institutional Context*

Political and administrative context has shaped feasibility by subjecting the policy process to bounded rationality and also institutional legacies (Cairney, 2021). These dynamics have made interventions geared towards prevention face greater resistance compared to enforcement-led guidance. In this analysis, it is widely considered a political framing rather than an analytic work. Hence, policy options can be implemented when they are aligned with existing political priorities while retaining substantive preventive measures (McConnell, 2017)

➤ *Stakeholder Bias and Framing*

Stakeholders normally define problems in ways that reflect how they feel and what the solution should look like (Bacchi, 2025). This process normally introduces bias in qualitative evidence. The different stakeholders considered in this analysis all have their different views of what a solution looks like for knife crime in Bristol - the police perspective, the local council perspective, the development organisation perspective, the youth organisation's perspective all have their positions on what they want the solution to knife crime in Bristol to be. However, these diverse perspectives promote inclusion in the policy process and implementation in attracts the benefit of pluralised perspectives (Fischer, 2003).

➤ *Challenges in Ethics and Piracy*

The implementation of policy options will require data collection, which might raise concern over consent, privacy and data protection in general (Wolford, 2018). Ethical and piracy constraints will limit evaluation design, which is part of the monitoring process and is essential for legitimacy. Also, ethical and data protection helps to strengthen trust and improve participation, which is needed for the effective delivery of policy options.

VII. CRITICAL CONCLUSION

The limitations explained above explain key constraints in which policy evaluation processes operate. They, however, do not undermine the relevance of the proposed policy options - the Community Partnership Coordination, Innovation Funds, and Catch them young.

This analysis concludes by reflecting Cairney's position that all policy analysis and evaluation approaches are constrained by one factor or the other. Cairney, (2019) emphasised that no single approach is capable of addressing the full complexity of the policy-making process. Stating these limitations acknowledges that no single theory is fully appropriate to analyse a particular policy.

The analysis contends that there is a need for flexibility and adaptation in the policy-making process. Having interacted with other policy analysis approaches during my Term One lectures in my school of public policy, readings and seminars, the MCA stood out as a perfect match for providing analysis in this study, as it is a decision-supported approach for both policy analysis and evaluation. This approach has proven to be very helpful in supporting stakeholders and policymakers to make informed policy choices when their decisions involve uncertainty.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Atar, E. (2022) 'Eugene Bardach and Eric M. Patashnik, A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving', *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 19(74), pp. 99–100.
- [2]. Bacchi, C. (2025) *What's the Problem Represented to Be?: A New Thinking Paradigm*. 1st edn. London: Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032678382>.
- [3]. Bardach, E.S. and Patashnik, E.M. (2020) *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. Washington, D.C: CQ Press.
- [4]. Barnes, A. (2024) 'Closure of more than a thousand youth centres could have lasting impact on society', *UNISON National*, 14 June. Available at: <https://www.unison.org.uk/news/2024/06/closure-of-more-than-a-thousand-youth-centres-could-have-lasting-impact-on-society/> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [5]. 'BCYC Report, 2024' (no date). Available at: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/files/documents/8917-bcyc-report/file> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [6]. Best, J. (2013) '11 Constructionist Social Problems Theory'.
- [7]. Botvin, G.J. and Griffin, K.W. (2014) 'Life skills training: Preventing substance misuse by enhancing individual and social competence', *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2014(141), pp. 57–65. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/yn.20086>.
- [8]. Bouyssou, D. and Pirlot, M. (2003) 'Conjoint measurement tools for MCDM. A brief introduction'.
- [9]. Cairney, P. (2019) *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [10]. Cairney, P. (2021) 'The UK Government's COVID-19 Policy: What Does "Guided by the Science" Mean in Practice?', *Frontiers in Political Science*, 3, p. 624068. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2021.624068>.
- [11]. Capano, G. and Howlett, M. (2020) 'The Knowns and Unknowns of Policy Instrument Analysis: Policy Tools and the Current Research Agenda on Policy Mixes', *Sage Open*, 10(1), p. 2158244019900568. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900568>.
- [12]. Chivers, C. et al. (2023) 'Microgrants as a pathway for community development: A case study exploring impacts, implementation and context', *Community*

- Development*, 54(3), pp. 411–428. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2022.2091626>.
- [13]. Cordeiro, V.C. (2025) 'The horrifying impact of knife crime on youth in England and Wales', *Humanium*, 8 April. Available at: <https://www.humanium.org/en/the-horrifying-impact-of-knife-crime-on-youth-in-the-united-kingdom/> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [14]. Fischer, F. (2003) *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford University Press.
- [15]. Gamper, C.D. and Turcanu, C. (2015) 'Multi-criteria analysis: a tool for going beyond monetization?', in A.J. Jordan and J.R. Turnpenny (eds) *The Tools of Policy Formulation*. Edward Elgar Publishing. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783477043.00017>.
- [16]. gov.scot (2022) *Supporting Communities Fund: evaluation*. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/supporting-communities-fund-evaluation/> (Accessed: 12 November 2025).
- [17]. 'Home Office – Serious Violence Strategy, April 2018' (no date). Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5acb21d140f0b64fed0afd55/serious-violence-strategy.pdf> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [18]. Howlett, M. and Rayner, J. (2013) 'Patching vs Packaging in Policy Formulation: Assessing Policy Portfolio Design', *Politics and Governance*, 1(2), pp. 170–182.
- [19]. Huxham, C. and Vangen, S.E. (2005) *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. Psychology Press.
- [20]. Lowndes, V. and Skelcher, C. (1998) 'The Dynamics of Multi-organizational Partnerships: an Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance', *Public Administration*, 76(2), pp. 313–333. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00103>.
- [21]. McConnell, A. (2010) 'Policy Success, Policy Failure and Grey Areas In-Between', *Journal of Public Policy*, 30(3), pp. 345–362. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X10000152>.
- [22]. McConnell, A. (2017) 'Rethinking wicked problems as political problems and policy problems', *Policy & Politics* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557317X15072085902640>.
- [23]. Meadows, D. (2008) *Thinking in Systems: International Bestseller*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- [24]. Meadows, D. (2008) *Thinking in Systems: International Bestseller*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- [25]. Rahman, M., Wellstead, A. and Howlett, M. (2019a) 'From adaptive capacity to policy capacity adaptation assessments: insights from the policy sciences', *Research Handbook on Climate Change Adaptation Policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 291–309. Available at: <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/edcoll/9781786432513/9781786432513.00023.xml> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [26]. Rahman, M., Wellstead, A. and Howlett, M. (2019b) 'From adaptive capacity to policy capacity adaptation assessments: insights from the policy sciences', *Research Handbook on Climate Change Adaptation Policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 291–309. Available at: <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/edcoll/9781786432513/9781786432513.00023.xml> (Accessed: 6 December 2025).
- [27]. Roy, M. (2009) 'Planning for sustainable urbanisation in fast growing cities: Mitigation and adaptation issues addressed in Dhaka, Bangladesh', *Habitat International*, 33(3), pp. 276–286. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2008.10.022>.
- [28]. Sanders-McDonagh, E. (2024) *Rising knife crime in London is linked to austerity cuts to youth services – here's the evidence*, *The Conversation*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.64628/AB.mk6e9y79r>.
- [29]. Scott, C. (2010) 'Adding Value to Policy Analysis and Advice'.
- [30]. Taub, J., Pearrow, M.M. and Walker, W. (2023) 'Resilience Through Violence and Bullying Prevention in Schools', in S. Goldstein and R.B. Brooks (eds) *Handbook of Resilience in Children*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 495–509. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14728-9_26.
- [31]. UK GOV (2023) *The UK Government Resilience Framework*, GOV.UK. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-uk-government-resilience-framework/the-uk-government-resilience-framework-html> (Accessed: 2 November 2025).
- [32]. Varone, F., Jacob, S. and Bundi, P. (2023) 'Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation', *Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation*. Edward Elgar Publishing. Available at: <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollbook/book/9781800884892/9781800884892.xml>.
- [33]. WHO (2019) *School-based violence prevention: a practical handbook*. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/school-based-violence-prevention-a-practical-handbook> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).
- [34]. Widdowson, E. (2025) 'Initiatives and projects 2025-2026 | Avon & Somerset Violence Reduction Partnership', 15 January. Available at: <https://asvrp.co.uk/about-us-2-2/> (Accessed: 9 December 2025).
- [35]. Wolford, B. (2018) 'What is GDPR, the EU's new data protection law?', *GDPR.eu*, 7 November. Available at: <https://gdpr.eu/what-is-gdpr/> (Accessed: 10 December 2025).
- [36]. 'World Bank Document' (no date). Available at: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/385041496301040423/pdf/Systems-Approach-for-Better-Education-Results-SABER-education-resilience-approaches.pdf> (Accessed: 8 December 2025).

- [37]. 'YEF.-Education-Systems-Guidance, May 2025' (no date). Available at:
<https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/YEF.-Education-Systems-Guidance.-May-2025.pdf> (Accessed: 8 December 2025).