



LJMU Research Online

Hurley, M and Boulton, L

Early Identification and Intervention with Individuals at Risk of Becoming Involved in Serious and Organised Crime (SOC)

<https://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/19725/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Hurley, M and Boulton, L ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5623-8884> (2021) Early Identification and Intervention with Individuals at Risk of Becoming Involved in Serious and Organised Crime (SOC). *Safer Communities*. 20 (2). pp. 73-84. ISSN 1757-8043

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Article Title	Early Identification and Intervention with Individuals at Risk of Becoming Involved in Serious and Organised Crime (SOC).
Author details	<p>Mick Hurley & Laura Boulton</p> <p>Mick@specialistcrimesolutions.co.uk Director, Specialist Crime Solutions Limited</p> <p>l.j.boulton@ljmu.ac.uk Senior Lecturer in Policing Studies, Liverpool Centre for Advanced Policing, School of Justice Studies, Liverpool John Moores University</p>
Research funding	N/A
Abstract	<p>This paper examines the ‘Engage’ pilot project and related processes for identifying individuals vulnerable to becoming involved in Serious and Organised Crime Groups. In this, a six-stage process developed in the five pilot sites in order to develop a meaningful action plan to be used to guide interventions is described. The project identified 18 individuals who have confirmed low level involvement in organised crime groups based in five areas of Greater Manchester by combining risk factors and the connecting of records held by law enforcement agencies. Key risk factors found to be associated with the 18 individuals identified are describes in relation to literature and discussed in terms of future intervention possibilities. A brief description of the key findings of the evaluation of the pilot project is also included. Together these findings are discussed to explore the challenges of preventative interventions tailored towards young people already involved in criminality and offers recommendations for future programmes in this field.</p>
Keywords	Gangs, Organised Crime Groups, Prevention, Early Intervention, Vulnerability
Article Classification	Research Paper

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines the 'Engage' pilot project and related processes for identifying individuals vulnerable to becoming involved in Serious and Organised Crime Groups.

Design: In this, a six-stage process developed in the five pilot sites in order to develop a meaningful action plan to be used to guide interventions is described. The project identified 18 individuals who have confirmed low level involvement in organised crime groups based in five areas of Greater Manchester by combining risk factors and the connecting of records held by law enforcement agencies.

Findings: Key risk factors found to be associated with the 18 individuals identified are describes in relation to literature and discussed in terms of future intervention possibilities. A brief description of the key findings of the evaluation of the pilot project is also included.

Originality/value: Together these findings are discussed to explore the challenges of preventative interventions tailored towards young people already involved in criminality and offers recommendations for future programmes in this field.

Introduction

This paper describes the process related to an intervention which aimed to identify young people at risk of involvement in Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) and deliver tailored interventions in order to prevent their involvement. This paper specifically focusses on the process underlying the identification of the young people at risk of involvement using a 'Deep Dive' analysis. However, a brief description of the project this Deep Dive process belonged to is provided for context. A short overview of the key findings from the evaluation of the intervention stage, which aimed to prevent those identified using this Deep Dive method from involvement in SOC, is also provided but is not the main focus of this paper. A fuller exploration of the evaluation study and the results associated with this evaluation can be found in Boulton, Pythian and Kirby (2019).

Background

Hallsworth and Young (2006) suggest that the main difference between an Organised Crime Group (OCG) and other typologies of peer group or 'gang' is the professional nature of their illegal operations and participation in crime for personal gain. This is in line with the Home Office's (2013) definition of Organised Crime (OC):

Individuals, normally working with others, with the capacity and capability to commit serious crime on a continuing basis, which includes elements of planning, control and coordination, and benefits those involved.

It is estimated that SOC costs the UK £24b a year (Mills et al., 2013), Therefore, during 2013, the Home Office presented a strategy to reduce the level of SOC. It was based on four specific elements:

- *Pursue:* Prosecuting and disrupting people engaged in SOC;
- *Protect:* Increasing the protection against SOC;
- *Prepare:* Reducing the impact of this criminality where it takes place;
- *Prevent:* Preventing people from engaging in this activity.

Prevent was further defined as, “...stopping people from getting involved in all forms of SOC and deterring existing organised criminals from continuing. It involves a wide range of local approaches, multi-agency partnerships, and interventions” (Home Office, 2013). The objectives of the strategy would be to:

- Deter people from becoming involved in SOC by raising awareness of the reality and consequences;
- Use interventions to stop people being drawn into different types of SOC;
- Develop techniques to deter people from continuing in SOC;
- Establish an effective offender management framework to support work on *Pursue* and *Prevent* (Home Office, 2013, p. 45).

Success in *Prevent* would mean that:

- Fewer people would engage in serious and organised criminal activity;
- It would reduce offending by people convicted for SOC.

Project Engage

During the 2015-16 financial year, the Home Office provided grant funding to *Programme Challenger* (Greater Manchester Police), to further develop the *Prevent* theme. At the forefront was *Programme Challenger*, a dedicated multi-agency team to identify, research and tackle the phenomenon. One of its specific objectives was, ‘To develop early intervention and prevention strategies aimed at young people and the families of those involved in organised crime’. As such, *Project Engage* was funded as part of the *Programme Challenger* initiative. Whereas *Programme Challenger* represented the multi-agency team responsible for developing the *Prevent* agenda more broadly in the Manchester region, *Project Engage* had a specific aim to:

‘...prevent young people and vulnerable individuals from becoming involved in SOC, and to support those already involved, in moving away from SOC.’

Project Engage had two specific objectives:

- The creation of an intelligence-based identification, information sharing, and case planning process, allowing young people/vulnerable individuals to be identified as suitable for interventions;
- To design and deliver bespoke interventions, during the following financial year.

As part of this project, Specialist Crime Solutions were commissioned by the Home Office and Greater Manchester Police to identify, in real time, those at risk of SOC involvement within the Greater Manchester area. It is estimated that up to £1.7b of SOC costs the UK a year can potentially be associated with Greater Manchester (Mills et al., 2013). Reducing this cost by a mere 1% could reduce public cost by up to £17m each year¹. This level of reduction in SOC would also generate wider community benefits, in the form of community cohesion and improved well-being (Bullock et al., 2013). These financial and wider costs provide a strong business case on which to explore new initiatives on which to reduce the impact of SOC. The increased use of young people to store and carry drugs around the UK is “a major concern to practitioners” (Disley & Liddle, 2016, p. 25), highlighting the current concerns surrounding county lines exploitation², including the

¹ Figure presented in ‘How to identify and work with individuals vulnerable to involvement in serious and organised crime (draft)’, Specialist Crime Solutions, 2016:8.

² “County lines is the police term for urban gangs supplying drugs to suburban areas and market and coastal towns using dedicated mobile phone lines or “deal lines”. It involves child criminal

links to criminal exploitation, drugs, gangs, missing from homes, modern slavery, safeguarding and violence (Home Office, 2017).

Specialist Crime Solutions are a consultancy firm who work with the police, local and national governments and the community sector to develop strategies, policies and legislation. Specialist Crime Solutions is run by one of the authors of this paper. Specialist Crime Solutions' role within *Project Engage* specifically related to the development of a six-stage model, which was subsequently implemented in four areas of Greater Manchester (Salford, Stockport, Manchester and Oldham)³. These areas were amongst those identified as priority areas in the Ending Gangs and Youth Violence programme (HM Government, 2015). The six-step model⁴ is described below. Specialist Crime Solutions were actively involved in Stages 1-5. Practitioners (i.e. specialist youth services, care workers, lead professional etc.) delivered the intervention (Stage 6).

Stage 1: Identification

The working theory underlying Specialist Crime Solutions' development of *Project Engage* was that it was possible, using recognised risk factors to identify those most at risk of involvement in SOC. This stage of the process asked the Divisional *Project Engage* practitioners to highlight potential subjects from their geographic area. To assist this process, they were provided with specific risk factors, based upon previous unpublished work commissioned by *Operation Challenger* conducted by Hope et al., (2016), to benchmark suitable subjects. These risk factors included:

- Has familial links or close non-familial links to OCGs or OC activity;
- Resident within neighbourhoods with known SOC activity;
- Violent crimes (suspected, reported or convicted);
- Low educational attainment;
- Exposure to violence in the home;
- Impulsiveness/risk taking behaviour;
- Parent hostility towards authority figures/lack of engagement with professionals;
- Lack of appropriate parenting skills including boundary setting;
- Involvement in antisocial behaviour/Criminal Justice System;
- Not in mainstream education e.g. pupil referral unit;
- Numerous exclusions from school;
- Substance abuse.

A total of 33 young people were initially identified at this stage.

Stage 2: Referral

The second stage of the process required an independent chairperson (in this case Specialist Crime Solutions), to establish whether the subjects identified by *Project Engage* practitioners met the risk factor criteria. In essence, this stage was a checking mechanism. Individuals who were confirmed to have met the criteria were referred onto Stage 3 and their details were recorded formally on an identification form. Out of the 33 identified in Stage 1, 18 were referred on from here to Stage 3. Those not referred on were considered by Specialist Crime Solutions to have not met the criteria set out above.

exploitation as gangs use children and vulnerable people to move drugs and money" (Home Office, 2017, p.1).

³ Tameside were originally included in this project but later discontinued their involvement in the programme and did not provide any information to this study.

⁴ Source: 'How to identify and work with individuals vulnerable to involvement in serious and organised crime' (draft), Specialist Crime Solutions, 2016.

Stage 3: 'Deep Dives'

It was proposed that following the identification of these individuals each would be subject to a 'Deep Dive' (a process that looks at significant life events that have occurred since the individual's birth up to the present day) and a facilitated multi-agency session to capture each agencies involvement with the individual. A large number of agencies were involved, typically they included representatives from the following agencies, although this is not an exhaustive list.

- Anti-social behaviour teams
- Children and young people's services
- Housing services
- Police including specialist police teams such as public protection units;
- Probation services
- Youth offending teams;
- Voluntary and community sector
- Health services including mental health services
- Education services (including Pupil Referral Units)
- Crown Prosecution Service
- Substance and alcohol misuse services

The purpose of the 'Deep Dive' was to enhance sharing of information and intelligence, identify where and how interventions had been delivered previously and develop a shared understanding of the behaviour, lifestyle and influences affecting the individual. The outcome of the exercise was a detailed history of the subject, including agency interventions. This history was recorded chronologically in electronic form. A visual timeline of interventions and incidents was created enabling for agencies to cross reference when, where and how each of their agencies has been involved or responded. Doing this in real time rather than post critical incident (as with a serious case review), the expectation was that a fresh preventative approach could be developed through the enhanced understanding that the 'Deep Dive' brought. An analysis of the key risk factors identified as being prevalent themes across the cohort for whom a 'Deep Dive' was conducted, is provided below.

Stage 4: Action Plan

This stage involved the formulation of an individual action plan for each of the subjects.

Stage 5: Case Planning and Reviews

For this stage partnership leads were asked to choose a date to discuss the action plan in order to promote accountability and highlight clear way forward using a multi-agency approach. All individuals ($n = 18$) were invited to participate in the intervention.

Stage 6: Intervention

Out of the 18 individuals referred at Stage 2 and considered through Stage 3-5, only four accepted the offer and engaged in the intervention (Stage 6). Due to poor engagement from the majority of the 18 individuals originally identified and referred via the 'Deep Dive' process (i.e. refusal to participate, no response to invites, screened calls etc.), youth workers nominated different young people who they considered to be more appropriate to the preventive aims of the programme. In total, a cohort of 22 young people (all male) engaged with the six-month intervention stage between March-September 2016 (see Boulton, Kirby & Phythian, 2019 for further details). Each of these individuals were provided with a 'lead professional' (i.e. youth worker). Interventions typically involved providing tangible support (i.e. support when applying for a driving licence), one-to-one

mentoring and facilitation of education and/or work access, however the intervention was tailored for each specific individual based on their lead professional's assessment of their needs.

Deep Dive Themes

The Engage Project saw 'Deep Dives' undertaken in 18 cases. Although the purpose of the pilot scheme was not to collect data and collate these into findings, it was possible, after completing the 'Deep Dives', to pull out key themes and patterns associated with risk for these individuals. To be clear, the following findings relate to the 18 young people originally referred at Stage 2 to Stage 3 ('Deep Dive'). They do not relate to the cohort of 22 young men who eventually engaged in the intervention (Stage 6). The following themes summarise the key findings from 'Deep Dive' case notes (frequency counts and percentages of individuals associated with these risk factors can be found in Table 1).

Table 1: Frequency and percentage of risk factors present within sample

<i>Risk Factor</i>		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
OCG experience	<i>OCG link</i>	18	100%
	<i>Family OCG link</i>	6	33%
	<i>OCG activity in neighbourhood</i>	14	78%
Previous involvement with services	<i>Criminal Justice System</i>	18	100%
	<i>Anti-Social Behaviour reports</i>	10	56%
	<i>Children's Services</i>	16	89%
	<i>Family Intervention Support</i>	10	56%
Gender	<i>Male</i>	16	89%
	<i>Female</i>	2	11%
Age	<i>Under 18</i>	16	89%
	<i>18+</i>	2	11%
Violence	<i>Violent behaviour</i>	18	100%
	<i>Domestic violence</i>	11	61%
Vulnerability	<i>Missing from home</i>	12	67%
	<i>Mental health diagnosis</i>	6	33%
	<i>Substance misuse</i>	13	72%
	<i>Alternative education</i>	10	56%
	<i>Family bereavement</i>	7	39%
Trauma	<i>Absent father</i>	8	44%
	<i>Exploitation by adults</i>	14	78%
	<i>Child sexual exploitation risk</i>	4	22%

OCG Experience

All 18 of the individuals had an identifiable link to a mapped OCG which was required factor for inclusion into the sample. In six of the 18 cases (33%), the link to the OCG came through a close family member, i.e. parent, grandparent, or sibling. This supports past research which repeatedly finds an association between young people's involvement in OCGs and a close family member who is involved in OCGs (Marshall et al., 2005; Pitts et al., 2017). In particular, sibling involvement in gangs appears to be specifically predictive of involvement (Disley & Liddle, 2016; Medina et al., 2013a).

In 14 of the 18 cases (78%), it was identified by the agency participants of the 'Deep Dive' that the area in which the individual lived was well known or notorious for OC activity. This was a very subjective finding but did appear to support the authors view, as well as past literature (Pitts et al., 2017), that it was more likely that someone could be 'groomed/exploited' to involvement in SOC living in an area where SOC was prevalent and visible. This may be due to a lack of alternative lifestyle choices for the young people who live there, and fear that non-involvement will result in physical repercussions from those who are involved in criminality within that area (Hallsworth, 2005; Pitts, 2007).

Previous Involvement with Services

Whilst this was a pilot project looking at opportunities to prevent young people from becoming involved in SOC in the future, all 18 individuals in the sample were already involved in the criminal justice system. The criminal histories of the young people were found to encompass various offending behaviour, including breach of bail, criminal damage, public order, assault, theft and driving offences. Intelligence on the young people corroborated their engagement in wider antisocial behaviour and highlighted their association with known OCGs. Support for this was noted in earlier research that

identified an association between a high rate of offending and gang affiliation (Bennett & Holloway, 2004; Bullock & Tilley 2002; Communities that Care, 2005). Furthermore, Pitts et al., (2017) found that OCG members under the age of 18 offended much more frequently than their non-OCG contemporaries and were over three times as likely to be convicted of a 'violent' crime or a 'very serious' violent crime (including murder).

10 of the 18 individuals (56%) had reports made against them of involvement in 'anti-social behaviour' (ASB) albeit in most cases the nature of the ASB was not specified. Only two of these 10 had received any formal intervention (Anti-social Behavior Order or Injunction). Antisocial Behavior Orders (ASBOs) and civil injunctions are time limited civil court orders awarded to prohibit particular anti-social or criminal behaviours.

16 of the 18 individuals (89%) had Children's Services records. Specifically, 10 of the 18 (56%) had lived in households that had been referred to Family Intervention and Support programmes. Furthermore, seven of the 18 (39%) were still open cases within Children's Services.

Young Males

16 of the 18 individuals (89%) were male, which generally fits with national proportion of mapped OCG members and is in line with past literature (Bennett & Holloway, 2004; Blanchette & Brown, 2006; Marshall et al., 2005). In terms of age, although the initial call was for those vulnerable to involvement in SOC only, 16 of the 18 (89%) were under 18 years of age (the two others were 18 and 19 years). This supports past literature (Flood-Page et al., 2000; Marshall et al., 2005), which suggests that over 50% of OCG members' criminal onset was under 18 years of age (Francis et al., 2013). Furthermore, there is evidence of a recent rise in the participation of individuals aged between nine and 14 years in gangs, with the majority aged between 15 and 17 years (Disley & Liddle, 2016). This is concerning as research suggests that younger onset perpetrators demonstrate more extensive and varied offending than older offenders (Francis et al., 2013).

Violence

In all 18 cases, violence featured as part of the 'Deep Dive', both with the individual being a perpetrator of violent behavior and/or as the victim or witness of violence. In terms of perpetration Pitts et al., (2017) suggest that between 20% and 45% of boys and 45%-69% of girls who are serious violent offenders by age 16 or 17 initiated their violence in childhood. Most violent young offenders only begin their violent behaviour during adolescence and Pitts et al., (2017) concludes that early onset violent offending is a strong predictor of 'lifetime persistent' violent offending.

Prior victimisation has previously been found to increase likelihood of offending behavior carrying a weapon (Marshall et al., 2005; Youth Justice Board, 2004). Specifically experience of neglect and/or abuse (physical and/or sexual) has been reported to increase a young person's vulnerability to county lines exploitation (Home Office, 2017).

In support of Pitts et al., (2017) findings, the 'Deep Dive' process specifically identified that significant domestic violence (DV), had been a feature of the lives of 11 of the 18 participants (61%). In most cases this was as a childhood witness of DV, but a small number had gone on to be involved in perpetrating violence to others in the household.

Vulnerability

A range of vulnerabilities were apparent in the history of the sample's lives. In 12 of the 18 cases (67%) there had been formal reports to the police that the individual had gone missing from home, which The Children's Society (2017) have identified is linked with county lines involvement and the NCA (2017) claims is a key risk factor in vulnerability of criminal exploitation. In 6 of the 18 cases (33%), there was a formal mental health

diagnosis or assessment. In a number of other cases, professionals had expressed concerns that there may be mental health issues but the threshold for assessment had not been met or the individual was on a waiting list for assessment. 13 of the 18 individuals (72%) had identified illicit drug use. This typically included cannabis use and illegal highs but with some elevation to crack cocaine use apparent.

10 of the 18 (56%) were, or had been, in some form of alternative education. Most of these 10 had been excluded from mainstream education because of inappropriate behaviour and had been through the Pupil Referral Units (PRUs). PRUs are a short stay, but often long stay, centres for pupils (up to age 16 years) who are educated other than at maintained or special schools. They admit pupils with behavioural difficulties (often permanently excluded from mainstream education) and those who are identified as vulnerable because of the health of emotional difficulties. In a small number of cases there seemed to be a deliberate attempt made by the individual to transit towards a PRU, where a more limited timetable allowed them to enjoy more street time. There was also a suggestion in one area that move to a PRU enabled the individual to be alongside friends who were jointly criminally active. It is thought that individuals excluded from school are at an increased risk, based on the normalisation of problem behaviour and criminal morals that are shared by gang members (Marshall et al., 2005), which was also reflected in county lines research (The Children's Society, 2017).

Six of the 18 (33%) had demonstrated what the authors' considered to be early inappropriate sexualized behaviour, generally towards similar aged people but in a couple of cases to older 'authority' figures. Where criminal charges had been made, they had been subsequently dropped and consequently when, at a later stage, there had been an opportunity to challenge this behaviour (i.e. when on some Youth Offending Service order), this opportunity had not been taken.

Trauma

Serious familial loss was apparent within the sample. In seven cases (39%) there was a significant family member who had died during the adolescence of the individual. Despite a lack of comparative figures, this appeared to be exceptionally high and seemed to have a major impact on the behaviour and lifestyle of the individual. Furthermore, in eight cases out of the 18 (44%), the biological father was no longer present in the household. The impact of the absence of a male role model is thought to increase likelihood of gang affiliation (Aldridge & Medina, 2007; Sharp, Aldridge & Medina, 2006), and future criminality (Marshall et al., 2005; Vigil, 2007).

In 14 of the 18 cases (78%), the individual was being exploited for the purposes of criminal activity or at risk of criminal exploitation. Pitts (2007) identified the vulnerability of youths and the bullying tactics that were implemented to support in the progression of the gang. More recently, The Home Office (2017) published guidance on county lines, detailing the criminal exploitation of young people; the guidance highlighted characteristics of such manipulation, in that it "can affect any...young person...under the age of 18 years; ...can still be exploitation even if the activity appears consensual; can involve force...enticement-based methods of compliance...violence or threats of violence; ...is typified by some form of power imbalance in favour of those perpetrating" (p.3). In particular, four of those (22%), including both females, we looked at were deemed to be at risk of or have been subject to child sexual exploitation (CSE).

Intervention Outcomes: UCLan evaluation

Researchers at University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) were commissioned to evaluate the *Project Engage* intervention in terms of process and outcomes for the young people targeted to receive the intervention. This evaluation was conducted using both quantitative (comparing data from before, during and after the intervention using Police National Computer, intelligence and crime databases) and qualitative methods (interviews with practitioners). The qualitative results from this research have since been published (see Boulton, Kirby & Phythian, 2019), however a brief overview of the key findings are presented here for context.

The research found some very encouraging results and identified areas in need of improvement. In particular, it was found that whilst there is no consistent evidence for a lasting reduction in offending behaviour after the intervention, there was a significant reduction in offending behaviour (in terms of significantly fewer crime and intelligence records on police systems) during the intervention. This suggests that the intervention had a strong immediate impact during its implementation. Furthermore, whilst there was lacking evidence of hard employment or educational outcomes across the cohort, soft outcomes were observed in the majority of those who engaged. These included positive changes in attitude, behaviour and appearance, which were taken to signify increased resilience and self-belief. This was predicted to decrease risk of further SOC involvement.

However, as a multi-agency approach, *Project Engage* was found to be problematic in terms of successful information sharing, joint decision making and coordinated intervention. These were seen as problems related to a shared understanding of who the programme should be targeting, of what the programme should be aiming to achieve, and consistent information sharing across agencies. For instance, it was clear that there was a disparity between the identification and 'Deep Dive' stages and the preventative aims of the intervention work. Specifically, it was found that only four of the young people identified for inclusion at Stage 2, and for whom a 'Deep Dive' had been completed at Stage 3, actually went on to receive the intervention. The identification and 'Deep Dive' stages resulted in a cohort which were unanimously agreed to be too far involved in SOC for achieving lasting preventative outcomes. Therefore, future work should agree a shared understanding of a targeted cohort that is appropriate and relevant for the aims of the programme, and this information should be communicated across the agencies. It is suggested that future preventative interventions should target individuals who:

- Are between 11-14 years old: Literature suggests that SOC involvement occurs between 12 and 14 years of age, therefore the average age of this cohort (15 years) was beyond the scope of early intervention and into the prime years of SOC involvement. This recommendation is supported findings which show that those individuals within the sample which engaged were significantly younger than those who did not.
- Are not yet currently involved in criminality but have an association to criminality (i.e. sibling of an OCG member) or some other vulnerability that makes them susceptible to SOC that can be evidenced by a practitioner. Only 4 out of the 18 identified through the Deep Dive actually went on to engage in the intervention stage (Stage 6) and interviewed practitioners claimed this was because the young people were "too far gone" (see Boulton, Kirby & Phythian, 2019);
- Live in a location within which both SOC and poverty proliferates;
- Have a high rate of absence from school or are excluded; and/or
- Have experienced a significant trauma in their lives (i.e. bereavement or absence of a significant male).

The full findings of this research have been provided as a report to the Home Office and Greater Manchester Police, but has also been submitted for publication as two research articles within peer reviewed journals:

1. Quantitative findings of long terms impact of the interventions on the sample's criminal activity; and
2. Qualitative findings from interviews with the practitioners involved in the project with specific recommendations for encouraging engagement. This paper is now publically available (see Boulton, Kirby & Phythian, 2019).

Conclusions

The cohort of young people identified for this project found themselves well established in low level activity of the OCGs and therefore, were considered by Specialist Crime Solutions to be the 'right' individuals to focus on in terms of prevention as defined by the Home Office Serious Organised Crime Strategy 2013. This, however contradicted with the post-intervention evaluation findings which suggested that the young people identified were already involved in SOC, which therefore meant that the identification process reflected a tertiary approach rather than an early intervention and/or preventative approach. Furthermore, only four of the 18 originally identified actually went on to engage the intervention stage which may relate to their involvement in SOC (i.e. young people's refusal to participate and/or risk of involvement for both the young people and the practitioners). Future projects should consider aims carefully and target those specifically relevant to achieve those aims. For instance, if prevention of SOC involvement is aimed for (early intervention), then targeting those not already involved in criminality is most appropriate to achieve preventative aims. However, if a reduction in involvement is aimed for (tertiary) then consideration should be made in terms of how practitioners can become better equipped to take on the challenge to intervene with an approach that focuses on both safeguarding the welfare of a child and undertaking necessary disruption/enforcement activity, criminal prosecution in parallel.

Based on the number of young people identified as having been educated at PRUs in this research, PRUs appear to be an obvious place where practitioners should want to focus their SOC prevention resources, as there was a clear concentration in the numbers identified as linked to SOC from the PRUs.

If agencies are to work together in partnership to prevent vulnerable individuals from becoming involved in SOC, then the ability to dynamically and effectively risk assess would appear to be pivotal in order to protect from the potential of reprisals or compromising operational activity. In one of the pilot site areas, a senior social worker, tasked with delivering an intervention plan with those vulnerable individuals identified, said that they felt there was a distinct lack of tailored intervention resources available to use to address the specific SOC lifestyles and behaviours. The social worker was limited to using 'off the shelf' resource materials that were not felt to be pertinent or indeed useful.

On reflection, the lack of available tailored intervention resources would appear to have contributed to the lack of meaningful engagement, or indeed any attempt to engage with those identified. This work was new to most of the practitioners involved and in the main, they preferred to look at how individuals could be managed by fitting into existing established approaches. The approaches developed for CSE, Prevent and Trafficked would be examples of tailored approaches/intervention.

REFERENCES

- Aldridge, J., & Medina, J. (2007). *Youth Gangs in an English City: Social Exclusion, Drugs and Violence*. Swindon: ESRC.
- Bennett, T., & Holloway, K. (2004). Gang membership, drugs and crime in the UK. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(3), 305-323.
- Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2006). *The Assessment and Treatment of Women Offenders: An Integrative Perspective*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boulton, L. J., Kirby, S., & Phythian, R. (2019). Diverting young men from gangs: A qualitative evaluation. *Policing: An International Journal*, 42(5), 887-900.
- Bullock, K., & Tilley, N. (2002). *Shootings, gangs and violent incidents in Manchester: Developing a crime reduction strategy*. Crime Reduction Research Series 13. Home Office: London. <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1411392> accessed 18/05/2016)
- Bullock, K., Chowdhury, R. & Hollings, P. (2013). *Public Concerns about organised crime*, London: Home Office Research Report 16.
- Centre for Social Justice. Available at: <https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/core/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/DyingtoBelongFullReport.pdf>
- The Children's Society. (2017). *APPG on Runaway and Missing Children and Adults: Briefing note on the event on disrupting exploitation of children along 'county lines'*. Available at: https://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/appg-on-county-lines-briefing-note_v1.pdf
- Communities that Care. (2005). *Findings from the Safer London Youth Survey 2004*. London: Metropolitan Police Service.
- Densley, J. A. (2012). Street Gang Recruitment. *Social Problems*, 59, 301-321.
- Disley, E., & Liddle, M. (2016). *Local perspectives in Ending Gang and Youth Violence Areas: Perceptions of the nature of urban street gangs*. Home Office. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/491802/horr88.pdf
- Flood-Page, C., Campbell, S., Harrington, V., & Miller, J. (2000). *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/1999 Youth Lifestyle Survey*. Home Office Research Study 209. London: Home Office.
- Francis, B., Humphreys, L., Kirby, S., & Soothill, K. (2013). *Understanding Criminal Careers in Organised Crime*. Home Office. Available at: http://www.antoniocasella.eu/nume/Francis_criminal_careers_oct2013.pdf
- Hales, G., & Silverstone, D. (2004). *Gun Crime in Brent: A Report Commissioned by the London Borough of Brent Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership*. Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth ICJS.
- Hales, G., Lewis, C., & Silverstone, D. (2006). *Gun Crime: The Market in and Use of Illegal Firearms*. Home Office Research Study No. 189. London: Home Office.
- Hallsworth, S. (2005). *Street Crime*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Hallsworth, S., & Young, T. (2004). Getting real about gangs. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 55, 12-13.

- Home Office. (2013). *Serious and Organised Crime Strategy*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/248645/Serious_and_Organised_Crime_Strategy.pdf
- Home Office. (2017). *Criminal Exploitation of children and vulnerable adults: County Lines guidance*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/626770/6_3505_HO_Child_exploitation_FINAL_web_2_.pdf
- Hope, T., Hurley, M., McGibbon, I. & Pitts, J. (2016). *Challenger: Preventing Organised Crime, commissioned report for Greater Manchester Police*
- Marshall, B., Webb, B., & Tilley, N. (2005). *Rationalisation of current research on guns, gangs and other weapons: Phase 1*. London: University College London Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science.
- Medina, J., Aldridge, J., Shute, J., & Ross, A. (2013). Measuring gang membership in England and Wales: A latent class analysis with Eurogang survey questions. *European Journal of Criminology*, 10(5), 591-605.
- Mills, H., Skodbo, S., & Blyth, P. (2013). *Understanding Organised Crime: Estimating the scale and the social and economic costs*, London: Home Office.
- National Audit Office. (2013). *Early action: landscape review*. Available at: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Early-Action-full-report.pdf>
- Pitts, J. (2007). Americanization, the third way, and the racialization of youth crime and disorder. In J. Hagedorn (Ed.), *Gangs in the Global City: Alternatives to Traditional Criminology* (pp. 273-292). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Pitts, J., Hope T. Hurley M. & McGibbon I. (2017) *Preventing Organised Crime*, University of Bedfordshire, Institute of Applied Social Research, Monograph, ISBN 978-1-911168-05-8
- Sharp, C., Aldridge, J., & Medina, J. (2006). *Delinquent Youth Groups and Offending Behaviour: Findings from the 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey*. Home Office Online Report 14/06. Available at: <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/rdsolr1406.pdf>
- Vigil, J. D. (2007). *The projects: Gang and non-gang families in East Los Angeles*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Youth Justice Board. (2005). *Risk and Protective Factors*. London: Youth Justice Board.