Evaluation of biological treatments for offending.

One biological treatment for offending is Depo-Provera. It has proven to be useful against offending. Meyer et al (1992) compared men taking Depo-Provera with a control group. 18 percent of the treatment group reoffended compared with 35 per cent of the control group, which shows that drug treatment prevents reoffending. This was confirmed by Maletzky et al (2006) who looked at case histories of male offenders who took Depo-Provera and a group who did not. Those who received the drug didn't reoffend whereas those did not had a high rate of reoffending. One strength of this research is that the studies are experiments, so we can draw conclusions about cause and effect. A downside is that these drugs have side effects.

Evaluation of biological treatments for offending.

One biological treatment for offending is Depo-Provera. It has proven to be useful against offending. Meyer et al (1992) compared men taking Depo-Provera with a control group. 18 percent of the treatment group reoffended compared with 35 per cent of the control group, which shows that drug treatment prevents reoffending. This was confirmed by Maletzky et al (2006) who looked at case histories of male offenders who took Depo-Provera and a group who did not. Those who received the drug didn't reoffend whereas those did not had a high rate of reoffending. One strength of this research is that the studies are experiments, so we can draw conclusions about cause and effect. A downside is that these drugs have side effects.

Issues:

- 1. Should be specific about type of offending.
- 2. Lack of random assignment to conditions
- 3. Overstated conclusion reduces offending but doesn't prevent it completely.
- 4. There were three groups: recommended/treated; recommended/not treated; not recommended/not treated.
- 5. Not entirely accurate some reoffending by D-P group but no sexual offences. 26-31% reoffending in other groups including 55+% sexual reoffending.
- 6. No RCTs in this evidence base, so cause-effect conclusions somewhat speculative.
- 7. Nature of side effect not explored; arguments about their importance are nuanced.