Designing effective local responses to youth crime
# Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Garda Youth Diversion Projects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>The Baseline Analysis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Offences Committed by Young People in project catchment areas</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>The individual circumstances of young people engaged with Garda Youth Diversion Projects</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Profiling Alcohol and Public Order Related Youth Crime</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Commentary on Relevant Research</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foreword

The National Youth Justice Strategy 2008-2010 was launched in March 2008 with a mission to ‘create a safer society by working in partnership to reduce youth offending through appropriate interventions and linkages into services’. Much progress has occurred over the past 12 months and the experience to date has demonstrated the necessity for all stakeholders to participate and contribute in delivering this ambitious vision.

Garda Youth Diversion Projects administered by An Garda Síochána and provided by a range of youth organisations occupy a pivotal position in the Youth Justice system. The projects provide us with an opportunity to engage young people who are at risk of developing a pattern of offending and to arrest this behaviour at an early stage.

The National Youth Justice Strategy specifically identifies the importance of improving the effectiveness of Garda Youth Diversion Projects in reducing youth crime. This baseline analysis which attempts to provide a vision for future practice is our initial commitment to bringing about the necessary change. The report is not a research document; it is intended to prepare the way for significant change in the way we approach our engagement with the young people, families and communities that we serve.

The findings of the report have been shared with all the projects that participated in this exercise and it is clear from the feedback we have received that there is an appetite for change. This is encouraging. The willingness of our partners in the youth organisations delivering Garda Youth Diversion Projects to strive for further improvement in their effectiveness will be a critical factor in improving our effectiveness in reducing youth crime.

For its part the Irish Youth Justice Service is committed to actively supporting this change.

I would like to acknowledge the work of Sean Redmond, our Head of Young Offender Programmes, in bringing the baseline analysis to a successful conclusion with the publication of this comprehensive report. It was an extremely complex and detailed task.

Michelle Shannon
National Director, Irish Youth Justice Service
The baseline analysis was completed within an ambitious timescale. This could not have been possible without the support of the Garda Office for Children and Youth Affairs, the support of local Garda management and the active participation of the Youth Organisations and management companies responsible for the delivery of the project services. A particular thank you goes to the staff in the Community Programmes Unit of the Irish Youth Justice Service for their efficient support throughout this project.

Sean Redmond
Head of Young Offender Programmes
Youth crime is a significant public policy issue. In a recent Garda Public Attitude Survey respondents rated juvenile crime a major national problem [76%], secondary only to drug related crime and violent crime, and rated ‘lack of parental’ control as a significant cause of crime in Ireland.

Primary legislation has attempted to respond to such concern. The Children Act 2001 (as amended) establishes an overall statutory framework for dealing with troubled children and children in trouble with the law. The Act attempts to reconcile the need to hold young people to account for their offending behaviour, the need to protect the public from offending behaviour and builds upon the viable premise that most young people mature into adulthood and cease offending.

In addition to legislation, there are a wide range of interventions designed to respond commensurately to young people who have offended. Direct interventions include:

- **The Garda Diversion Programme**, the first level of response, involving early intervention by a Garda Juvenile Liaison Officer, for those young people who admit their involvement in a criminal offence,
- **Garda Youth Diversion Projects**, for those young people who are deemed to present with added risk of further offending,
- **The Probation Service** for young people appearing before the courts for their offending behaviour and
- **Children Detention Schools** for those young people whose offending is either repeat or serious in nature.

It is also important to recognise the wider range of available interventions, falling within the strategic auspices of the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs, which according to the available research evidence impact on likelihood of youth offending. Services targeted at improving parenting effectiveness, early attachment and cognitive development for children, improvements in school performance, reductions in alcohol and drugs misuse and participation by young people in mainstream youth activities all have a critical role to play in helping children realise their potential and avoid
becoming involved in offending behaviour.

The Irish Youth Justice Service was established in 2005 and is an executive office of the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform. It operates within the strategic scope of the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs and has lead responsibility for driving coordination and reform in the area of youth justice. The Irish Youth Justice Service has been given responsibility to lead a national strategy ‘To create a safer society by working in partnership to reduce youth offending through appropriate interventions and linkages into services’.

The Garda Youth Diversion Projects baseline analysis falls under Goal 2 of the National Youth Justice Strategy: ‘To work to reduce offending by diverting young people from offending behaviour’. More specifically, “To make existing intervention measures more effective in reducing offending behaviour. In doing so, promote good practice in the delivery of the Garda Juvenile Diversion Programme and the Garda Youth Diversion Projects” [objective2].
Purpose of study

This baseline analysis is the first part of an improvement programme for Garda Youth Diversion Projects, as envisaged by the National Youth Justice Strategy 2008-2010. The baseline attempts more specifically to provide a qualitative profile of youth crime in each locality and to analyse the way that Garda Youth Diversion Projects intend to effectively impact upon youth offending. Some young people will go on to offend. However, this analysis aims to help secure better outcomes for a large number of young people engaged with Garda Youth Diversion Projects and make a corresponding impact on youth crime.

The report attempts to serve 3 main audiences. Firstly the report aims to inform senior policy makers and decision makers involved in various capacities in measures to reduce youth crime. Secondly, for those charged with the governance and management of individual projects, the report aims to provide guidance on where project effort might best be applied to improve effectiveness. Thirdly, it attempts to assist project staff by highlighting key practice issues.

Undertaking the baseline analysis

The baseline analysis involved site visits to 96 of the 100 projects currently in existence. The key person with programme responsibility for the project [usually the project co-ordinator] was present in all cases and local Gardaí were represented in the majority of visits.

The local site visit to the project was a key component in undertaking the exercise. Valuable insights were derived from engaging in a face to face discussion with front-line staff about the nature of youth crime experienced within the locality, the subsequent challenges raised for each project and what improvements each project thinks it can make to the current situation. Additionally, local connection with each project and the responsible youth organisation or Management Company facilitates next phase discussions in the context of improving effectiveness.

“The baseline analysis demonstrates that patterns relating to youth crime are diverse and best analysed in their local context. However, the analysis also demonstrates that there are recurrent features which resonate with international evidence and should be reflected in a local project’s service design.”
The exercise has been informed by the research literature relating to youth crime. A significant criticism of the orthodox research on risk is that its capacity to predict offending behaviour is limited by its inability to capture the inherent complexities of human interactions. In its purest form the calculations of risk are akin to probability mathematics with the attendant logic that the greater number of risks associated with a particular young person, the higher the likelihood of re-offending. Practitioners in the field, opponents of this type of research evidence, indeed parents and young people themselves will report that the picture is much more complex combining what have become orthodox risk factors [self, family, peer group, neighbourhood] in a narrative with situational opportunities and the occasional random external force, all of which could have a significant bearing on a young person’s capacity to engage in, or extricate themselves from offending behaviour.

This study has attempted to outline how these offending incidents occur, using intelligence gleaned from the project interviews, reference to current thinking on risk factors based on longitudinal studies and statistical data published by An Garda Síochána. The profiles are diverse and are best analysed in their local context. However, the analysis also demonstrates that there are recurrent features which resonate with the international research evidence and should be reflected in a local project’s service design.

As a consequence of the baseline analysis, each of the 96 participating projects has its own account of youth crime in the locality that it serves, as reported by participants in the baseline analysis.

Three illustrative profiles, based on recurrent features from the discussions relating to alcohol and public order crime, have been generated to assist in understanding the often complex dynamics which accompany such offending behaviour. As with any profiling exercise constructed from composite information, the profiles outlined in this exercise don’t fit specifically any one location, but they are resonant of many. In the same way that there is no average voter, there is no neighbourhood, town or city that fits precisely the profiles identified. Therefore the profiles carry the caveat that they are intended to be used as a reference point rather than a pro-forma in building up a local youth crime profile.

It is accepted that this baseline analysis is a snapshot discussion of local youth crime patterns and the efforts that local projects are making to impact on youth crime. It is also accepted that the ‘picture’
of crime relies on the knowledge of the persons available for interview at the time\textsuperscript{8}. Nevertheless, the analysis is supported by statistical data published by An Garda Síochána suggesting that the snapshot picture is not untypical of reported youth crime at local level.

With respect to practice, a potential key weakness to the ‘snap-shot’ is that projects are at various stages of development; some having been established for years and others currently in set up phase. However, a snap shot in these circumstances is possibly of more use given that the overriding interest is to consider how practice can be developed across the board from a certain point forward, irrespective of whether the project is mature or in a development phase.

The baseline report uses real features and examples from individual projects as well as raising thematic issues which relate to clusters of projects. The identities of individual projects are not disclosed. The reason for such anonymity is to ensure that any required changes can take place without undue exposure for the individual project or the area it serves. Specific referencing in the background data for this report allows for meaningful feedback to be provided discretely to individual management companies in terms of how an individual project can improve its effectiveness.

“Three illustrative profiles, based on recurrent features from the discussions relating to alcohol and public order crime, have been generated to assist in understanding the often complex dynamics which accompany such offending behaviour.”
Introduction
**What is a Garda Youth Diversion Project?**

A Garda Youth Diversion Project is a community based, multi-agency crime prevention initiative which seeks to divert young people from becoming involved (or further involved) in anti-social and/or criminal behaviour by providing suitable activities to facilitate personal development and promote civic responsibility.

The Garda Youth Diversion Projects are funded by the Irish Youth Justice Service and administered through The Community Relations Section of An Garda Síochána. It is important to note that Garda Youth Diversion Projects operate alongside other Garda [and complimentary] initiatives aimed at reducing youth crime.

**What does a Garda Youth Diversion Project do?**

Garda Youth Diversion Projects have clear and distinct roles aimed at young people at risk of, or at the onset of becoming involved in offending behaviour:

1) To divert young people from becoming involved in criminal or anti-social behaviour.

2) To provide suitable activities to facilitate personal development and encourage civic responsibility and work towards improving the long-term employability prospects of the participants.

In achieving the above, projects seek to support and improve local Garda and community relations and enhance the quality of life in the area.

The first two Garda Youth Diversion Projects were established in 1991. In 2008, 100 projects were in operation [see figure 1] providing interventions for approximately 3,600 young people. The total financial commitment to Garda Youth Diversion Projects in 2009 will exceed €13 million. Garda Youth Diversion Projects fulfil many necessary functions, however it is their mission to directly impact youth crime which distinguishes them from other youth service interventions and underlies the logic for Irish Youth Justice Service investment.
Figure 1: Location of Garda Youth Diversion Projects

Key – square = project location
[for full list see Appendix 1]
Dublin  29 Projects
Cork    11 Projects
Limerick 6 Projects
crime which distinguishes them from other youth service interventions and underlies the logic for Irish Youth Justice Service investment.

**Garda Youth Diversion Projects – Governance Structures**

Garda Youth Diversion Projects are governed locally by a multi-agency and community based committee, which is responsible for the strategic direction of the project⁴. Staff in the 100 projects are directly managed and supported by 38 youth organisations and independent management companies [see figure 2]⁵. More recently, the overall improvement strategy for Garda Youth Diversion Projects has fallen within the remit of the National Youth Justice Strategy. The strategy aims to support a change programme for Garda Youth Diversion Projects requiring close collaboration between An Garda Síochána, the Irish Youth Justice Service and the Youth Organisations and Management Companies responsible for delivering the local services.

![Figure 2: Organisations responsible for delivery of Garda Youth Diversion Projects](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dublin Youth Services Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Regional Youth Service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Youth Service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloyne Diocesan Youth Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Management Organisations</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogra Chorcaí</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Connacht Regional Youth Service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildare Youth Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Youth Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes - Organisation is Member Youth Service of Youth Work Ireland

n = 100
Garda Youth Diversion Project Guidelines

Projects are currently supported in the design, management and governance of their local service by a guidelines manual. The Garda Youth Diversion Project Guidelines detail the process by which, in the context of the National Development Plan, local communities merit consideration for the development of a new project and what type of structure local projects need for the purposeful ongoing operations and management of projects.

The guidelines also provide useful guidance for projects regarding ‘good youth crime prevention practice’, taking into account international evidence and previous research conducted in Ireland. Of particular note from an Irish context are the research studies undertaken by Trinity College [Bowden and Higgins 2000] and Centre for Social and Educational Research, Dublin Institute of Technology [DIT] [2001]. This study builds on these two research studies. Indeed, Bowden’s findings that whilst projects often struggle with focus and structure in terms of designing their interventions, they can still impact offending behaviour and the DIT study’s comprehensive analysis of risk factors, are echoed and further developed in this baseline study⁶.

The guidelines suggest that ‘Good youth crime prevention practice, according to the broad literature, must be evidence based. That is, it should draw on a range of practices, resources and techniques that have a measurable result in preventing either the onset of offending or re-offending’.

This advice has a high degree of currency in the context of this baseline analysis which attempts to throw further light on the patterns of youth crime committed in local communities, thereby assisting projects in determining their most effective responses.
Three The Baseline Analysis

The site visits and group interviews for this exercise took place between March and July 2008. Each interview consisted of a semi-structured discussion which lasted for approximately 2 hours. A record of each meeting was prepared by the Irish Youth Justice Service. This record was submitted to the project for verification of its accuracy. All records were amended where necessary and verified by interview participants and the Irish Youth Justice Service.

At a local level, key participants in this exercise [in addition to project Co-ordinators] were Garda Juvenile Liaison Officers and Community Gardaí who were able to a) list the main offences committed by juveniles in the catchment area and b) identify clear patterns to behaviour where such patterns existed.

The analysis is based on semi-structured discussions rather than numerical data. However it has been possible to make approximate comparisons, sufficient enough to make more general strategic analysis possible.

It is assumed that the assessments provided by local projects are reasonably accurate given that:

- The Garda Diversion Programme enjoys a panoramic view of detected crime\(^1\) admitted by juveniles at both local and national levels.
- The mean population served by projects is approximately 14,000\(^2\) [see figure 3] of which it is estimated only 9.3% or 1,300 are aged 12-18yrs [juveniles]\(^3\).
- Garda [2006] Juvenile Diversion Statistics\(^4\) indicate that approximately 5% of the youth population overall was referred to the Garda Diversion Programme as a consequence of offending [See Appendix 3].
- The actual number of young people offending in any particular locality and referred to the Garda Diversion Programme is therefore low. Even if extra significance is given to the likelihood that most Garda Youth Diversion Projects are located in higher crime areas, the number of such young people is unlikely to exceed 250 -300\(^5\) in any one project location.
- The pattern and prevalence of local youth offending as disclosed in this exercise, corroborates the general patterns of youth crime according to official Garda statistics\(^6\).
Critically the objective of the exercise related to the project’s local analysis of youth crime and its strategic intent or logic for what it believed could be done, using its own resources, to improve the situation. This discussion deliberately steered clear of a description of project activities, which out of context leaves little capacity to differentiate between strong and weak interventions. With specific reference to project activity, the efficient execution of project intent and the quality of intervention will need to be the subject of a follow up study, given that this analysis is based upon self report information. Gauging a project’s orientation and alignment of activities in relation to local youth crime patterns is sufficient for this exercise.

“The efficient execution of project intent and the quality of intervention will need to be the subject of a follow up study”
The baseline discussion covered the following:

i. **Size of catchment area**: The size of the total population being served by the project. This information is required to gauge the potential relative impact of the project with reference to the youth population of the locality; and for comparison purposes.

ii. **Basic list of offences committed by young people**: A simple list of offences committed by young people in the catchment area. Projects were encouraged to be exhaustive. This information is required to provide focus for the discussion regarding crime patterns, for intended improvements and for comparison purposes.

iii. **Patterns of youth crime in the area**: involved a discussion relating to how the simple list of offences [above] occur in reality. For instance, what times of the year/week/day and in what locations? Are the offences committed by large or small numbers of young people? Are they committed on ad hoc occasions or on frequent/ regular occasions? Are the offences clustered into offending episodes, if so, how? Descriptions of the configurations of young people committing these offences? This information helps to build the profile of the youth crime challenge being faced by an individual project and can assist in terms of more precise programme selection. It adds value to the identification of risk factors by constructing a narrative of how crime tends to occur in the locality. More generally at a national level, the comparison of these patterns can inform strategy, policy and practice in terms of joint action between An Garda Síochána, the Garda Youth Diversion Projects, the Irish Youth Justice Service and other participating stakeholders.

iv. **The profiles of young people committing these offences**: How do young people present to project staff? Are they capable of or willing to reflect on their own offending behaviour? How do parents reflect on the young person’s behaviour? What is the parent’s attitude to the young person’s offending and how able or willing is the parent to provide effective support and supervision for the young person? How does the young person perform in school? What is the effect of peers and neighbourhood on offending behaviour? This information helps to build a picture of the young people committing offences in the locality in their social and ecological context.
v. The improvement[s] that the project is trying to make to change the situation. Bearing in mind the local youth crime patterns and the profiles of the young people committing crime in the locality, what positive difference is the project intending to make? This information is important in trying to establish with some degree of precision, how the project intends to focus its efforts to secure improvements within its environmental context. This information is also important in disclosing those needs and risks that the project can and cannot meet and where it may need help from other agencies. This information helps to build a picture of where current effort is being applied. Aggregated at a national level, this type of information helps to identify a) the most effective contribution(s) that projects can make in terms of impacting youth crime and b) what degree of co-operation is required with other stakeholders to deal with outstanding risks and further impact youth crime.

vi. What is the project’s logic for seeking these improvements? Why does the project believe that if it is successful in achieving these improvements it will make an impact on youth crime? Most projects constructed a short statement to articulate in simple terms why they thought they were making a difference. The statements inevitably encapsulate a mixture of organisational philosophy, practice principles and, critically, assumptions made about the causes of youth crime and the best ways that a project can respond to make the best impact. The value of a logic statement is that it can be audited for its coherence against a) the patterns of youth crime identified by the individual project (see iii above) and its capacity to respond and b) the available research evidence on what appear to be the most promising approaches to effecting change in offending behaviour. In terms of service development such a statement provides a clear transparency in relation to how a project intends to use the public investment to its best effect in reducing youth crime in its locality. Such a statement can be used as a governance tool for local management committees to gauge the activities of a project relative to its logic.

vii. For the purposes of this report the statements are useful in indicating how aligned local project activities are to dealing with local patterns of youth crime, what changes may be necessary and what capacity needs might need to be met to improve overall performance.
Building Capacity

The baseline interviews were also intended to be of benefit to each local project. None of the projects had completed this exercise before. As a consequence of the exercise each project has its own documented account outlining the challenges presented by youth crime patterns within their locality and the project’s intended improvements in impacting youth crime. These accounts can act as a useful baseline at project level to aid service design discussions, they can also serve to improve the knowledge of young people and parents about how and why, in their local context, they may be at risk of offending. It is intended that the approach taken in the baseline analysis will inform the future commissioning and administrative demands of projects as part of the future improvement programme.
Offences committed by young people in project catchment areas

Offence descriptions

Alcohol related offences are the single largest category of offences committed by young people, accounting for a fifth of all juvenile crime [An Garda Síochána 2006]. Taking into account other offences which from project interviews predominantly relate to those offending episodes where alcohol is a critical factor, this figure could amount to almost half of all recorded crime [An Garda Síochána 2007].

Each project was asked to construct a simple list of offences committed by young people in their catchment area.

The purpose of the exercise was to ensure that all offences committed by young people within the locality were captured, attempting to create an exhaustive list. A clear pattern emerged regarding a group of offences which appear to occur during episodes of alcohol consumption; typically public order and criminal damage, but also including to a lesser extent minor assault and trespass.

The other key offences were theft, drugs related matters, violent offences, unauthorised taking of motor vehicles, burglary and road traffic matters.

Of the 96 completed project visits, 85% [n=82] located alcohol related crime as first on the list of offences committed in their catchment area. Of the remaining 15 projects, 10 projects listed it as 2nd or 3rd. Only one project did not list alcohol related crime in its list of offences at all. However, this project identified drugs misuse as a key feature in relation to youth crime.

Two projects have been more specific by conducting their own surveys, attributing 50% and 94% of offending directly to alcohol consumption.
Four

*Offences committed in catchment areas*

A range of offences, in particular criminal damage⁸, public order, minor assault and trespass appear alongside discussions regarding alcohol with offences being committed in clusters or episodes.

Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that when we talk about youth crime in local neighbourhoods, we are for a large part describing alcohol related youth crime.

In addition to the cluster of crimes committed under the influence of alcohol, projects face a number of other types of offending behaviour, some with distinct patterns.
Offences committed in catchment areas

differentiate acts of violence committed under the influence of alcohol from those which are not. However a number of features emerged which appear not to be directly related to alcohol consumption [see offending patterns below]. Projects identified certain types of violent offending, typically those which appear to be extensions of school based bullying episodes to be largely unreported. Other examples include violent acts as a consequence of longstanding neighbourhood and family disputes, clashes between identifiable groups of young people and individual young people seeking neighbourhood notoriety for their fighting ability.

- Other offences

13 projects included road traffic offences. Many projects believed that recent legislative changes governing road use will increase the numbers of young people presenting with road traffic violations. 12 projects reported burglary offences and 10 unauthorised taking of mechanically propelled vehicles [UTMPV]. This last offence is of particular interest because its incidence appears to have decreased dramatically in recent years.

Offending patterns

Alcohol related crime

Alcohol and public order related crime by juveniles appears in the main to be perpetrated by boys. Girls certainly feature in terms of underage drinking; but tend to be involved less [and less frequently] in the other offences associated with drinking episodes.

There appear to be a number of features relating to alcohol intake by young people which serve to differentiate how and when offences are committed at local project catchment level. Some of these features are temporal, that is determined by time and frequency, some are situational, that is the opportunity to secure and consume alcohol and some are influenced by the young person’s individual circumstances, that is the degree to which a young person’s social environment prohibits, permits or encourages alcohol use.
Four

Offences committed in catchment areas

Temporal features

In all project areas alcohol related offending is characterized by three related peaks of activity:

1) Firstly there is a spike in activity at weekends; more specifically where public order matters are concerned, late Friday and Saturday nights. Some project areas experience a less pronounced spike, or longer periods of alcohol related activity from Thursday to Sunday, in many cases impacting school attendance. In a smaller number of projects alcohol consumption, though more likely at weekends, can occur at any time of the week.

2) Secondly, projects experience increases in alcohol and public order crime toward the summer months, quite possibly because it involves more outdoor drinking which inevitably has a higher visibility.

3) The third feature is calendar events; notably Halloween, completion of school exams / summer recess, St Patrick’s Day which experience a higher frequency of alcohol and public order crime clustered around these times.

In at least 40 projects, most alcohol related offending occurs as part of a routine pattern with significantly less crime being committed outside this temporal profile.

Some projects have already profiled their responses to take account of these patterns. At least two projects have initiatives specifically targeted at the Halloween period and report lower incidence of crime around this event. Some projects have attempted to target weekend nights to provide an alternative activity or an attractive early morning event on a Saturday with the intent that this will affect Friday night behaviour. Some projects load particular effort toward the summer months

Situational features

These primarily refer to the relative ease experienced by young people in gaining access to alcohol and finding places to consume it. The overwhelming picture is one of easy access to alcohol; however it is instructive that in a least two project areas the geographical layout is such that there are few alcohol outlets within easy reach and young people either appear to consume less alcohol less frequently or rely on stealing or securing alcohol from home: suggesting that the degree of effort involved in securing
alcohol may be a consideration for some young people.

Accessing alcohol In order to gain some perspective on this behaviour an attempt was made to record the means by which young people gain access to alcohol. The following routes appear to predominate:

- **Taken from home**: In some situations alcohol is stolen from home but there was also a significant pattern of young people being supplied with alcohol by parent[s] or older siblings. In some situations it appears that parents have supplied alcohol to young people as a deliberate risk reduction strategy to avoid what they perceive as other more serious offending. Given that ‘taken from home’ is such a significant route for securing alcohol, this highlights the limitations of any initiatives in alcohol reduction that do not take into account parental behaviour.

- **Group members are adults**: Much of the group drinking activity involves young people under the age of 18yrs mixing with young adults 18+. These clusters tend to occur where alcohol consumption is undertaken in discrete locations. Typically, a young adult will purchase alcohol for the group from a local outlet and participate in the subsequent activity.

- **Targeting lax licensees/ targeting of young people at checkouts**: In a minority of cases young people target licensees who they perceive as being less vigilant in terms of examining identification. Alternatively, projects reported that young people target outlets where young people [who are known to the group] or foreign nationals [which young people perceive as being less able to distinguish age] work at check outs.

- **Home delivery services**: A number of projects identified off licenses that deliver to home addresses or taxi drivers delivering alcohol to home addresses as being of significant concern. Respondents from An Garda Síochána reported the difficulty in taking action on such enterprises given that on many occasions an adult will receive the delivered goods and that once on a private premises young people can legally consume the alcohol.

- **Approaching known adults**: A number of projects reported that certain adults within their locality will purchase alcohol for young people. In many cases the adult will suffer with
Four

Offences committed in catchment areas

an alcohol addiction. In at least 13 project areas there are adults who are willing to purchase alcohol for young people in return for cash or alcohol.

- **Cross border purchases:** Projects within reach of the border to the North have the added complication that alcohol is secured outside the jurisdiction in large volumes and returned to home neighbourhoods. Projects suspected that many outlets on the northern side of the border are less vigilant about sales of alcohol to young people.

- **Theft:** A number of projects reported that young people, particularly boys, attempt to steal alcohol from stores.

- **False identification:** In at least 2 project areas, false identification is used as a key route to securing alcohol.

**Alcohol consumption and subsequent offending** In most project areas there appears to be a finite number of locations where young people consume alcohol in an almost routine manner clustered around weekends, certain calendar events and during the summer months. In many of the projects the number of venues most regularly used is less than 10. These venues include fields, waste ground, graveyards, parks, playgrounds, the housing estates where young people live, local amenity areas, woodlands etc in addition to winter time use of derelict properties and sheds. Some young people are also permitted to consume alcohol at home and/or gain access to alcohol at house parties.

In some project areas members of An Garda Síochána actively police this small number of locations and target patrols at times when they believe young people have not had the opportunity to consume excessive alcohol. These projects report that there has been some success in arresting behaviour before it becomes too drunken and loutish and as a consequence impacts directly on the incidence, frequency and seriousness of public order crime\(^{20}\). Projects reported that most exchanges between An Garda Síochána and young people, when alcohol is confiscated, are concluded without significant incident.

Many projects reported that the time at which this behaviour is encountered is critical in terms of whether the episode progresses to more serious public order related crime. Typically where Gardaí encounter the behaviour as a consequence of complaints by neighbours or being called to a town or city centre late on a Friday or Saturday night, the public order incidents appear to be of greater severity and
Offences committed in catchment areas

“Given that ‘taken from home’ is such a significant route for securing alcohol, this highlights the limitations of any initiatives in alcohol reduction that do not take into account parental behaviour.”

exchanges between Garda and young people more hostile.

In many of the project areas the offending episodes follow very particular patterns of alcohol acquisition from a finite number of sources and consumption in a finite number of locations followed by loutish behaviour, damage to property and possibly assaults. Although it is important to note that the pattern of these offences tends to be clustered rather than sequential\(^{21}\).

Projects reported that much of the criminal damage to property, typically damage to car wing mirrors, shop windows, bus shelters, plants and trees occurs in clear lines marking the routes of young people from drinking location to drinking location or returning home.

Most of the criminal damage and public order offending is not targeted at individuals. However there are situations where such effort is directed with intent. Examples include neighbours complaining about anti-social behaviour, long running disputes between families, or enforcing the compliance of drug debtors. Many of these alcohol related episodes also involve violent behaviour. Excessive alcohol consumption and possibly certain young peoples’ desires to acquire notoriety appear to be the key features related to this type of exchange. Indeed, a significant number of projects could identify the reasonably small numbers of young people who were more likely to offer resistance to members of An Garda Síochána in such situations. Many of these conflicts are town centre based, between 11pm and 2am on Fridays and Saturdays close to public congregation points\(^{22}\) or thoroughfares from a town or city centre to home.

However it is also clear that many of the conflicts have common undercurrents, be it relationships, family disputes, longstanding parish or school rivalries and drugs related disputes including young people who have accrued debts.

It is important to note that not all violent offending committed by young people takes place under
influence of alcohol [and drugs].

Non-alcohol related assaults
Alcohol is a key feature in most assaults. However there is significant evidence to suggest that it is not associated with all assault related incidents. Assaults which are not alcohol related appear to share the same feature; that is that there is either a higher degree of planning to the behaviour or the behaviour is a slow burn outcome to a long period of bullying behaviour. Examples include staged fights and neighbourhood conflicts and conflicts between identifiable groups of young people.

Girls feature significantly and in comparison to their participation in other offending, disproportionately, in this type of behaviour. Girls involved in this type of offending are typically engaged in a long campaign of bullying [often school based] followed by a contrived fight and possible further bullying. Projects reported in the main, that their awareness of this activity was on the basis of self reports from girls and knowledge of local behaviour. Mostly the activity has been under-reported to An Garda Síochána.

At least 14 projects were aware that fights involving boys or girls had been arranged, documented and disseminated by use of IT and mobile communications. This media serves to add a higher degree of notoriety to the aggressor[s] and humiliation for the victims. One youth organisation is currently considering how best to deal with the specific issues relating with the use of IT and mobile phones in this type of offending.

Drugs related offending
Most projects reported patterns to drugs misuse [particularly cannabis] which were similar to alcohol misuse; indeed usage of cannabis in the experience of most projects was synonymous with the use of alcohol. However most project staff believed that cannabis related offending is significantly under reported. Projects believed that this is partly explained by the evidential challenges for members of An Garda Síochána of apprehending young people carrying small amounts of cannabis, young people’s discrete behaviour in smoking cannabis and in some cases what appears to be a degree of tolerance for
smoking cannabis by a small number of parents and neighbours.

The effect of this is that even in project locations where the recorded level of drug related youth crime [particularly possession] is small, projects generally believe on the basis of young people’s self reporting that the usage of cannabis is significantly higher.

73 projects reported that young people were involved in some form of drugs activity within their project area, though a number of these reports are non-specific in terms of the nature of the activity. In 15 project reports, drugs misuse does not feature on the offence list. Whilst some caution needs to be ascribed to this finding, given that a number of projects highlighted the under-reporting of drugs misuse, a small number of projects believed that actual drugs use was low in their project area or that the onset of possible drugs use had been delayed.

All the projects which reported usage in their areas identified cannabis as the preferred drug. At least 24 projects identified cocaine usage in the area, 19 projects ecstasy, 8 projects heroin, 2 crack cocaine and 1 LSD. At least 8 projects reported concerning use of prescription drugs or ‘legal highs’.

35 projects identified situations where a small number of young people had become involved in more sophisticated drugs supply networks often related to family links, typically an older male sibling. In addition, a number of projects reported that some [possibly intellectually or emotionally vulnerable] young people in the area, attracted by the status afforded to local drug dealers by young people or the acquisition of money, were groomed by adult dealers.

The offending risks associated with young people caught in these circumstances are obviously high, however some projects reported that risks were further compounded in cases where young people had fallen into debt with dealers, possibly due to their addiction or having drugs they were holding or couriering for adult drug dealers confiscated as a consequence of An Garda Síochána operations.
Four

Offences committed in catchment areas

Some project areas faced additional risks due to their geographical proximity to larger centres of drugs activity, particularly where there are family connections in both locations. External or unforeseen risks such as a particular group of individuals moving into a project area or the introduction of a new drug, for example crack cocaine, were also reported.

Theft

71 projects reported theft as one of the main offences committed by young people in project areas. By far the largest form of theft was shoplifting and by far the most common form of shoplifting was opportunistic and relatively unsophisticated shoplifting. Projects were asked to identify key features relating to opportunistic theft and of particular note is the difference in behaviour between boys and girls.

18 projects identified discernable differences; girls in the main targeting cosmetics, accessories and clothes, boys tending to target food, confectionary, alcohol, DVD’s, computer games and sports goods. One project suggested that girls were responsible for 80% of all shoplifting offences and another identified a group of 3-4 girls responsible for 50% of thefts within the project area.

Opportunistic shoplifting amongst young people does not appear to be confined to young people from disadvantaged communities. Indeed many projects believed that for girls in certain situations, the offence itself was more driven by thrill seeking behaviour than the acquisition of goods or the cash proceeds from the sale of the goods to a third party. Projects suggested that this particular type of offending may be motivated by girls participating in a rite of passage into a friendship group, or relate to coercive and/ or bullying behaviour by other girls. In any event members of An Garda Síochána believe this type of offending to be particularly amenable to diversion if caught early.

7 projects reported that alcohol is targeted particularly [though not exclusively] by boys, in some cases stockpiling the proceeds during the week for consumption at the weekend.

10 projects identified groups of young people involved in multiple theft offences who were either discrete sub-groups of those young people involved in alcohol and public order crime or separate
entirely from the group of young people involved in repeat alcohol and public order crime. There appear to be discernable differences in the profiles of young people involved in multiple theft offences or acquisitive crime and those young people involved in alcohol and public order crime. In many cases these young people whilst not necessarily pre-planning thefts, appear constantly aware of opportunities, have acquired skill and will target goods. In addition to store thefts, young people fitting this profile may engage in thefts from persons with menace.

In certain project locations young people have relatively easy opportunities to convert stolen items into cash. Projects also provided examples of where young people may be incited to steal by family members or neighbours or where an environment which cultivates a local demand for stolen or pirated goods has been sustained over a long period of time.

Young people involved in multiple theft offences tend to offend as a group, in many cases with young people known via established neighbourhood or family links. There appears to be a degree of exclusivity and loyalty within these groups, known to [and possibly admired] by young people involved in less sophisticated offending. Young people’s participation in these groups may be knowingly supported or in any event encouraged by adult members of the family. These young people are more likely to offend across a number of offences categories, where opportunities exist. The effect is that young people involved in this activity face significant difficulties in desisting their offending given the extent to which, over and above the young person’s self determination, other peer, family and neighbourhood influences exert influence and control over them and will present significant multi-dimensional challenges to a project in attempting to make and sustain change.
The individual circumstances of young people engaged with Garda Youth Diversion Projects

The research studies on risk factors relating to youth crime identify a number of features which potentially increase or decrease the likelihood of offending behaviour.

It is argued that these risks occur in various dimensions of the young person’s life; *individual* risks, risks associated with *family*, risks associated with *school performance* and risks associated with the *neighbourhood* that a young person lives in. The risk and protection paradigm, as it has become known, is the key conceptual framework adopted by many western jurisdictions dealing with young people who offend and informs the way that these jurisdictions allocate resources at a strategic and clinical level.

**Risk factors:**

1) Individual risks
2) Risks associated with family
3) Risks associated with school performance
4) Risks associated with the neighbourhood that a young person lives in

The paradigm is not without its critics. Such criticism questions the predictive validity and *pseudo-science* of the approach in addition to a number of other philosophical and technical concerns.

Risk factors were not taken solely at face value in the baseline analysis. Rather, they were considered in the context of what actual challenges such risks present to projects in respect of their attempts to secure improvements with young people. *Presenting* risk is an important component in this discussion, given that most projects use individual assessment rather than standard instrument assessment to measure the voracity of particular factors.

Projects were asked to describe features relating to the young people they were engaged with, including relevant information about their circumstances\(^1\). It was acknowledged that the focus of the discussion regarding the *baseline analysis* primarily related to youth crime and could therefore portray a
disproportionately negative picture of a young person and not the totality of the relationship between the young person and the project.

It was further acknowledged that similar to any profiling exercise which asks respondents to describe groups of factors, there are limitations in applying approximated information to individual young people.

Nevertheless, asking similar sets of questions in 96 locations relating to reasonably small local populations of young people yielded useful and relevant information. Bearing in mind that the projects are usually strategically positioned at the point where a young person may be at the onset of more prolific offending behaviour, a significant number of the factors identified in the research literature on risk feature as part of the picture regarding young people and crime in each local project area.

**Individual risks**

73 projects reported more detailed information in relation to how the young people they work with typically present.

- 34 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people they worked with presented as verbally or physically aggressive, typically demonstrating a ‘short fuse’.
- 14 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people were specifically prone to impulsivity.
- 5 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people specifically presented as lacking empathy.
- 9 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people presented with delayed social and emotional competence.
- 8 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people experienced chaotic lifestyles, typically that they were active for most of the night and sleeping until late in the day.
- 6 projects reported that a significant number of young people presented with some form of learning difficulty.
At least 47 projects reported that a significant percentage of young people believed their offending behaviour to be normal or were indifferent to changing their behaviour.

Most of the offending identified in the baseline analysis related to alcohol and public order crime. The perceived indifference by some young people to changing behaviour related both to a reluctance to desist alcohol consumption as well as the subsequent anti-social activity. Some projects identified that young people perceive a qualitative difference in their attitudes to alcohol consumption [that it is normal] from subsequent offending behaviour [which many feel more remorseful about], despite the fact that there is an at least credible causal link between the two.

Projects reported that that though some young people felt remorseful soon after the event, the sense of shame or remorse was relatively short lived and a cycle of alcohol consumption and public order offending continued as before.

Risks associated with family

89 projects provided more detailed information about family circumstances and parental skill and attitude.

- 36 projects reported that a significant percentage of young people lived in families where a family member [usually an elder brother or father] had previous involvement with the criminal justice system or had been in prison.
- 10 projects further identified the absence of a positive male parental influence or that the male influence was itself a risk to offending behaviour.
- 15 projects identified a significant number of parents who were involved in: alcohol related anti-social behaviour [n=4], were engaged in chaotic lifestyles [n=3] or promoted poor attitudes to authority and who would not encourage young people to accept responsibility for their behaviour [n=8].
- 37 projects reported that a significant number of parents had problematic drugs and/or alcohol use.
11 projects reported that young people experienced high levels of violence at home involving attacks mainly, but not exclusively, on mothers.

90 projects provided an indication of how parents typically responded to the young person’s offending. The list is not exclusive so includes responses from projects which cover a number of parental responses simultaneously, reflecting the variety and mix of the typical project workload. Projects experienced parents with a variety of abilities, skills and attitudes and which have differential potential to lessen or heighten the risk of further offending.

- 66 projects experienced parent[s] doing their best, often in difficult circumstances and where there may be a skill gap in terms of their parenting effectiveness.

- 29 projects experienced parents who present as concerned, possibly angry, at the young person’s offending behaviour but were unable or unwilling to articulate this concern into self generated action, for instance in terms of reinforcing supervision arrangements or providing reparation.

- 51 projects experienced parents who minimize the offending behaviour. This means ‘minimization’ either in terms of the offence seriousness or their young person’s role in the offence; having the potential effect of allowing the young person to mitigate culpability for the offence and frustrating any process of remorse.

- 45 projects experienced indifference by parents to the young person’s offending, suggesting that parents were not concerned about the young person’s behaviour. However it is also important to note that the perceived indifference may be associated with the sense of overwhelming stress that many parents face, as reported by at least 20 projects, often presenting as depression and lethargy.

- 21 projects identified certain situations where they believed that parents had some culpability for the offending behaviour. This ranged from supplying young people with alcohol and/or drugs and participating in alcohol and public order crime to facilitating or joint enterprise in some of the drugs related and acquisitive crime.
Risks associated with educational performance

91 projects reported more detailed information in relation to educational performance:

- 55 projects reported that a significant percentage of the young people engaged with the project had mixed or poor school attendance. Of these, 18 projects believed that the majority of the children, despite poor attendance, were still on a school roll or attending school ‘on paper’. Of these, 3 projects believed that certain young people, possibly with the support of parents, had managed to ‘stay below the radar’, thereby avoiding intervention by statutory services.

- 31 projects reported that a significant percentage of young people presented with discipline problems at school.

- 58 projects reported that a significant number of children performed poorly at school. Although this could well be an under-report given that a significant number of projects which reported poor attendance and/or poor discipline did not necessarily report poor performance, although logically performance is highly likely to be affected.

Risks associated with neighbourhood

For the majority of projects, neighbourhood plays little part as a risk in its own right. Indeed, it is more common for the community to represent the injured party; in many cases local project effort is invested in trying to repair the harm caused by a young person’s actions.

However, 38 projects reported ‘neighbourhood’ features [relating to the area their project serves or parts of their catchment area], which one may reasonably assume to have an association with the incidence of youth crime:

- 13 projects reported neighbourhoods or certain parts of neighbourhoods which appeared to have some tolerance or encourage under-age drinking, drugs misuse and or anti-social activity.

- 6 projects reported neighbourhoods or certain parts of neighbourhoods which had poor attitudes or were suspicious of An Garda Síochána, resulting in under-reporting of criminal activity.

- 18 projects reported neighbourhoods or parts of neighbourhoods where there was an
acceptance of receiving stolen goods, either creating a local demand for young people targeting certain items for sell-on or providing opportunities to convert stolen goods into cash.

- 11 projects reported neighbourhoods or parts of neighbourhoods where there appeared to be an acceptance of drug dealing.
- 11 projects reported neighbourhoods or parts of neighbourhoods where there was a high concentration of adult criminal activity, often with family members of the young people involved in offending.
- The degree to which these neighbourhoods [or parts of neighbourhoods] participate in or are compliant with criminal activity is also tempered by the number of project areas [14] which responded that a culture of menace or threat existed, serving to underpin criminality and anti-social attitudes. In some situations, young people were deemed operatives responsible for perpetuating this climate, but more usually it appeared to be enforced as part of systematic adult criminal activity or the dominance of a small number of families in a given location.

Across the range of locations served by Garda Youth Diversion Projects there is a high degree of diversity in relation to the breadth and intensity of risks faced by young people. Young people’s circumstances appear to have a significant bearing on their propensity to offend and present differential magnitudes of challenge to individual projects.

Some projects experience, at one extreme, the young person involved in ad hoc alcohol related public order crime who is performing satisfactorily at school and whose parents are making the best effort they can to change the behaviour. At the other extreme, some projects are attempting to engage young people who present as compulsive, aggressive, are intimately involved with an offending peer group committing public order and more sophisticated drug related and acquisitive crime, facilitated to offend

“The profiles outlined in this exercise suggest that equal levels of performance across GYDPs will probably lead to differential outcomes. This means that differential effort will probably need to be deployed across GYDPs to secure similar outcomes.”
by family members and further encouraged or coerced to offend by significant forces within the neighbourhood.

This analysis of the profiles of young people involved in the Garda Youth Diversion Projects raises the critical relevance of local context. It appears that the weight of each project’s challenge is determined by

- The types of offences being committed in the area it serves,
- The patterns of offending and
- The relevant circumstances [relating to individual, family, school and neighbourhood risk factors] presented by young people and their families.

The profiles outlined in this exercise suggest that equal levels of performance across Garda Youth Diversion Projects will probably lead to differential outcomes. This means that differential effort will probably need to be deployed across Garda Youth Diversion Projects to secure similar outcomes.
Profiling Alcohol and Public Order Related Crime

The following 3 profiles are illustrations based on the accumulated information collated during this baseline analysis relating to alcohol and public order related crime. The illustrations attempt to present relevant features and linkages in a manner which resonates with the experience of many of the projects participating in the baseline analysis. However there is no intrinsic validity in the profile illustrations or in the application of these profiles to individual circumstances. Each profile is a general hypothesis about how alcohol related crime occurs in particular locations and is intended to provide a transparent starting point for local discussion. All of these profiles can co-exist in a single project location. More meaningful profiling exercises will be best undertaken by each local project, in consultation with local Garda management and other relevant stakeholders.

Profiles of Crime
Alcohol and Public Order related offending

1) Ad hoc membership / Ad hoc activity
2) Regular membership / Regular Activity
3) Regular membership, Widespread activity, External influence

Profile 1  Ad Hoc membership / Ad Hoc Activity

Most projects reported that alcohol consumption amongst young people across their catchment area was prevalent, affecting a large percentage of all young people. Many young people consuming alcohol meet in groups on ad hoc occasions [for instance calendar events], in some cases informing parents that they are intending to participate in some other form of activity. These young people may or may not come to the attention of An Garda Síochána; if they do, a number will be returned to their parents and some may be cautioned due to their behaviour. In the main, most will desist from further offending.

At least 41 project areas are more likely to experience this type of behaviour as a significant part of their work profile. These young people are typically in some form of education and most parents when
Right: In profile 1 the young person will typically arrange to meet with friends on a Friday / Saturday evening or on one of a small number of calendar events. The group will have organised how to secure alcohol, in this example by a) asking a known adult in return for cash or a share of alcohol b) asking an older member of the peer group to purchase on behalf of the group c) securing alcohol from a parent with or without their knowledge d) targeting the licensed premises in the town which is perceived to be lax in terms of supplying alcohol to young people. The group will use [in this example] one of four drinking locations, for example a playground, local park, riverbank or wooded area. Some of the group will become drunk and gravitate towards the town centre, more particularly fast food outlets, committing public order nuisance type offences and possibly minor assaults and criminal damage offences on the way. These young people in the main will have satisfactory school attendance though performance may be impaired. Parents present as concerned about the behaviour and the consequences of the involvement of An Garda Síochána.
Alcohol and Public Order Crime
Profile 1
Ad Hoc membership / Ad Hoc Activity
confronted with the effects of the behaviour of their young person are appropriately concerned\textsuperscript{2}.

Members of An Garda Síochána reported that often in such circumstances young people are arrested and returned home because of fears about the young person’s health, their levels of intoxication and inevitable vulnerability. Young people in this profile are involved in related public order criminal damage and violent offences in a similar ad hoc manner.

It is mainly, though not exclusively, within this group that project staff and members of An Garda Síochána report the increasing frequency of girls involved in bouts of heavy binge drinking.

Demographic changes in recent years have complicated the picture for a number of project areas. In particular, new ribbon developments and satellite towns have resulted in a higher degree of anonymity and lack of organic community infrastructure. Projects reported that young people often present at the age of criminal responsibility for minor offences but with very complex and troubled behaviours and family backgrounds.

**Profile 2 Regular membership / Regular activity**

52 projects report that there is a clear cohort of young people involved in alcohol related public order offending on a repeat basis. Thirteen projects identified this cohort but were unable to estimate the size of the group. Nine projects estimated that the size of this group was less than 10, thirteen projects between 11-20, seven projects between 21-30, four projects between 31-40 and six projects 40 or more. Based on the average project size\textsuperscript{3}, the number of young people estimated to be repeat offenders in terms of alcohol related crime account for between 0.8% and 7% of the youth population in the project catchment areas.

This cohort of offenders is responsible for disproportionate levels of alcohol related youth crime in the project catchment area. Whilst alcohol and public order related offending features, it is important to note that where young people are offending in closed groups on a repeat basis, these groups [or more usually sub-groups] may also commit other *unrelated* offences, in particular pre-planned crime committed for financial gain.
Many of the young people in these groups consume alcohol [and drugs] on a regular basis and buck the trend of seasonal peak by reverting to indoor venues to drink alcohol during the winter months.

Although there may be an overall group [across the catchment area] of up to 30 young people involved in the cohort, this compliment typically breaks down into smaller neighbourhood groups, each of 5-10 young people. In the experience of many of the project areas, these young people tend to be more discrete about their behaviour, choosing hard to reach outdoor drinking locations, indoor drinking venues or locations safe within the estates on which they live, sometimes facilitated by adults and family members within the neighbourhood. However, some members of An Garda Síochána reported success in policing these areas due to greater use of bicycles for routine patrols.

In some situations, young people involved in these groups appear to have developed an *esprit de corps* such that their alcohol related behaviour also leads them into more regular public order, criminal damage and violent behaviour. Violent activity occurs in particular where there are underlying parish/neighbourhood animosities, family feuds and other underlying conflicts including drugs related activity, within a particular catchment area. A significant number of projects reported that self-reinforcing dynamics within these groups tended to establish anti-social rather than pro-social attitudes, a degree of normality to the offending behaviour and perceived indifference by group members to changing their behaviour patterns. Where these attitude changes were tolerated or copper-fastened by the family and neighbourhood experience of the young people involved it makes the challenge of seeking improvement for projects particularly problematic (see ‘Parents’ and ‘Neighbourhoods’ below).

**Profile 3: Regular membership, widespread activity, external influence**

A third of projects [33] identified features within their project areas where a considerable number of social and environmental factors served either not to discourage or to actively encourage offending behaviour. For many of these projects these features related to a relatively small geographical part of the project’s catchment area and perhaps not surprisingly a disproportionate amount of overall project effort. For 15 projects, the features related to all or a substantial part of their project catchment area.

These features tend to reflect family and neighbourhood factors including the relative impact and
Right: In profile 2 the young person presents with a high degree of impulsivity, perceiving his offending behaviour to be ‘normal’ and thus appears to be indifferent to changing his behaviour. The young person also has poor attendance at school and more generally presents as having little interest in educational improvement. His attitudes are underpinned by similar presenting indifference by parents and by his peer group. The situational factors are similar to those in profile 1, however this activity is likely to occur on a more regular basis with the same membership and can involve certain members of the peer group in other types of crime, for example theft, in offending episodes outside this profile.
Alcohol and Public Order Crime
Profile 2
Regular Membership/Regular Activity
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Public Order Crime
In profile 3 the young person experiences a powerful combination of influences some of which he has control over, some of which he has limited control over and some of which he has very little control over. The effect of these influences drive the young person [due to the pull factors of increased status and wealth or the push factors of family/friendship network expectations and the menace attached to adult criminalised activity] to seek out and act on opportunities to offend. We know little about how all these factors interplay and it appears that there are differences in the way that such influences bear respectively on thrill seeking type alcohol and public order crime and acquisitive crime such as theft, robbery and drug dealing. However it is reasonable to assume that escaping the gravity pull of these influences presents considerable difficulties for young people and presents overwhelming challenges for Garda Youth Diversion Projects.
Alcohol and Public Order Crime
Profile 3
Regular membership, widespread activity, external influence
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OPPORTUNITY
saturation levels of adult and organised crime in the neighbourhood. According to a number of projects there appears, at least at a superficial level to be a greater tolerance for alcohol and drugs misuse and less of a propensity to make official complaints to Gardaí. The specific reasons for the consequent enclave situation are difficult to identify and may involve equal measures of adult participation in anti-social activities and fear by other neighbours of making complaints. In such situations there are high levels of alcohol related crime involving young people drinking together with adults, often family members including older siblings and parents. In these situations, and particularly during the summer months, young people can be involved in alcohol related offending on any night [or day] of the week.

As a consequence, normal patterns of behaviour for young people including school attendance, participation in sporting or other clubs is significantly impaired.

Young people in these situations have a closer proximity to other types of organised crime, particularly, but not exclusively, drug dealing and tend to be more at risk of progressing from what may be deemed ‘pleasure seeking’ alcohol and public order related crime to crime for ‘financial gain’. This proximity can permeate all dimensions of the young person’s life within these project areas, friendship groups, family members and neighbours.

Typically projects were able to identify clear and distinct groups of young people previously involved in alcohol related offending who had:

a) been cultivated by adult drug dealers to sell or courier drugs or
b) who were part of close knit friendship, family and neighbourhood groups involved in organised theft, burglary and robbery.

The net effect of these ‘profiles’ is that they present different degrees of challenge for projects which are similarly configured in terms of staffing and programme resources. The profiles raise questions therefore about the importance of relative performance and casts doubt on the capacity of any single programme alone to be universally successful. However the profiles do support the application of evidence based logic to dealing with individual local circumstances.
Commentary on relevant research

It is not intended in this report to provide a comprehensive analysis of research activity in relation to youth crime; this has been done effectively elsewhere\(^1\). This summary rather attempts to highlight the key research relevant to the issues raised in this baseline report.

There is no consensus identifying the causes of juvenile crime or the most effective interventions\(^2\). However, there are indicators for both which it would be remiss to ignore and which strike a resonance in this baseline analysis. *Risk and protection* indicators, based on longitudinal studies, whilst still largely speculative in terms of articulating any causative effect appear nonetheless to have some impact on offending behaviour. Advocates of the risk and protection factor approach to youth crime attach significant weight to the existence of certain factors in a child’s life which increase the potential for offending\(^3\).

**Individual Factors** such as impulsiveness, low empathy in addition to low intelligence and / or low educational attainment, appear to have some association with young people who engage in criminal behaviour. The longitudinal research evidence suggests that young people exhibiting these characteristics are more likely to present as aggressive, be involved in thrill seeking type behaviour and to lack sufficient moral reasoning to resist the opportunities for thrill or gain presented by offending. It follows that such an effect can be compounded and sustained when a young person engages in anti-social group activities with peers presenting with similar characteristics and motivation, particularly where there are friendship, family or neighbourhood ties underpinning the relationship.

Many projects report the presence of these risks factors in the populations of young people that they serve. Of particular concern is the large number of projects which report that when challenged, young people, for a variety of reasons, present as reconciled to heavy and frequent use of alcohol, even where this is related to other subsequent offending. As a corollary such young people present as being unmotivated to make changes to this behaviour presenting significant engagement challenges for individual projects.

**Educational attainment factors** including a young person’s affection for school, their attendance,
behaviour, performance and the quality of school management are also believed to appear to have a clear association with a young person’s potential to offend. School performance, more often under-performance, features significantly in the baseline analysis both as an indicator of troublesome behaviour and as a predictor of low aspiration, particularly but not exclusively amongst boys.

Family Factors such as parents who have been or are involved in criminal activity, family size, family conflict and parenting capacity also appear to be associated with youth related offending.

The presenting logic is clear; the family is the environment where most children receive instruction and develop their sense of right and wrong, where parents protect against risks, nurture physical, emotional and social development and promote life-chance opportunities. Where this does not occur; more pointedly where parents themselves are either engaged in criminal or anti-social activity or omit to act when their children are involved in criminal activity; youth crime is more likely to prosper.

The relationships between these dynamics are less clear and some commentators have argued that simplistic cause and effect calculations are misleading: pointing out for instance that large family size in Ireland is probably as predictive of a child’s likelihood to embark on a career in medicine as it is to determine criminal activity\(^4\). However, it is clear from the baseline analysis that many practitioners believe, consistent with the overwhelming evidence from longitudinal studies, that poor parenting skill, attitude and participation in anti-social or criminal activity, directly and negatively affects the young person’s behaviour.

It is important, in considering the available research evidence relating to young people and crime, to recognise that whilst the risk and protection factor approach is dominant, a number of academics criticise:

- The imprecision of risk factors such as ‘ineffective parenting’ which it argues are largely subjective judgements rather than clinical and measurable conditions.
- The problems with using macro profiles created by aggregated data to interpret individual circumstances\(^5\).
- The inability to distinguish between Proximal risks [or those which appear to be
Commentary on relevant research

associated with certain outcomes] and Causal risks [where the risks are proven to be more likely to produce a particular effect].

- The tendency for longitudinal studies to target children and families from disadvantaged neighbourhoods and minority groups.
- The tendency to rely on recorded crime and conviction data, which over represents children from disadvantaged communities and minorities.
- The effect that interventions demanding programme integrity with accompanying manuals have on stifling practice innovation and reflection.
- The lack of a theory of change over and above applying effort to offset risk factors with protective factors.

The often conflicting academic discourse relating to youth crime demands that Garda Youth Diversion Projects be informed by the available research evidence from longitudinal studies, but also to be sufficiently reflective to innovate where there is a clear under-lying logic for action.

Interventions

The experience of the baseline analysis reflects to a large degree, the broad research finding that the reasons for young people becoming involved in offending are often complex and multi-systemic. The profiles illustrated earlier in this analysis hypothesise a combination of risk, temporal and situational factors which appear to facilitate environments where [in these examples] youthful public order crime proliferates. This complexity poses a number of challenges to agencies, authorities, parents and young people attempting to mitigate the presenting risks.

It follows that multi-systemic responses are required to offset the multiple risks faced by young people, particularly in neighbourhoods experiencing higher levels of crime. Developing hypotheses, such as those sketched in this analysis, specific to individual locations around the country may serve to galvanise and synchronise better, the efforts of the responsible agencies. Garda Youth Diversion Projects cannot respond to all these needs and have to make judicious choices about the best use of limited resources to make their most effective impact on crime reduction.
Helping young people to reflect on and challenge their offending behaviour and to develop meaningful insight into the damage of his or her actions on other people will help young people to think differently about their behaviour. If the inherent risks are largely within the young person’s control, such an intervention could reduce their potential for impulsivity and develop improved genuine empathy, which in turn may encourage the young person to think twice about offending. A small number of projects employ formalised cognitive behavioural approaches in their direct work with young people. Other projects cultivate pro-social relationships with young people and attempt to create environments with clear behavioural expectations within projects not dissimilar to pro-social modelling techniques used successfully with young offenders elsewhere.

Nevertheless, the challenges faced by most projects encountering ambivalence by young people with respect to changing their behaviour should not be under-estimated. It may require significant time investment and skill to bring young people [and their parents] to a point where they are able and willing to reflect on their current behaviour and be motivated toward change. Indeed, certain interventions have been designed to specifically meet the challenges presented by such hard-to-engage clients.

An intervention that improves performance at school, or develops talent, allows a young person to gain pro-social status and sense of achievement and provides her or him with a route out of offending and to more sustainable employment. Interventions with parents appear to yield results, particularly where the young person’s offending behaviour is associated with deficits in parenting skill.

Additionally, there is substantial logic for providing opportunities for young people: whether it is the opportunity to participate in new activities, opportunities to experience pro-social environments, team work and the opportunity to engage in ‘altruistic activity’, allowing the young person to enjoy, experience and develop a dynamic interest in activities that they may normally be denied access to. The potential of ‘civic engagement’ as a means to help young people overcome significant adversity,
including offending behaviour, is receiving significant academic interest both in Ireland and internationally\(^9\).

The research on *resilience* is still under-developed. However there is an undeniable logic that a young person’s ability to avoid, confront and negotiate risks, and to develop competence to take control over their actions, will improve the chances of the young person not being corralled into circumstances where they offend\(^{10}\). There is an equally vociferous logic that dynamic relationships formed between adults and young people are both beneficial in developing self worth, securing opportunities and a capacity for reflection and self efficacy. As part of this baseline analysis, ‘resilience accounts’ [i.e. where projects have reported incidences of children who have appeared to withstand overwhelmingly risky milieu] have been collated from a number of project areas and will be used to inform future discussion.

It is critical that decision makers are able to access sound evidence in order to make the effective decisions. In addition to processing the learning from research evidence, there is a clear need for good quality local data to assist a project to identify the size and scope of the challenge it faces. Whilst none of the projects had previously undergone the precise intellectual sequence involved in this baseline analysis, there were numerous examples of sharing information particularly between An Garda Síochána and local projects. In addition to improving the capacity for service design, these exchanges have led to innovative situational solutions designed to break the chain of events leading to an offence.

The next section, ‘Improvements’, identifies the positive differences that projects are trying to make in relation to the offending patterns experienced within their locality and the challenges presented by the young people and their circumstances.
Eight Improvements

Each project was asked to identify what ‘improvements’ it was trying to make in relation to impacting on the circumstances that were associated with youth crime in its area. This was a deliberate area of enquiry for the baseline analysis. Asking a project to reflect on how it uses its organisational effort to make a positive difference provides a greater degree of insight into how the project sees itself positioned to engage with the task of reducing youth crime within its locality. Such insights are not gained by simply describing project activity.

What the discussion in the baseline analysis essentially yields is an indication of how ‘aligned’ a project is to its local circumstances and how close a fit the intended improvements are to what the research evidence suggests are the most effective interventions. Obviously such self report analysis is insufficient on its own to provide a full appraisal of service delivery. In future exercises, scrutiny will need to be applied to how well a project executes these intentions into practice.

Discussion regarding intended improvement also provides useful reference points for future service development. We need to ask, ‘Are the intended improvements really likely to impact offending behaviour?’, and if so, ‘Are the activities currently being provided by a project really likely to secure these improvements?’ Given that the largest resource input available to a Garda Youth Diversion Project is its human resources, the way that project staff use their time is therefore critical.

It is clear from discussions with projects that offending and reducing offending are not simple linear progressions, they are more often a complex interplay of static and dynamic risks factors combined with various situational factors and the occasional possibly unforeseen external factor. The improvement intended by a project may fit only part of a plan to reduce certain types of youth crime within a particular locality. However this contribution should be clear, measurable and have an inherent logic regarding its role as either, breaking the chain of a particular sequence of events leading to a criminal act or reducing risk[s] implicit in the young person’s circumstances and which increase their chances of
becoming involved in a criminal act. The abstract on the next page shows how a combination of interventions designed to reduce risk or break the chain could reasonably impact the sequence of events illustrated in profile 2.

Projects identified many improvements and project activities to secure these improvements. These are listed exhaustively within each project’s own record of the baseline interview. A number of the intended improvements share a close fit with research evidence or demonstrate a clear logic relating to why the intended improvement[s] should contribute to reducing crime, examples of these are outlined below.

**Improved engagement with young people**

Garda Youth Diversion Projects deliver their services within the context of a purely voluntary relationship with young people and their families. Though obvious, it is worth stating that if there is no relationship between the project staff and the young person; then there is no intervention. It follows therefore that there is a need for the young person to value the relationship with the project in order to engage and to sustain that engagement. There are particular challenges inherent in the relationship, not least in challenging offending behaviour, which for the young person will probably be an uncomfortable and unfamiliar experience. Indeed, a number of projects indicated that young people engage with the project for drop in sessions or for the more pleasurable activities at the expense of sessions designed to address offending behaviour. However, other projects appeared to have managed this complexity by either making the relationship clear from the start; at the point of Garda caution\(^1\), or in the context of an engagement contract with the young person and their family\(^2\). The value of such a tactic is that it avoids undue drift from the point of caution to the point of intervention by the Garda Youth Diversion Project or misunderstanding about the role of the Garda Youth Diversion Project\(^3\). Some projects have found residential activities or other intensive activities away from the locality to give further understanding and meaning to the relationship. Nevertheless, sustaining a voluntary relationship over the long term and during what a young person might perceive as the more prosaic activities continues to be a challenge for projects\(^4\) and the use of ‘self’, or the competence of the project staff member is undoubtedly instrumental in this. Nevertheless, identifying the best ways of sustaining improved robust and honest relationships between projects, young people and their parents would be assisted overall by the opportunity for sharing tactics and ideas amongst projects.
Right: This illustration demonstrates how a number of interventions delivered both in parallel and in sequence could interrupt this particular pattern of offending behaviour.

A] **Interventions to reduce risks associated with youth crime:** poor self control and ambivalence to change could be addressed by a combination of motivational interviewing techniques and cognitive behavioural type interventions. This intervention could be complimented by providing the young person with new opportunities to demonstrate pro-social behaviour. In tandem with these interventions support could be elicited to provide a parenting intervention with sufficient dosage to effect attitude change and a more active case management of school attendance.

B] **Interventions to break the sequence of events leading to youth crime:** there are a number of opportunities to break the sequence in this profile. For instance, where adults locally are suspected of purchasing alcohol for young people, a local authority could mobilise local support for confidential information to be passed to An Garda Síochána. The higher degree of alert may also possibly affect retailer vigilance. Active monitoring of known drinking locations targeted at certain times on weekends may result in the confiscation of alcohol and lower levels of drunkenness. The availability of an easily accessible alcohol free and attractive activity for young people such as a youth café at certain risk times may provide a viable alternative to engaging in drunken anti-social behaviour.
Abstract Public Order Crime
Profile 2: Repeat behaviour by a cohort group

1. Engage+Challenge young person
2. Provide new prosocial Opportunities
3. Intervention to tackle and challenge attitudes by parents
4. Monitor school attendance

Strategies to stop known adults purchasing alcohol for young people have a positive effect on licensee vigilance.

Designed to reduce risk
Designed to break the chain
Improvements in helping young people to reflect and challenge their offending behaviour and negotiate their own path away from crime

Projects face a considerable challenge in encouraging young people to reflect on their behaviour and to use this reflection to inspire change. Additionally many young people [and on occasion their parents] present as complacent and ambivalent to change [particularly, but not exclusively, in relation to alcohol related offending]. In some cases, even though there are brief reflections and feelings of remorse; the period between this reflection and the young person committing their next related offence can be short. Young people involved in repeat acquisitive crime and/or drugs related activity may be subject to further considerable influence from sources outside their immediate control, such as peer group, family and neighbourhood.

Nevertheless, a number of projects have attempted to intervene to mitigate the individual risks associated with the young people they work with. Some projects deliberately introduce dissonance into their conversations with young people to disrupt complacency when designing interventions to reduce impulsivity; or ‘connect’ young people in a meaningful way with the consequences of their actions, intending to improve their feelings of empathy. These feelings are more likely to be copper-fastened where young people are directly exposed to the victim’s experiences of their offending behaviour. The various restorative programmes and techniques currently employed in the Irish Youth Justice system provide for this opportunity.

It should follow that these types of interventions work best where a young person him or herself has the control over whether they expose themselves to risks associated with offending behaviour; [for example in this report to profile 1 rather than profiles 2 & 3]. However a number of projects deliberately attempt to bolster the young person’s own personal resources, accepting that the social environments that many young people interact with constantly provide pull and push dynamics for further offending. In a small number of cases, the baseline analysis has collated narratives relating to resilience or the ability for a young person to encounter and negotiate the myriad challenges they face with less apparent risk of their committing offences.

Some projects appear to have a well developed logic which articulates that in most situations young
people have a large degree of control if they wish to change their life course. Projects further argue that the key to change is building upon a conviction that young people can become self motivated to improve their circumstances, acting as an antidote for the type of scenario where ‘offenders tend to believe that what happens to them depends on fate, chance or luck rather than their own actions’.

A number of projects gave examples of intended improvements which precipitate greater motivation, assist young people to design their own route out of crime and apply effort to sustain it over the longer term. Examples also included the use of clear expectations of behaviour whilst the young person was engaged with the project, intending that the exposure to such a pro-social experience and relationship will have a wider impact on personal behaviour. The logic continues that the development of a pro-social value system, combined with certain competencies will help to execute positive intentions.

Some projects have combined evidence based theory with practice wisdom, arguing that a closed group approach to working with young people in high crime neighbourhoods can develop pro-social values and further that this particular configuration can act as a buffer to other more immediate negative peer and family influences.

**Improvements to young person’s school / educational performance**

Projects reported that in many instances there was problematic school attendance and behaviour, with the corollary, particularly where a young person has an intellectual or cognitive impairment, that educational performance was poor. The cyclical patterns of alcohol and public order offending, particularly where this impacts directly on school attendance [surrounding weekends or certain calendar events], inevitably complicates this situation. Whether poor educational performance is symptomatic of or a contribution to other anti-social activity, it remains a significant barrier to improvement for many young people currently engaged with projects. Some young people present as disaffected with school and some parents appeared to do little to encourage young people succeeding in school. Additionally, the re-organisation of local schools in some areas, according to projects, has added to the challenges of low school performance.

Some projects have invested considerable effort in directly improving educational performance. Certain
Eight Improvements

projects have committed resources to facilitating participants in securing recognized educational qualifications\textsuperscript{11}. Sustained over a long period, some projects believe that improved educational performance of a critical mass of young people in a particular locality has led to a more general increase in overall expectations by young people and parents, cultivating a more promising environment for some young people to succeed. Therefore there are accrued benefits in relation to reducing Youth Crime arising from successful outcomes in activities falling within the auspices of the Department of Education and Science.

**Improved parenting effectiveness**

The research evidence relating to parenting and the onset of offending by children and young people is compelling. Projects experience a wide range of attitudes and skills in relation to a parent’s relationship with their young person and levels of effectiveness in terms of a parent’s supervision. The majority of projects report that parents are willing to engage with the project staff, although of concern is that many project staff believe that parents hope the project will ‘fix’ the young person’s behaviour rather than change occurring as a consequence of something that the parent might do differently. Most projects report that while the majority of parents are trying their best, often in very difficult circumstances, a large number of parents tend to minimise the offending behaviour and a minority present as either indifferent to or complicit in the young person’s offending.

Most projects have at least one contact with parents, perhaps at the point of entry to a project or programme of activities and would generally aim to improve the harmony of relationships between young people and their parents within the home. Other projects more deliberately invest staff time in effecting improved change in the young person’s behaviour by also working with parents. Examples of this investment in parents include attempts to engage parents in the young person’s programme\textsuperscript{12} and interventions to improve parenting skill. In more problematic situations where parents present as indifferent or complacent about the young person’s offending behaviour, a small number of projects invest in a relationship based intervention\textsuperscript{13} designed to improve parenting attitude.

Some projects have assessed parenting capacity and attitude to help determine what level of input a young person might require, i.e. the lower the apparent investment by parents, the higher the required
input by the project. Other projects have factored in a negative parenting effect where improvements in a young person’s attitude to offending are more likely to occur in spite of parental [and other] influence.

**Improved opportunities for young people to behave in a pro-social manner and realise their potential**

Some of the criticism of the risk centred practice suggests that in focussing on the eradication of the factors and behaviours which relate to anti-social activity, opportunities are lost to capitalise on a young person’s potential to act pro-socially. This fits with a number of the practices across projects which, although not necessarily incompatible with holding young people to account for their behaviour, focus on the use of positive reinforcement, sense of achievement and self worth to bring about change. There are a number of examples of this type of work which, in addition to being of intrinsic value, can also act to develop empathy and reduce impulsiveness\(^{14}\), repair harm in particularly difficult relationships between young people and their home community by undertaking voluntary remedial work and reduce the fear of crime\(^{15}\). Promoting new opportunities more generally was a significant and particularly strong feature of intended project improvement, for example:-

**Practical**
- Opportunity to engage in an environment that is safe from negative coercive influence
- Opportunity to engage in activities with correct safety equipment

**Experiential**
- Opportunity to broaden the repertoire of activities experienced by a young person [for example outdoor pursuits, horse riding, drama]
- Opportunity to engage in mainstream youth activities
- Opportunity to receive appropriate adult advice
- Opportunity to experience fun or a ‘buzz’ legally

**Relationships**
- Opportunity to form and sustain adult relationships
- Opportunity to experience committed and consistent relationships
- Opportunity to experience a sense of belonging
- Opportunity for improved perception of the young person by others
Opportunity to demonstrate a commitment to citizenship

**Personal development and enhanced life chances**

- Opportunity to receive meaningful praise and encouragement
- Opportunity to give and receive respect
- Opportunity to genuinely understand the impact of behaviour on victims
- Opportunity for improved social presentation and to be perceived well by other people
- Opportunity for leadership experience
- Opportunity for talent development
- Opportunity for improved educational outcomes and credential acquisition

Undoubtedly providing the opportunity for young people to engage in pro-social activities, to learn from pro-social experiences and to be advanced by new opportunities and life chances at the very least will do no harm. However some evidence suggests that such interventions may provide more sustainable pathways for some young people trying to extract themselves from potentially high risk environments\(^{16}\).

**Improvements in reducing the opportunity for youth crime**

In addition to identifying risks which are associated with offending behaviour, offender management and crime reduction strategies have also seen progress in attempting to reduce the opportunities for youth crime. These strategies are typically underpinned by theories that

- If a crime is too difficult to commit, a certain percentage of young people will not apply the extra effort involved.
- If a crime is easily detectable young people will fear being caught.
- If there is an activity more pleasurable or meaningful for young people, they will choose this activity in preference to committing offences.

These strategies are often linked together as a clear logic which attempts to reconcile the need for public safety with the need for quality of life. For instance, prickly shrubbery creates effective, yet aesthetically pleasing perimeter protection for property. It follows that if the perimeter is securely protected then it is
likely that most intended intruders will think twice before attempting to trespass, therefore reducing
property crime. This protection is afforded without making such properties overtly security focussed -
thereby reducing the likelihood of local neighbours unnecessarily perceiving a high crime threat in their
neighbourhood.

The bulk of this analysis has related to human interactions but there are also clear indicators that
situational and temporal factors are in some cases equally important; whether this relates to the relative
ease of accessing alcohol and locations to consume alcohol, saturation levels regarding drugs use in
certain neighbourhoods facilitating easy access to purchasing drugs or the variety of sell on
opportunities for stolen goods. A small number of projects have reported for instance that alcohol
consumption appears to be relatively low where alcohol outlets are more than an easy distance from
where young people live and meet up. There is also suggestion that the general reductions in car theft
related crime has as much to do with improved car security systems as changes in offending behaviour.

A number of projects [and partner agencies] have deployed effort to attempt to reduce the opportunity
for youth crime including; the routine exchange of soft information between agencies to reduce delay
where a young person may be placing him or herself in risky situations, organising meetings or
appointments at certain times or days of the week to disrupt anti-social or offending cycles17, or the
targeting of certain calendar events to apply disproportionate effort to meet higher levels of risk18. Some
projects have employed tight controls, similar to active case management19 to reduce the risk of a young
person drifting into further crime, particularly those who are engaged in chaotic lifestyles20. One youth
organisation is applying effort to attempt to understand the dynamics relating to internet based violence
with a view to informing practice.

The active policing of known drinking locations at times when young people are likely to be in
possession of alcohol but sober rather than drunk is likely to reduce the severity of public order
incidents. Some projects also reported that where the Garda involved in dealing with such an event has
a strong relationship with the young people involved21, the effect of a reduction in offence seriousness is
likely to be enhanced without reducing the integrity of the Garda executing their statutory functions to
prevent crime and protect the public.

*The final section considers the next steps...*
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Next Steps

The baseline analysis has clearly demonstrated the need for both informed and reflective practice in local projects. That is, to consider existing local service provision in the context of high quality local data relating to youth crime, research evidence, practice wisdom and to give a genuine commitment to introduce the necessary change to bring about improvement for the young people and communities being served.

In recognition that Garda Youth Diversion Projects will probably provide only part of the response necessary to reduce youth crime in local areas, the Irish Youth Justice Service will ensure ongoing consultation with the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs to promote better local partnerships. More directly, the Irish Youth Justice Service is also committed to providing ongoing developmental support to secure necessary improvements and changes in consultation with the key stakeholders responsible for Garda Youth Diversion Projects.

The process of improving interventions requires a dynamic partnership between the key stakeholders: the Irish Youth Justice Service, which has key statutory responsibility for leadership of the National Youth Justice Strategy; An Garda Síochána, which has key responsibility for the administration of Garda Youth Diversion Projects; and the Youth Organisations and Management Companies which have responsibility for the delivery of services and have the capacity for innovation.

The significance in this vision is that the opportunity for innovation will be located with local management companies and Youth Organisations. A local GYDP is best positioned to analyse local circumstances, develop its logic, deploy its own resources and negotiate its own path to improvement of outcomes for young people. This development model provides sufficient room for reflective innovation but provides probably a greater degree of accountability in terms of a local project evidencing the rationale for its intended activities. Of course none of this front-end thinking substitutes for the rigorous independent evaluation of project strategy and effort in achieving better outcomes.

The Irish Youth Justice Service and An Garda Síochána will actively support this ongoing partnership, to give direction where necessary in terms of strategy but also to participate in the process of change and
assist in the development of capacity to improve services. Therefore, in addition to applying appropriate effort to facilitate improvement across all projects, the Irish Youth Justice Service will seek to promote those projects which strive for excellence.

**Specific Improvement Measures - Intended Outcomes**

1) Alignment of project activities with local youth crime patterns

2) To develop new service designs in 5 trial sites

3) To improve knowledge over all Garda Youth Diversion Projects

1) **Intended Outcome:**

**Alignment of project activities with local youth crime patterns**

- The Irish Youth Justice Service will require as a condition of funding that all 2010 Annual Plans for existing Garda Youth Diversion Projects and business plans for applicant areas contain a detailed analysis of offences committed by young people within the catchment area of the project and an analysis of the patterns of youth crime. This analysis will need to be undertaken in close cooperation with local Garda management and verified by a suitably senior local Garda manager.

- The Irish Youth Justice Service will require as a condition of funding that all 2010 Annual Plans for existing Garda Youth Diversion Projects and business plans for applicant local areas contain a detailed logic statement identifying specifically what improvements the project intends to make to the local youth crime situation. Ideally this statement will also identify, in the context of the analysis of local youth crime, what risks and needs remain unmet to encourage multi agency action.

2010 business plans will need to demonstrate a clear link between the analysis of local youth crime and the project’s rationale for selecting activities to improve the situation.
2) **Intended Outcome:**

To develop new service designs in 5 trial sites

The Irish Youth Justice Service, An Garda Síochána and a selection of Garda Youth Diversion Projects will establish 5 trial sites in 2009. The purpose of this exercise is to re-design existing Garda Youth Diversion Project interventions which will be informed by detailed local crime data provided by specialist analysts within An Garda Síochána. The trial sites will be regularly reviewed and key learning will be disseminated routinely to all Garda Youth Diversion Projects to facilitate more widespread improvements in service delivery. The Irish Youth Justice Service will also actively consider opportunities to collaborate with youth service providers who wish to improve other specific practice interventions.

3) **Intended Outcome:**

To improve knowledge across all Garda Youth Diversion Projects

The Irish Youth Justice Service intends to facilitate capacity improvements in four areas.

1) The development of common principles for the assessment of young people being referred to and being served by projects.

2) The development of advice and guidance to assist projects in crime analysis and to develop logic models to coherently transfer the local analysis of youth crime into project effort.

3) The development of training in key practice areas; initially developing staff skills in dealing with presenting complacency [i.e. motivating young people and parents] and developing staff skills to encourage young people to reflect on and change their behaviour.

4) The facilitation of an ongoing dialogue and the cultivation of a learning community amongst providers of Garda Youth Diversion projects to improve practice and share knowledge.

These three overall outcomes represent an agenda for change rather than a list of recommendations,
reflecting the reality that improvement will need to be a collaborative and developmental exercise between the key stakeholders. However, progress in aligning project effort to local evidence regarding youth crime, improving project capacity to design services, the development of key skills in engaging young people and the opportunity to consider the practicalities of transferring evidence into practice in trial sites hopefully provides for a robust strategy in responding to a complex challenge.
One | Introduction

1 Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2008 [see www.garda.ie].


3 The Probation Service operates a dedicated Young Persons Probation division.


5 The data for this report has been comprehensively cross-referenced, clustering those projects facing similar challenges and designing similar solutions. It is not appropriate to publish specific location sensitive data though this will be used as part of the improvement programme to match projects facing similar issues or working at similar solutions.

6 The 4 remaining projects were at early development stage

7 Members of An Garda Síochána participated in 66 of 96 of visits.[ A total of 89 members of An Garda Síochána were present 62 Garda, 13 at sergeant rank, 12 at Inspector rank and 2 at Superintendent rank.]

8 See section 3 ‘The Baseline analysis’ and corresponding end notes dealing with the relative accuracy of crime profiles

Two | Garda Youth Diversion Projects

1 Garda Youth Diversion Project Guidelines [May 2005]

2 The Garda Diversion Programme for instance is a national programme administered by An Garda Síochána which considers the case of each young person [under the age of 18 yrs] who admits to committing an offence. The Director of the Programme decides whether the young person is suitable for caution, thereby avoiding prosecution, or whether their case is passed to the Director of Public Prosecutions. This programme now falls within the statutory framework of the Children Act 2001. Those cases passed to the DPP are usually situations where; the young person denies the offence, the offence is so serious that it has been deemed unsuitable for diversion, or the young person has been considered for diversion on prior occasions and has exhausted the option by re-offending. The Diversion programme has an impressive record in successfully diverting young people from further offending (See “Report of the Committee appointed to Monitor the effectiveness of the Garda Juvenile Diversion Programme” [An Garda Síochána] 2007).

3 An Garda Síochána Youth Diversion Projects Information Manual 2003

4 An Garda Síochána Youth Diversion Projects Information Manual 2003

5 See Appendix 1 for full list of Management Companies

6 See also ‘The Impact and Effectiveness of the Garda Special projects’ [2000] Bowden and Higgins and ‘Study of Participants in Garda Special Projects’ [2001], Centre for Social and Educational Research D.I.T.

Three | The Baseline analysis

1 There was evidence from project responses of certain under-reporting of crime particularly in terms of assaults / bullying incidents committed by girls, assault and criminal damage with a possible racial motive and a more general under-reporting in neighbourhoods experiencing disproportionately high levels of crime.

2 Refers to total populations of children and activity. A number of the population sizes were estimated by local professionals during interview, given that project catchment areas do not necessarily correlate with census areas nor are co-terminus with boundaries determined by other statutory agencies. Figure 3 demonstrates that there is a wide divergence in terms of project catchment size. Nevertheless 54 of the 69 projects that provided estimates [i.e. 78%] estimated total populations within the catchment area to be below 20,000.

3 Calculation based on census 2006 figures: Total population Ireland, 4,239,848, total number of young people aged 12-18yrs 395,503. It is accepted that there are demographic differences in localities around the country and that in many of the project areas demographics are in particular significantly younger than the average.
In 2006, 20,016 young people in total were referred to the Garda Diversion Programme, representing 5% of the total population of 12-18 yr olds. This figure, if anything is a high end % indicator of detected youth crime, encompassing all young people referred to the Garda Diversion Programme even where the outcomes of the referral were unsuitable for caution, no further action or pending. See “Annual Report of the Committee Appointed to Monitor the Effectiveness of the Diversion Programme 2006”.

Extra significance in this respect means the likelihood that there are proportionately more young people involved in offending behaviour [and referred to the juvenile diversion programme] who reside in areas served by Garda Youth Diversion Projects than might be expected from the national average. Average referral rate @ 5% of average youth population in Garda catchment area [1,300] = 65. Three times the average rate of referral to the Garda Diversion Programme or 15% of overall youth population = 195; four times the national average or 20% of overall youth population = 260. It is accepted that some young people who commit offences are not detected.


For example it is clear from the discussions that alcohol related crime often encompasses a package of offences including criminal damage, public order, minor assault, trespass and possession of drugs.

For example there was some evidence to suggest that premeditated theft, burglary and robbery are committed by young people operating in closed peer groups

### Four Offences committed by young people

1. Offences described in this section relate to all young people in project locations and not exclusively young people involved in Garda Youth Diversion Projects

2. An Garda Síochána Statistics, young people referred to the Garda Diversion Programme in 2006. 4974 offences were alcohol related from a total of 25,080 offences.

3. Criminal damage, public order, minor assault, assault on Gardaí, public mischief and trespass.

4. The offences referred to amount to 11,906 offences of a total of all juvenile offences referred to the Garda Diversion Programme in 2007 [n= 25,080]

5. It is not possible to guarantee absolute precision in relation to this list. Of particular difficulty is the way that categories of offences such as theft, robbery, burglary, trespass were used interchangeably by respondents. Nevertheless the responses were overwhelmingly similar, permitting overall trends to be assumed

6. Mainly to gain access to premises to consume alcohol and drugs

7. It is difficult to disentangle unlawful use of alcohol from drugs misuse with many projects reporting that most young people use both drugs and alcohol and many Gardaí reporting that young people are often found in possession of drugs when arrested for other matters, particularly drunkenness and other public order matters

8. Whilst most of the criminal damage type offending appears to be alcohol related and for ease has been listed in this report as generally associated with alcohol related crime; some is not. A number of projects reported that while general levels of ant-social behaviour are high, criminal damage can be a ‘normal’ part of this behaviour. There are two other key exceptions to alcohol related incidence, firstly graffiti related crime which can often involve a core [and closed friendship group] of young people and secondly, intimidatory criminal damage more often carried out in neighbourhoods where there is a significant culture of coercion and menace.

9. Drugs possession and Drugs Sale / Supply account for 4% or 1110 offences referred to the Garda Diversion Programme in 2007.

10. For instance groups of young people aligned to certain music cultures or football teams

11. Road traffic matters covers a range of offences from dangerous driving, driving without tax and insurance to driving on a provisional license without a suitably qualified driver.

12. Criminal damage, public order, minor assault and trespass.

13. Possibly around 30 project areas, or parts of project areas

14. For example one project holds early morning football competitions on Saturdays

15. Although this is often substituted for drugs use

16. Each project reported a range of access points

17. For example drugs misuse

18. The young adult could also be an older brother/ sister or other relative. One project reported an adult 30yrs+ drinking with young people
For example fields, waste ground, indoor venues, graveyards, parks or on home housing estates.

A number of projects also reported that the underlying relationships between young people and their friendship networks and An Garda Síochána were a key factor in terms of subsequent public order offending. For instance four projects believed that public order offending tended to escalate partly as a consequence of the relationship with An Garda Síochána. Alternatively two other projects reported that the underlying relationship between An Garda Síochána and the young people in a particular locality had served to mitigate rather than aggravate potentially difficult public order situations. Another project reported that the longstanding relationships established between young people and local members of An Garda Síochána had resulted in generally lower levels of public order crime in its locality, despite there being high usage of alcohol amongst young people.

By this it is meant that it is entirely possible that criminal damage, public order and assault offences take place as part of the same offending episode.

Outside fast food premises, night clubs, town squares etc

Where for instance the uniform identifies a particular youth culture or support for a football team.

For a more detailed analysis of drug use and prevalence see ‘Drug Use in Ireland and Northern Ireland 2006/2007 Drug Prevalence Study: Cannabis results’. wwwnacd.ie/publications/prevalence

Who may also be using cannabis

Hallucinogenic and other products sold in outlets known as Head Shops

According to respondents some young people steal food and confectionary because they are hungry

Particularly if there are local [possibly neighbourhood] sell on opportunities to convert these items into cash

See section ‘Profiling Alcohol and Public Order Related Youth Crime’

Where a young person is asked to target a particular item or where a young person is aware of a local demand for a particular item, for example sportswear.

The profiles of young people engaged with Garda Youth Diversion Projects

It is important to note that projects were not asked to report whether or not certain risk factors were evident in their work experience, the identification of risk factors in this report relied on an analysis of open questions describing how young people present. It is assumed therefore that the presence of risk factors is, if anything, understated.

Most projects reported some degree of contact with parents, at a minimum to provide the parent with information about the project and secure consent for the project’s activities

Profiling alcohol and public order related youth crime

And drugs consumption

Although a number of projects reported that many parents present as more concerned about the young person acquiring a criminal record than the young person’s risky behaviour.

Three of the 6 projects estimating cohorts of 40 or more also had project catchments of over 30,000 or double the average size.

Also including clashes between young people subscribing to particular popular culture and soccer teams

One project characterised the effect of this process as accelerating the typical gap between offending episodes. For instance, the time lapse from where a young person experiences a remorse following an offence before reconciling and making normal the behaviour and then looking for further opportunities to offend.

Commentary on relevant research

For a useful reader in support for the risk and protection approach to youth crime with accompanying references see Farrington and Welsh 2007 ‘Saving Children from a life of Crime’ [Oxford University Press]. For a useful reader on criticism of the risk and protection paradigm with accompanying references see Case S. [2007] ‘Questioning the evidence of risk that underpins evidence-led youth justice interventions’ SAGE ‘Youth Justice 7; 91-105 [Sage].


4 O Mahoney [2008] ‘In Ireland, while prisoners tend to come from unusually large families, it is quite likely that inquiry would show that doctors, for example, also tend to come from much larger than normal families’

5 Illustration: This presents a similar challenge to the way that actuarial data for instance, identifies young male drivers as ‘high risk’ thereby determining the size of insurance premium irrespective of the skill competency and caution exercised by an individual young male driver.


8 However, a number of projects have identified poor parental attitude to offending behaviour as well as poor parenting skill as a key feature of their work.

9 This UNESCO research programme is being led in Ireland by NUI Galway [Professor Pat Dolan] in conjunction with a range of national and international NGO and academic partners.

10 See for instance McIvor and Barry 1998 Social work and Criminal Justice Volume 6 ‘Probation’ Edinburgh. The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

Eight | Improvements

1 For example in four projects, the project co-coordinator is present with the young person and their parent[s] when the caution is administered to explain the programme and in another project the project co-ordinator is introduced to the family shortly after the caution is administered.

2 For example one project requires young people to engage with all parts of the programme as a precondition to entry.

3 A number of projects indicated that young people and/or parents may not be fully aware of the role of the project in relation to crime reduction.

4 Some projects suggested that Garda Youth Diversion Project interventions should be made a condition of a caution so that there is a consequence for non-engagement.

5 For example, one project specifically attempts to assist young people to defer gratification or the range of projects which include fishing as a means to slow the pace of interaction.

6 For example two projects provide a cognitive behavioural approach and cognitive training, one project has used Garda data to assist young person to understand the patterns of behaviour, and another project which organised a restorative session with the victim of assault by a young person.

7 For example one project reported that for some young people it was difficult to find one positive influence in their whole social environment.

8 These narratives were produced by projects typically located in or serving localities experiencing higher levels of crime or presenting with higher levels of multi-systemic risk. It is intended that the narratives will be used to further develop knowledge across projects about why some young people appear to deal better with difficult circumstances.


10 For example two projects refer to the development and cultivation of ‘moral courage’, another project identifies ‘stickability’ as a key competence, yet another uses its advocacy leverage to attempt to ensure that young people who are motivated can repair broken relationships and opportunities. Two projects attempt to work with the young person to predict outcomes if behaviour remains unchanged. One project uses scenario planning to attempt to predict likely risky situations and another project identifies the small steps needed to achieve overall change.

11 For example in securing Junior Certificate, Leaving Certificate and FETAC awards. Two projects hold FETAC accreditation.

12 For example two projects provide regular individual feedback to parents regarding the young person’s performance.

13 For example one project which engages parent’s in reflection about how their behaviour might be affecting the young person’s behaviour and another project which invests significant time in relationships with parents and attempts to improve parents’ attitudes to offending behaviour.

14 For example one project provides opportunities for young people to work voluntarily with people with learning disabilities on outdoor pursuit activities and another project which is engaged in Christmas fundraising campaigns for the local hospital.

15 For example one project which makes and repairs garden furniture for elderly residents in the area it serves.

16 See Case S. [2007] *Questioning the evidence of risk that underpins evidence-led youth justice interventions* SAGE *Youth Justice 7; 91-105* [Sage]
For example one project targets early morning visits for young people who have chaotic lifestyles, another project organises project activities on Saturday morning, attempting to reduce alcohol consumption on Friday nights and two projects which have provided night coffee bar services to young people on Fridays and Saturdays.

For example two projects which have designed interventions targeting Halloween, with some measured success in reducing certain young people’s participation in anti-social activity.

This typically involves higher levels of engagement with a young person and rapid follow up if a young person fails to attend appointments.

In one project, the Garda Juvenile Liaison Officer actively supervises young people engaged with the Garda Youth Diverssion Project.

For instance two projects have a high degree of direct Garda participation in their operations.

### Nine | Next steps

1. In this context ‘logic’ means a coherent articulation describing the specific youth crime challenge in a particular location matched with a clear outline of the intended contribution project activities will make to youth crime reduction.
## Appendix 1: Garda Youth Diversion Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Management Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABLE Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Ballyfermot, Dublin 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACORN Project</td>
<td>Midlands Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Edenderry, Co. Offaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF Project</td>
<td>Midlands Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Athlone, Co. Westmeath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An T-Oiléain Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Castleisland, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Tallaght, Dublin 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALL Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Lisduggan, Co. Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BÁN Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Ballybane, Co. Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandon Youth Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Bandon, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Ballincollig, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPADE Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Killarney, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Project</td>
<td>Best CP</td>
<td>Ballymun, Dublin 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Port Laoise, Co. Laois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyne Project</td>
<td>Youth Work Ireland Louth *</td>
<td>Drogheda, Co. Louth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookefield Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Tallaght, Dublin 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Drogheda, Co. Louth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabra for Youth Project</td>
<td>Cabra for Youth Ltd.</td>
<td>Cabra, Dublin 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan 365 Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Cavan, Co. Cavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCYDG Project</td>
<td>Moyross Development Company Ltd.</td>
<td>Moyross, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Project</td>
<td>Clay Ltd.</td>
<td>Crumlin, Dublin 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODY Project</td>
<td>Cherry Orchard Equine &amp; Education Centre Ltd.</td>
<td>Ballyfermot, Dublin 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Project</td>
<td>Ossory Youth *</td>
<td>Kilkenny, Co. Kilkenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect 7 Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tralee, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYAP Project</td>
<td>North Connaught Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Castlebar, Co. Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYD Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Clonmel, Co. Tipperary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Donore Avenue, Dublin 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Dungarvan, Co. Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIME Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Hardwicke Street, Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGE Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Finglas, Dublin 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis Youth Project</td>
<td>Clare Youth Service *</td>
<td>Ennis, Co. Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE Project</td>
<td>Midlands Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Mullingar, Co. Westmeath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcarragh Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Falcarragh, Co. Donegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAN Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Finglas, Dublin 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAYRE Project</td>
<td>Ogra Chorcafé</td>
<td>Faranree, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feabhas Project</td>
<td>Cloyne Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Cobh, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Management Company</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>The Glen, Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAFT Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Clondalkin, Dublin 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAY Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Dunne Street, Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Voltage Project</td>
<td>Cox’s Demense Youth &amp;</td>
<td>Dundalk, Co. Louth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Project</td>
<td>Carlow Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Carlow, Co. Carlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAY Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Tallaght, Dublin 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jets Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Swords, Co. Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Project</td>
<td>Youth Work Ireland Galway *</td>
<td>Ballinasloe, Co. Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Us Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tralee, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Tallaght, Dublin 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilrush Project</td>
<td>Clare Youth Service *</td>
<td>Kilrush, Co. Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Island Project</td>
<td>Limerick Youth Service *</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Park, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knocknaheeney/Holyhill Project</td>
<td>Knocknaheeney/Holyhill Special Justice Project Ltd.</td>
<td>Knocknaheeney, Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAB Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAF Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Raphoe, Co. Donegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Longford, Co. Longford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCYI Project</td>
<td>LSCYI Ltd.</td>
<td>Roxboro, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallow Project</td>
<td>Cloyne Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Mallow, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Blackrock, Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Knocknacarra, Co. Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNYP Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Monaghan, Co. Monaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST Project</td>
<td>CDYSB</td>
<td>North Circular Road, Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tralee, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Directions Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Bray, Co. Wicklow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICKOL Project</td>
<td>Belvedere Youth Club</td>
<td>Buckingham Street, Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK 10 Project</td>
<td>Kerry Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Listowel, Co. Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Youth Development Project</td>
<td>Limerick Youth Service *</td>
<td>Ballynanty, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPD Project</td>
<td>Meath Youth Federation *</td>
<td>Navan, Co. Meath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orb Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Hartstown, Dublin 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Waterford (Inner City), Co. Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puddle Close Project</td>
<td>BRU Ltd.</td>
<td>Crumlin, Dublin 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Project</td>
<td>Cul le Cheile</td>
<td>Portarlington, Co. Laois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD Project</td>
<td>County Roscommon Youth Service</td>
<td>Roscommon, Co. Roscommon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY Project</td>
<td>Roscrea 2000 Ltd.</td>
<td>Roscrea, Co. Tipperary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Management Company</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Project</td>
<td>FAB CDP</td>
<td>Coolcotts, Co. Wexford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Sandyford, Dublin 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaney Project</td>
<td>Ferns Diocesan Youth Service *</td>
<td>Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Project</td>
<td>TIDE</td>
<td>Trim, Co. Meath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Birr, Co. Offaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Project</td>
<td>Swan Youth Service</td>
<td>Store Street, Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAY Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Waterford, Co. Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIFT Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Clondalkin, Dublin 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT Project</td>
<td>Ogra Chorcaí</td>
<td>Togher, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAR Project</td>
<td>Tipperary Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tipperary, Co. Tipperary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM Project</td>
<td>Muirhevnamor Community Youth Pro-</td>
<td>Dundalk, Co. Louth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bridge Project</td>
<td>Kildare Youth Service *</td>
<td>Celbridge, Co. Kildare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castle Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Ballyogan, Dublin 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Curragh Project</td>
<td>Kildare Youth Service *</td>
<td>Newbridge, Co. Kildare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley Project</td>
<td>Catholic Youth Care</td>
<td>Clondalkin, Dublin 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treo Nua Project</td>
<td>Youth Work Ireland Roscommon / NE</td>
<td>Tuam, Co. Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tréoin Project</td>
<td>Youth New Ross Ltd.</td>
<td>New Ross, Co. Wexford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullamore Project</td>
<td>Midlands Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tullamore, Co. Offaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYRE Project</td>
<td>Waterford Regional Youth Service *</td>
<td>Tramore, Co. Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watergate / Garryowen Project</td>
<td>Limerick Youth Service *</td>
<td>Garryowen, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAY Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Wicklow, Co. Wicklow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Blanchardstown, Dublin 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Douglas Project</td>
<td>Ogra Chorcaí</td>
<td>Douglas West, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Limerick Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Newcastle West, Co. Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodale Project</td>
<td>Sphere 17 Youth Service</td>
<td>Darndale, Dublin 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAB Project</td>
<td>North Connaught Youth &amp; Community Service *</td>
<td>Ballina, Co. Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAK Project</td>
<td>Kilmore West Youth Project Ltd.</td>
<td>Coolock, Dublin 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAPS Project</td>
<td>North Connaught Youth &amp; Community</td>
<td>Sliog, Co. Sligo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEW Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Ballyboden, Dublin 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIS Project</td>
<td>SICCDA</td>
<td>Meath Street, Dublin 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youghal Project</td>
<td>Foróige</td>
<td>Youghal, Co. Cork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Garda Diversion Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garda Region/Division</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlow/Kildare</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laois/Offaly</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford/Westmeath</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louth/Meath</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Region Total</strong></td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>2943</td>
<td>3443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dublin Met. Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dublin Met. Region Total</strong></td>
<td>6228</td>
<td>6981</td>
<td>7105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan/Monaghan</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sligo/Leitrim</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Region Total</strong></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Eastern Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipperary</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford/Kilkenny</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wexford/Wicklow</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Eastern Region Total</strong></td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda Region/Division</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork City</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork North</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork West</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Region Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3749</strong></td>
<td><strong>4253</strong></td>
<td><strong>4360</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galway West</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscommon/Galway East</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Region Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>1817</strong></td>
<td><strong>2236</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,567</td>
<td>20,016</td>
<td>21,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diversion Programme - Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Cautions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no supervision by JLO)</td>
<td>10,135</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>12,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal cautions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(under JLO supervision)</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>4,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further action / dismissed</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total diverted (%)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deemed unsuitable for diversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(returned to local Superintendent for possible prosecution)</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not finalised – carried forward</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total referred</td>
<td>17,567</td>
<td>20,016</td>
<td>21,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>