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Executive summary

The Y Care International with support from the DFID Development Awareness Fund Mini Grants programme delivered the Gangs, Guns and Knives project from 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2012. The Youth, Community and Education (YCE) Division of De Montfort University (DMU) was contracted by Y Care International (YCI) to conduct an independent evaluation of this project.

The summer 2011 riots in England raised a number of pertinent questions about young people’s involvement in crime. In addition, the continuous spate of stabbings, before and since the murder of Stephen Lawrence, especially in London, has raised a concern about the involvement of young people in gangs, guns and knives crime. A key question, often arousing moral panic, is how one engages with these young people on the margins of society, both in the streets and in Secure Estates. This Gangs, Guns and Knives project, sought to exactly do this by utilising a Global Youth Work approach - an informal way of working with young people to explore local-global issues and how it impacts on them personally.

Over a period of two years, the project engaged 180 young people aged 11-24 although the overwhelming majority were between 14 - 21 in twelve different sites; seven of them in youth work settings and five of them in Secure Estates. The participants, 25% females and 13% BME, with an average age of 16.72 were usually engaged in two hour sessions over a number of weeks. Sixty-seven young people were engaged in the first year and 113 in the second year.

Using a range of evaluation tools including project worker evaluations, young people’s individual evaluation (response rate of 66%), observation visit and semi structured interviews; the evaluator was able to capture relevant data to gauge the effectiveness of the project intervention. This project was ground-breaking in its ability to engage young people at the margins to deconstruct their realities and make local-global connections to their lives. Some of the key findings from the evaluation include:

- Seventy-two percent of respondents claimed an increased awareness of gangs and violence outside of the UK, towards the end of the project, which represents a 36% change during the project.
- Fifty-two percent increase in young people feeling that they were better able to illustrate local-global links towards the end of the project.
- There has been a change from, the baseline information, with 29% of young people feeling that they are able to stop gang, gun and knife violence (up 20%)
- Overall, 97 young people responded to the question about the impact of the project on them. Seventy-seven percent reported that the project has made them less likely to join a gang, 51.5% reported that the project has made them less likely to carry a knife, 48% reported being less likely to carry a gun and 51.5% reported being less likely to commit a crime. Only about 4% of respondents reported that the project did not make any impact on them.
Overall, young people reported that the project has a significant impact on their disposition to engage in violent crime. Further data will be needed to assess the long term impact of the intervention and its actual impact on their behaviour. This project added value and deserves closer inspection by organisations working with young people at risk of offending.
Introduction

The Youth, Community and Education department of De Montfort University has been contracted by Y Care International (YCI) to evaluate its Gangs, Guns and Knives project. The project was supported by funding from the Department for International Development (DFID) Development Awareness Fund Mini Grants project which took place from 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2012.

This report is an independent evaluation of the project conducted by Dr Momodou Sallah, Senior Lecturer at the Youth, Community and Education Division of De Montfort University. The report sets out the project objectives and; using a range of evaluation methods, explores whether the objectives have been met. It presents the findings of the evaluation and the added value of the project for engaging marginalised young people in global learning as well as project limitations and recommendations for the future.

Global Youth Work

Global Youth Work (GYW) is “informal education with young people. It encourages a critical understanding of the links between personal, local and global issues. It seeks their active participation in bringing about change towards greater equity and justice.” (Development Education Association, 2007:23)

Global Youth Work brings a global dimension to work with young people. As a youth work approach, it supports young people to make connections between their lives and their communities with peers and issues affecting those in the Global South. Promoting the values of fairness and justice, Global Youth Work aims to provide young people with opportunities which create positive change in society.

Global Youth Work has many associated terminologies, including but not exclusive to:

- Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDG) (particularly in Wales)
- Global Citizenship
- International Humanitarian education
- Global Learning
- International Youth Work
- Development Education in Youth Work and Global Justice in Youth work (Ireland) (Sallah 2009; Cotton 2009; Dare to Stretch 2009).

DEA (2010) conceive of GYW as a methodology that seeks to connect with young people on issues that are important to them, challenge their thinking and how they interact with the wider world, and change their attitude and actions. Woolley (2009) presents GYW as a methodology where young people explore global issues through global experiences to develop global perspectives. Reflecting on the above perspectives, GYW can be construed as an informal approach to working with young people to explore local-global issues in order to provoke critical consciousness and support young people to take action. In doing so, it starts from “young people’s
everyday experiences and engages them in a critical analysis of local and global influences on their lives and their communities.” (DEA 2007:23)

As with all youth work, it is based on a premise of voluntary participation (Davis 2005), where young people largely engage with this methodology because they have chosen to. Making the personal, local, national and global connections also allows young people to deconstruct their reality (Sallah 2008) and leads to consciousness and action. Since “deconstructing reality” is an important component of discussions that will take place later, it is necessary to set out what is meant by it now. People, as a result of many years’ experiences, come to see the world in a particular way in terms of what is good or bad, right or wrong or just and unjust. This tapestry becomes their reality, a way of looking at the world through a certain sense of imbued experiences; this can be called one’s constructed reality. This then becomes the basis on which individuals interact with the world. A key part of Global Youth Work, and by implication the whole youth work approach, is to get young people to deconstruct that given reality in order to see the world in a different way, and hopefully a change in the way they interact with the world.

YCI, as one of the major proponents of GYW, chose this approach to engage with young people on the margins of society because of its informal nature as well as its ability to maintain sustained action, long after the initiators are gone. It has also been chosen as a genuine tool that can bring far away realities to young people and act as a mirror for young people to reflect on their lives.

**Young people and guns, gangs and knives**

The recent focus (Goldson 2011; Cameron 2011; Densley 2012) on young people, gangs, guns and knife crime, especially after the August 2011 riots across England, has raised pertinent questions about how to engage with young people affected by these issues. A recent government report stated that:

“Gangs and youth violence have been a blight on our communities for years. The disorder in August was not caused solely by gangs but the violence we saw on our streets revealed all too vividly the problems that sometimes lie below the surface and out of sight.” (HM Government, 2011)

Youth surveys have found that for those aged 10-19, between 2% - 7% are reported to belong to gangs (HM Government 2011). Before going any further, it is important that we advance a definition of what we mean by “gangs”, especially in relation to young people. There have been many attempts to clarify this definition (Klein, M.K 2001; Aldridge and Medina 2008). The Centre for Social Justice (2009) report *Dying to Belong*, provides one of the most comprehensive analysis in this light and since there is very little scope in this report to replicate what has already been done, we will be adopting the following definition of gangs:

“A relatively durable, predominantly street-based group of young people who (1) see themselves (and are seen by others) as a discernible group, (2) engage in a range of criminal activity and violence, (3) identify with or lay claim over territory,
(4) have some form of identifying structural feature, and (5) are in conflict with other, similar, gangs.” (Centre for Social Justice 2009:48)

It is pivotal to note that young people are disproportionately affected by violent crime in comparison to the general population; for example those between 16-24 are four times more likely to be victims of violent crime and over 500,000 violent incidents were reported in 2010/2011 in England and Wales for those in the age range of 10-15 (HM Government 2011).

It is also important not to jump on a media bandwagon or be swept in the overwhelmingly negative media portrayal that demonises young people as the above statistics highlights the disproportionate impact of crime on young people, but it is also necessary to engage with the fact of young people’s involvement with gangs, guns and knife crime. It is crucial, for example, to note that in the August 2011 riots, out of the 10 places where the riots were most prevalent, 13% of those arrested were reportedly affiliated to a gang. This figure was 19% in West Yorkshire, 17% for Nottinghamshire and 19% for London (HM Government 2011).

NCVCCO/NCVYS (2007:8) also highlighted that:

“A Youth Justice Board survey carried out in 2004 found that while a quarter of children in school had carried a penknife and nine % a flick knife in the 12 months before the survey only three % had ever used them offensively whilst a Guardian survey found that half of all head teachers had caught a pupil carrying a knife in the previous 12 months”.

‘Communities that Care’ commissioned The Safer London Youth Survey in 2005 which surveyed 11,400 young people aged 11-15 living in Inner London. Ten percent of the young people claimed that they had carried a knife over the last 12 months and 1 in 17 claimed to have carried a gun whilst 6% claimed to have actually fired one.

It was reported in the Guardian that “youth violence increased by 4% year on year across the capital, with a 9.6% hike in knife crime” following massive cuts in activities for young people (Guardian 29 July 2011). The article further highlighted that:

“Youth services, particularly those that prevent gang violence, have been savaged by local authorities because of government-imposed cuts. More than £100m was removed from local authority services for young people up to March this year, according to the Confederation of Heads of Young People’s Services, which surveyed 41 of their members. Budget cuts imposed at the start of the financial year averaged 28%, but some local authorities were cutting 70%, 80% or even 100% of youth services, it said. Almost 3,000 full-time staff who work with youths have been lost” (Guardian 29 July 2011).

It is reasonable to conclude that there is an urgent need to engage with some young people around issues of gangs, guns and knives, which has been exacerbated by the massive cuts to the youth services across England who have a tradition of engaging with these young people on the margins. Therefore this project is timely and adds great value in working with the affected population under discussion.
There are a number of organisations, apart from the youth services, that focus on working with young people around the aforementioned issues for example NACRO works around prevention, offender management and resettling with the population under discussion. The National Association for Youth Justice works around the issues of campaigning, lobbying, publishing practice and policy papers and providing training events and conferences. Leap Confronting Conflict specialises in youth and conflict: working mainly with 11 – 25 year olds, they focus on training and supporting young people to manage conflict and avoid violence. All of these organisations, and many more, contribute immensely to engaging young people around issues of gangs, guns and knife crime. Where the work of YCI is complimentary and crucial is the distinctive use of Global Youth Work methodology to engage with young people on the margins.

**Project Overview**

**Project objectives**

- To support 120 young people, including young people in prison and Young Offender Institutes, to explore the global dimension to gang, gun and knife crime and increase their awareness of development issues.
- To support 120 young people to explore what the similarities, differences and links are between their lives and similar young people’s lives in other communities and to explore and identify for themselves, what the root causes of gang, gun and knife crime are.
- To help 120 young people to come up with creative young people-led solutions to tackle the problem of gang, gun and knife crime.
- To build an authoritative body of evidence to demonstrate the added value which global youth work brings to youth work programmes intervening in the domestic and global issue of gang, gun and knife crime perpetrated by and against young people.

The Guns, Gangs and Knives project started on the 1st April 2010 and has a final end date of 31st March 2013. From April 2010 to April 2012, project interventions were delivered in twelve sites; four in the first year and eight in the second year. May 2012 to March 2013 has been set aside for the dissemination of the project findings and exploration of ways to embed the project.

In Year 1 of the project, YCI worked with 67 young people across four sites, one of which was in the Secure Estate. In the second year, YCI worked with six organisations to engage 113 young people over eight delivery sites. Four of these sites were within the Secure Estate and the other four were youth work settings.

Delivery with young people was led by youth workers from partner organisations, predominantly YMCAs. They were responsible for designing, delivery and evaluation of their project. They were supported with training and on-going support provided by YCI. Each project had a formal agreement with YCI which laid out this responsibility and had to send regular reports to YCI on progress against objectives. YCI then compiled these reports to the funder and to share emerging best practice between projects.
Across the twelve different project sites, youth workers tailored the delivery dependent on the setting they were working in (either within the Secure Estate or a youth work setting); the age range and gender of the young people; their relationship and previous interventions with that group of young people and logistical issues they faced in terms of access to space. The majority of projects were delivered over two hour workshop sessions over a series of weeks.

**Young people engaged**

Overall, the project worked with 180 young people in both youth work and Secure settings. It is noticeable that only 32% of project participants were female and this is reportedly due to the fact that the majority of people involved in guns, gangs and knives are male as well as the majority of organisations engaged by the project in the Secure Estate were working in male only wings. Whilst the project worked with both those in Secure Estates and in youth club settings, it can be noted that available evidence (House of Commons Home Affairs (2007) suggests that in relation to the national trend, 17% of offenders can be classified as BME.

There is significant evidence to suggest that the overwhelming majority of young people successfully engaged in the project could be described as “hard to reach”, marginalised or on the margins of society. The reports from youth workers of their project described the young people they worked with is reproduced in box below. Within some youth work settings, the projects reported working with other young people engaged in youth councils but stated that these were from very deprived communities and have been exposed to gang, gun and knife crime.

*“Convictions of violent crimes” “anti-social” and “bad perception from public”, “low income deprived areas of [PLACE] where anti-social behaviour orders and school exclusions are common place”, “affected or involved with gang or knife crime or felt they would benefit from the programme”.*

It is important to recognise that the act of engagement itself with this group was a big achievement. There were occasions when project workers were engaged in protracted negotiations to gain access into Secure Estates as well as managing to maintain work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Demographics of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of females*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of BME participants*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of BME participants*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in a secure estate setting*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in a youth work setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* of those where evaluation data available
with such a transient community. This led project staff in the various sites to use innovative methods to engage with the groups of young people in the various sites such as music, drama, video and other related activities.

**Evaluation Methodology**

A range of evaluation methodologies were used to capture the effectiveness or otherwise of the project in relation to the project objectives. The evaluator and the YCI project managers were keen to make sure that evaluation was an inbuilt mechanism from the start of the project and not something added as an afterthought, at the end. From the initial conception of the project, right through to funding application and project implementation, the evaluator has worked with the YCI project management team to design, refine and amend the evaluation methodology. The evaluation methodologies went through a piloting stage and feedback from respondents was used to improve methods employed.

To this end the following approaches were developed:

**Worker Evaluation Reports**

All the project managers submitted project reports at the end of their individual projects. This was to a set template distributed by YCI. Project managers reported on the project overview, profile of participants, financial expenditure, workshop activities and outcomes, and workers’ reflections on GYW activities and outcomes (Appendix 2). In two instances, project managers provided more detailed project reports. In total, 12 project reports were received and additional appendices and resources that were used or developed were also made available to YCI and the evaluator.

**Young people’s individual evaluation**

Young people who participated in projects were given the opportunity to fill out the individual evaluation forms (Appendix 1). This form gave young people the opportunity to record their age, gender, ethnicity as well as their overall reflections on the sessions. Young people also had the opportunity to capture their knowledge of the issues to be addressed by the project (Gangs and violence outside the UK, making the links, and links to poverty and action) at the start of the project and to complete it again at the end of the project. The evaluator and the project management team felt that it was important to do this in order to provide a baseline before project intervention against which changes in knowledge and attitudes could be measured in the follow-up evaluation.

Out of the 180 young people involved in the project, 55 of the 67 completed the evaluation in year one and 87 out of 113 in year two; denoting a response rate of 79%. Youth workers reported a number of reasons as to why some young people did not complete the individual evaluation (this is covered in the section: evaluation issues). It is important to put this response rate into context, especially given that the population under discussion have significant literacy issues and often found structured paper based evaluation difficult. It is also significant to note that the second year of project delivery gained a response rate of 77.5% for the capture of baseline and evaluation; in comparison to the first year of the project which stood at 58%. This significant increase
in the response rate is largely due to the hard work YCI project management team and the partner organisations; especially after the meeting convened at the end of the first year to reflect on project learning and ways to increase the response rate.

**Semi structured interviews with projects**
The evaluator conducted two semi-structured interviews: one telephone interview with the project manager from Coventry Cathedral and another face-to-face interview with the project and training managers from Sunderland YMCA. The rationale for these interviews was to help the evaluator assess any differences that might reflect the fact that one project participated in the programme over both years 1 and 2 whereas the other only participated from year 2 onwards. The need to reflect the experiences of those working with YOIs and within youth work settings was also taken into consideration. These interviews focused on the extent to which project managers/workers felt the project objectives were met, the limitations of the project and examples of good practice.

**Observation visit**
Having read the stories emerging from the project reports and evaluations from the young people, the evaluator observed a session in progress to better understand the project intervention. The evaluator was afforded the opportunity to observe a session in Deerbolt Young Offender’s Institute in Sunderland. He observed a session on 27 March 2012 where two members from Sunderland YMCA delivered an hour and a half long session to young men. This visit was an observation of two youth workers delivering a session with young men in a Secure Estate, without the presence of the institution’s staff. It involved an introductory session, as a continuation of a previous session, and then watching a Ross Kemp DVD, before engaging in group work and then plenary discussion. The evaluator was very impressed with the ability of the project staff to engage with the young people and the animated nature of the discussions young people had during the plenary. There was evidence of critical thinking and the critical exploration of how the global impacts on the local and personal worldviews of young people.
Findings and analyses

In this section, we will present the analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data gathered during the evaluation. The first half of this section will largely focus on the individual questionnaires administered to young people and which 113 young people completed. This will be complimented by the qualitative data generated from project manager/worker reports and the semi-structured interviews conducted with two project managers as well as the observation visit conducted by this evaluator. The manual analysis of the qualitative data generated six themes which will also be covered in the later part of this section. It is worth noting that whilst there are many strengths to the quantitative data presented here, the qualitative data remains most illuminating, especially the direct words from the project beneficiaries. Where possible in the quantitative data, differences between different variables are highlighted, however where the statistical significance is difficult to establish due to the size of the sample, then this is not presented as it would need a bigger study to be able to extrapolate and make stronger claims.

The project increased understanding of gang and violence outside of the UK

Young people were asked at the start and at the end of the project about their perception, on a four point scale, of how much they think they knew about gangs and violence outside of the UK. Table 2 shows the changes in knowledge comparing before and after the project intervention. Table 2 shows that at the beginning of the project, young people reported not knowing a lot about gangs and violence outside the UK but 72% of respondents did claim to be aware “a lot” towards the end of the project (1 being “not at all” and 4 being “a lot”). This represents a 36% change from the baseline evaluation. This is a significant increase which can be attributed to the project, whilst bearing in mind a 66% response rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Baseline Score</th>
<th>Average Endline Score</th>
<th>Changes in Points</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Total scoring 3 or 4 at end</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>+0.74</td>
<td>+36%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This quantitative data is supplemented by qualitative information given by young people. When asked about the best thing about the project sessions, many young people mentioned learning about gangs; two young people illustrate this point below:
“Learning about reasons why people join gangs and getting to know more about different cultures”

Female, 17, Bolton YMCA

“Learning about gangs around the world”

Male, 15, Rainsbrook

The project increased an understanding of links between the lives of participants and young people in the Global South

A key element of YCI’s approach to Global Youth Work has been to strengthen young people’s understanding of the similarities, differences and interdependence between young people throughout the world. The evaluation questionnaire asked young people at the start and at the end of the project, their perception, on a four point scale, of the links between their lives and those of young people in the global South. Table 3 shows a 52% increase in young people reporting feeling a stronger local-global link by the end of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Baseline Score</th>
<th>Average Endline Score</th>
<th>Changes in Points</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Total scoring 3 or 4 at end n %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>+0.77</td>
<td>+52%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also worth noting that by the end of the project, 44% of young people who completed the question scored either 3 or 4 (1 being “not at all” and 4 being “a lot”), denoting a significant increase in being able to make personal, local, national and global links between things “out there” and what happens “here in my life”.

Two individual young people from different Secure Estates started linking their personal experiences to the global below:

“How hard it is for people in other countries”

Male 15, Hindley
The project increased young people’s perceived level of knowledge of global poverty and development issues
As the table below illustrates, there is a 20% shift in perceived knowledge of poverty and development issues which represents a considerable change in young people’s perception, especially with 61% of those who completed the questionnaire scoring 3 or 4.

Table 4: Q3 - How much do you think you know about development issues like poverty, hunger, trade, employment? (n=118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Baseline Score</th>
<th>Average Endline Score</th>
<th>Changes in Points</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Total scoring 3 or 4 at end</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
<td>+30%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young people’s understanding of development and poverty issues has been illustrated in the multiple sites of delivery and a young female captures similar sentiments expressed across different sites:

“Poverty in other countries and how they live-it’s disgraceful”

Female 15, Hindley

The project increased young people’s sense of efficacy to stop gang, gun and knife violence in the UK
Global Youth Work is not just about increasing knowledge and understanding of global issues and the interdependent nature of our globalising world. As noted earlier, a Global Youth Work approach seeks not just to connect young people with issues and challenge their thinking but to seek their participation in positive social change. Therefore, we wanted to assess whether the project changed young people’s sense of efficacy to take action, especially around gang, gun and knife crime.
### Table 5: Q4 - Do you feel you can stop gang, gun and knife violence in the UK? (n=116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Baseline Score</th>
<th>Average Endline Score</th>
<th>Changes in Points</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Total scoring 3 or 4 at end n %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, in this section there has been a change in the baseline information, with an average of 20% increase in young people feeling that they are able to stop gang, gun and knife violence. By the end of the project, on average, nearly a third of young people strongly felt they could take action.

A key variable in the shift of perception is the project intervention where young people, in the different sites of delivery, demonstrated a more critical understanding of local-global interconnections and felt empowered to take action. A young man who participated in the project said that:

“I have learned that people do have a choice, but sometimes they choose the wrong way because of threatening behaviour.”

---

Male 21, Watford

The following individual young people below reflect on the need to start taking action:

“That may be doing something can make a difference.”

---

Male, 15, Nottingham

“That we can stop gangs by not joining them and being against them.”

---

Male, 10, Nottingham

### Future involvement in gangs

The project looked at young people’s own perception of future involvement in gangs. On average this found a very small decrease in young people’s perceptions of their likelihood of future involvement in a gang. At first glance the relative lack of change in these figures might be considered disappointing. However given that the young people evidenced an improved awareness of contextual factors influencing the formation of gangs and use of weapons, it could plausibly be said that the sessions have at least strengthened the existing level of resistance to gangs by young people. It is also possible that the overall greater awareness of context, evidenced by replies to questions 1-4, might lead young people to reflect on the fact that they themselves cannot change everything about local and global contexts, and thus to exhibit a greater maturity, if a little pessimism, in their own chances of avoiding gang culture.
Table 6: How likely is it that you will be involved in a “gang” in the future? (n=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Baseline Score</th>
<th>Average Endline Score</th>
<th>Changes in Points</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Total scoring 3 or 4 at end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agree or disagree: Reasons for getting into gangs in the UK are the same in other countries**

In the questionnaire administered to young people, they were asked to agree or disagree whether the reasons for getting into gangs in the UK are the same in other countries.

Table 7 – Agree or disagree: Reasons for getting into gangs in the UK are the same in other countries (n=102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that 42 young people, over the two years disagreed that the reason for joining gangs in the UK were the same as those outside, rising to 51 after the project intervention. This can be interpreted as the benefit of the project critically exercising the young people to review their previous stance and understanding.

The biggest shift recorded is for those who were not sure from initially having 39 young people unsure to 18 young people, which illustrates that the project intervention did provide young people with new information to help them develop critical understanding of reasons people join gangs.

There is also a noticeable shift upwards for those who agreed that the reasons people join gangs were the same; this again points to the ability of the project intervention to critically engage young people on the margins to develop critical knowledge and reasoning skills.

**The project changed young people’s understanding of why young people join gangs**

The evaluation tracked young people’s understanding of why young people joined gangs. Young people were given a range of 14 reasons as to why young people would join a gang and then were asked to choose three which they felt caused young people
to become gang members. Over both years 81 responses were received for this question.

From the table below, it can be deduced that the respondents perceive the need for “protection” and to “get respect” as the key variables in influencing someone to join gangs.

The project appears to have caused some significant changes in young people’s understanding of why people join gangs. By the end of the project young people were far more likely to believe that the need for respect and survival were key reasons for joining gangs. Similarly, they were far less likely to believe that drugs, the need to make money or alcohol were facilitating factors to joining gangs. It is interesting to note that this suggests a deeper level of critical understanding by project participants towards psychosocial enabling factors to gangs rather than material or illicit activities.

Table 8 – Young people’s perceptions of why young people join gangs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get respect</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act older</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make money</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis reveal that the different demographics also reveal particular leanings; for example 7 out of 11 from a cohort from a Secure Estate highlighted revenge as one of the motivations for joining a gang; again from another Secure Estate setting, 5 respondents identified protection and 5 similarly identified “respect” as a motivation, out of a group of 8. Survival was significantly high especially for two groups within youth work setting; 8 out of 11 in one setting and 9 out of 15 in another setting.
Most young people state that the project has reduced the likelihood of involvement in gang, gun and knife crime.

The overwhelming majority of respondents also stated that the project has made them to be less likely to carry a gun, join a gang or commit a crime. Overall, 97 young people responded to the question about the impact of the project on them. All but four young people stated that the project had an impact on them. They were able to choose up to four variables.

Seventy-seven percent of young people (75) reported that the project has made them less likely to join a gang; 51.5% (50) reported that the project has made them less likely to carry a knife, 48% (47) reported less likelihood of carrying a gun and 51.5% (50) reported less likelihood to commit a crime.
Overall themes

Making the global links

The data gathered from the workers’ project evaluations, the individual questionnaire from young people and the semi-structured interviews with the two projects indicate that young people were able to demonstrate a new understanding of the links between the personal/local to the global. In a project report, a project manager illustrates this point as follows:

“The debate swung from the global to the local and the realities of their environment. They discussed the level of gang crime in the Meadows and how that related to the rest of Nottingham, the country and the world”

Nottingham Project Year 2 Report

Young people identified countries with wars, civil wars and gang violence and demonstrated how this can be compared or contrasted with their lives. A significant number of young people for example identified how *Mano Dura* used in El Salvador\(^1\) allowed young people to draw links:

“One of the young men had brought in a newspaper article about weapons found in a 15 year old’s room. The article was read out and discussed. It demonstrated how children got dragged into gang activity without knowing any better. The Mano-Dura law was introduced; the majority of the group had tattoos and were angry that that was cause to put people in jail.”

Bolton YMCA project report April 2011

The following quotation illustrates how young people’s engagement with the project resulted in transformative learning as a result of using global examples to deconstruct their own lives:

“....Going through the project you could really see moments of clarity happening when people were realising that some of the reasons may be the same but to a different extent, for example people joined for protection, UK from bullies, El Salvador from being killed”

Sunderland YMCA project report March 2011

On the other hand, at least three project managers expressed concern that some of the young people found it difficult to make links between the personal/local and the global. This could be due to a number of reasons, including the fact that some of the young people at the margins especially the target audience of the project might be less likely to have travelled, less likely to be educated to a higher level and therefore with less

---

\(^1\) This refers to the *Mano Dura* (“Strong Hand”) policies adopted in El Salvador to tackle gang violence. See Hume (2007) for details on the policies.
chances of having been exposed outside the UK or even their estate. A project worker captures this view below:

“Young people could not understand the global dimension ... some of the young people have never left the city they grew up ...One of the young people came from Leicester and other young people (from Coventry) asked her where Leicester was – young people did not have a concept of the Global South ...”

Project worker - Interview

However, it can be stated that for even those not well travelled or not exposed to global issues, the methodology (GYW) utilised to engage them was largely successful in exposing them to new worldviews and consequently an exploration of their lives and global issues.

**Evaluation issues**

Given that this has been a ground-breaking project especially in its ability to engage those at the margins, the project management team rightly put emphasis on gathering evaluation data. Some teething problems were identified by the project managers, for example, one project was cancelled at the last moment when a fight erupted between young people just prior to their first session affecting the youth workers’ willingness to deliver the project with them.

Some young people were reluctant to fill in the evaluation forms either due to not having the literacy skills or not considering it important enough. The long interval in delivering sessions, typically four sessions over four weeks, given the transient nature of some of the project audience in the secure estates effected the young people’s availability to complete the project and take part in project evaluations. It was also mentioned, specifically in the first year, that there was a delay in projects receiving the evaluation materials and this was said to have affected the implementation of the first phase of the project.

**Understanding terminology**

The language of development education was not easily accessible to all the young people who took part in the project, especially given that the majority of the young people involved in the projects live on the margins of society. The significant number of workers in their project evaluations, as well as the project managers/workers I interviewed, raised this issue a number of times. The following phrases were reportedly found difficult by some of the young people involved in the various sites of the project: “What is Global South?”, “development issues”, “global poverty”. This terminology was not easily understood by some of the young people and this did affect their responses to both the baseline and final individual evaluations. However this was not significant enough to affect the findings. This also affected some of the young people’s ability to engage to some extent but this was largely overcome by the workers explaining these terms. However this was much improved in the second year when YCI made some resources, including suggested activities for practitioners, available to the practitioners.
and the evaluation forms were amended following initial feedback. It is pivotal to note that the project team had little choice but to use these terms, as the project funder, expected evaluation against these terms and indicators.

**Benefits of the project**
All the 12 sites where the projects were delivered reported some benefits to the young people and overall, the Global Youth Work approach to exploring guns, gangs and knife crime was found to be very effective. This approach has been effective because of its ability to informally engage young people on the margins, starting from where they are at and also in supporting them deconstruct their realities following a critical analysis of the local-global, in relation to the personal. It was most especially effective in supporting young people step outside themselves to look at other people’s lives in relation to theirs. Many benefits of the project were identified including the markedly increased opportunities for young people to deconstruct their stereotypes of particular groups and races as well as promoting a deeper understanding of global issues. It was also reported as of great significance that the project started where young people were at by focussing on issues and experiences which were ‘real’ to them. Youth workers reported that it has allowed young people to develop a better understanding of prison life and to develop key skills, such as using the internet for research and critical literacy.

The project also gave young people the opportunity to explore what they perceive as being the benefits of joining a gang as well as the potential downsides, the extent of poverty in other countries, lack of rights and poor quality of life in comparison to their own lives. The Ross Kemp DVD exploring gangs in different parts of the world was considered a highlight that young people really engaged with. This was reportedly due to its ability to be “real” and in contextualising the issues young people face locally in a global context. A range of engagement methods including group work, discussion groups, drama and other informal approaches to learning, made the project largely successful in reaching some of the most “hard-to-reach” young people on the margins of society.

**Issues in YOI/Secure Estates**
Five out of the 12 projects were delivered within the Secure Estates (i.e. Youth Offending Institutes, Secure Training Centre and a prison). This was largely successful, especially in engaging young people who display challenging behaviour. It helped young people to reflect on their own reality through exploration of the lives of young people in similar settings in other parts of the world. Indeed, this global dimension specifically helped this reflection and deconstruction process.

The project was strongly supported by staff within these institutions in most instances; however there were a few issues that require reflection. It was reported that due to some members of Secure Estate staff being present during some sessions, this stopped some young people from being very open. A young person said that “Due to the place I am in, I cannot say....”. This highlights the need for caution on the part of the young people so as not to reveal incriminating evidence. Global Youth Work thrives on
young people and youth workers engaging each other to explore their world and hopefully leading to young people gaining a new understanding of their place in it. However, where external forces prevent this from happening, then the Global Youth Work process can become stunted.

Linked to this issue is the fact that young people in some of these institutions are not allowed to draw knives and guns, which arguably restricts their ability, especially those with literacy problems, to articulate their thoughts. This became a barrier for youth workers to engage them in reflecting on both global issues and their own behaviour.

Where Secure Estate rules restrict how youth workers and young people interact, it affects the process of youth work and invariably global learning. A project worker illustrates this point:

“There is an embargo on asking young people about what they have done, how long they have been there and why they are there – this project is about “me” and he reflects on what he has done and reflects on how he wants to move away from the estate when he comes out (Young man)”

Project worker – Interview

In at least two projects, some prison members of staff have reportedly expressed the view that they do not like the name of the project as it has a negative slant and therefore needs a more positive label.

There have also been reported instances where youth workers have not been able to access Secure Estates and have had to divert as a result of not being able to get in. This had some serious implications for project planning and on the success of the project to engage young people in the Secure Estate.

**Lessons from the project**

Whilst the project was largely seen as successful in meeting its objectives, a number of issues were identified that need addressing for future projects of a similar nature.

**Behaviour of young people**

At least three project managers reported the difficulty of working with some young people, especially in Secure Estates, without having prior knowledge or contact with these young people. Global Youth Work, as an offshoot of youth work, depends largely on pre-existing association and relationships. Where this is limited; it has the potential to limit the quality of the intervention. Ideally this project should be part of on-going youth work practice within the Secure Estate rather than having ‘new’ external facilitators delivering this project as a one-off.

Youth workers reported that some young people displayed behaviour which they found very difficult to manage. One way projects found to gain legitimacy was by involving workers with personal experience of gang membership, for example Bolton. A youth worker below gives an example of struggling to manage this behaviour:
“During …young women were very difficult to engage and in the second project. We left them out ...tried every trick in the book ... one of the girls was violent, abusive, aggressive and disruptive – turning furniture over, screaming and being uncooperative”

Project worker – Interview

It is vital when working with young people that staff feel confident to effectively and safely deescalate intimidating or violent behaviour. Given the emotive topics being discussed, this takes a high degree of skill in engaging young people.

Similarly, there is a strong emphasis on association and relationship building in the use of Global Youth Work/Youth Work as a tool of engagement; more so with young people on the margins. However, by its very nature the Secure Estate has a very transient population group with young people entering often for short periods, especially if on remand and individuals being moved to different wings or premises. Project workers reported that some young people were “lost”; due to “violent outburst” (i.e. they were not allowed to continue participating in the project due to their behaviour). The dynamic nature of inmates and others “lost” after lengthy intervals affected the project delivery. Perhaps a shorter project lifespan delivered over consecutive days rather than weeks would reduce the attrition rates.

**Scheduling in a secure estate setting**

It was raised by a number of project managers in some of the projects held in Secure Estates, that young people’s free time was being used for the delivery of the project, which invariably impacts on their ability to engage in other activities in their free time. Youth workers felt very uncomfortable with eating into this free time but also recognised the limited opportunities for broader learning on offer in the Secure Estate. They believed it was better to offer something, even if it is in the free time, than nothing at all. Whilst an invidious choice for the youth workers; it demonstrates the difficult choices made for youth workers working in such a restrictive setting.

**Use of age appropriate materials**

Some youth workers selected and played clips from a Ross Kemp on gangs documentary to the young people. The issue was raised a number of times as to whether this DVD (rated 18) is appropriate to use within these projects, especially if shown by the youth workers to under 18 year-olds. However one of the strongest messages coming out of the evaluation is the effectiveness of the DVD in engaging young people. This issue needs further exploration and further guidance to youth workers on the legality and ethical issues that this raises.

**Gendered learning styles**

A project manager raised the issue of gendered learning styles; having observed that in their project, males responded to drawing and females to reading. It is worth looking deeper into this issue to explore whether there is an established pattern that needs to be followed when working with people on the margins in relation to gender.
Recommendations

Clearly there are a number of very important lessons to be learnt from this project; both in terms of areas of development but more especially a lot of examples of good practice that needs to be shared. The following recommendations are hereby proposed:

**General recommendations**

- That the utilisation of Global Youth Work to engage those at the margins demonstrates significant added value and this should be promoted and celebrated.
- YCI and other youth work organisations should engage YOIs/Secure Estates through workshops and appropriate briefings to enlighten them about the benefits of using Global Youth Work methodology.
- Given that gendered learning styles was raised in the delivery of the project, that more observation and research be developed in this area to develop best practice.

**Recommendations for organisations working with young people at risk of offending**

- Global Youth Work methodology requires deconstructing young people’s constructed realities and this can be restricted within a YOI/Secure Estate environment given that other rules might take precedence; however this tension needs to be negotiated with Secure Estate authorities as some of the restrictions on the process of youth work reported can have detrimental repercussions to the process of engagement and limit the positive impacts of the project.
- Access to the Secure Estates when delivering related work should be sponsored by the highest authority so that it cannot be undermined.
- In relation to project delivery in YOIs/Secure Estates, we recommend that due to its transient community, the project be shorter and more intense, potentially lasting a week rather than over a series of weeks.
- Organisations working in Secure Estates should prepare a short briefing guide for Secure Estates staff about Global Youth Work. In this light there is a need for exploration of desired Global Youth Work methods in relation to institutional (particularly Secure Estate) norms from the onset.
- Whilst project managers have developed many creative and innovative approaches to working with young people at the margins as evidenced throughout the project; there were a few times where the young people’s understanding of their exposure to the process of globalisation is limited. For these young people, however limited they are, there is a need for more focus on the personal, local, national and global levels.
Recommendations for Y Care International

- YCI and other youth work organisations should continue to engage YOIs/Secure Estates through workshops and appropriate briefings to enlighten them about the benefits of using Global Youth Work methodology.
- The project teams should consider the appropriateness of the Ross Kemp DVD for use with under 18s. YCI and other youth work institutions might want to consider developing a more appropriate DVD for lower age ranges.
- This project has led to palpable shifts in young people’s perception and attitudes, and YCI should expand in this field of working with young people at the margins through GYW methodology.
- That YCI disseminate the learning from this project as far and widely as possible.
Conclusions

The Gangs, Guns and Knives project has been groundbreaking in many ways, especially in its ability to engage young people on the margins to explore their lives through Global Youth Work Methodology. It is pertinent at this juncture to revisit the objectives of the project identified at the beginning, and explore whether they have been achieved.

To explore the global dimension to gang, gun and knife crime and increase their awareness of development issues.

180 young people were supported over a period of two years in 12 delivery sites, including five Secure Estates, to explore the global dimension of gang, gun and knife crime as well as gained awareness of development issues. The reports submitted by the project workers evidences the achievement of this objective; additionally the individual evaluation questionnaire for young people reported that 72% of respondents did claim to be aware of a lot (about gangs and violence outside the UK) towards the end of the project (1 being “not at all” and 4 being “a lot”), which represents a 36% change from the baseline evaluation. The young people’s narratives from the various sites of delivery, suggests a deep and critical engagement with the project, leading to changes in young people’s perceptions and attitudes, it can be claimed.

There was also a reported 30% shift in perceived knowledge of poverty and development issues which represents a considerable change in young people’s perception, especially with 61% of those who completed the questionnaire scoring 3 or 4 (Four point scale of 1 being “not at all” and 4 being “a lot”).

The fact that there was 52% increase from the baseline information captured at the beginning of the project, with young people reportedly feeling that they were able to illustrate local-global links towards the end of the project, strongly evidences the successful nature of the project in relation to this objective.

To explore what the similarities, differences and links are between their lives and similar young people’s lives in other communities and to explore and identify for themselves, what the root causes of gang, gun and knife crime are.

Again, throughout the project, the available evidence suggests that young people were supported to explore similarities, differences and links to the South. 180 young people were supported to explore the root cause of gang, gun and knife violence, and also in comparison to those outside the UK. From the young people’s individual evaluation, project participants perceive the need for “protection” and to “get respect” as the key variables in influencing someone to join gangs. This was identified after young people explored the reasons people join gangs before and after the project as well as whether the reasons for joining gangs in the UK and outside the UK were the same.
Development of critical literacy and contextual application was evidenced throughout the project.

**Young people to come up with creative young people-led solutions to tackle the problem of gang, gun and knife crime.**

Both the project worker reports and the young people’s individual evaluations evidence the transformative learning of the project with 97 young people responding to the question about the impact of the project on them. Seventy-seven percent reported that the project has made them less likely to join a gang, 51.5% reported that the project has made them less likely to carry a knife, 48% reported being less likelihood to carry a gun and 51.5% reported being less likelihood to commit a crime. These changes in attitude were supported by a range of materials developed by project participants, ranging from poems, posters to a letter to would be offenders.
References


What was the most enjoyable activity or session?

How could the sessions have been improved?

Tell us one thing you learned during the sessions that you didn’t know before...

If you are ok with Y Care International getting in touch with you about similar projects in the future or to ask you more questions about the Gangs, Guns and Knives project please give us your:

MOBILE: ________________________________

EMAIL: ________________________________

---

**GANGS, GUNS & KNIVES**

This project is all about gangs, guns and knives in the UK and around the world.

Filling in this form will help us find out what people think about this project.

Please be honest - your views will help us make it better next time.

If you need any help filling it in just ask the person who gave it to you.

While we ask you for your name, we will never use it in our reports or anywhere else.

**Name:**

**Age:**

Please tick which ethnicity best describes you:

- Asian
- Chinese
- Black-Caribbean
- Black-African
- White British
- Any other ethnicity:

- Mixed White and Asian
- Mixed White and Chinese
- Mixed White and Black-Caribbean
- Mixed White and Black-African
- Any other mixed background:

---

This project is managed by Y Care International with funding from the Department for International Development (DFID)
### First Session

Please take 5 minutes to answer these questions before we begin...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On a scale of 1 to 4, from 'Not at all', to 'A lot'...</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How much do you think you know about gangs and violence <strong>outside</strong> of the UK?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How much do you feel there are links between your life and the lives of young people in the Global South (Africa, Latin America, Middle East or Asia)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How much do you think you know about development issues like poverty, hunger, trade, employment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do you feel you can stop gang, gun and knife violence in the UK?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How likely is it that you will be involved in a &quot;gang&quot; in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Agree or disagree: The reasons people get into gangs in the UK are the same as in other countries (please circle one)

   **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **NOT SURE**

7. Which of the following things cause young people to become gang members (please choose THREE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Being Poor</th>
<th>Lack of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>No fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sex</td>
<td>To be treated like a man</td>
<td>Revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act older</td>
<td>To make money</td>
<td>For fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe 2 – Individual Worker Evaluation Form
### Project overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people in rehabilitation projects</td>
<td>Double click the grey box to select from list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other give details:</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details of where you ran your workshops and the type of participants you have worked with. If you have worked in a YOI please state the name and give a brief overview of its makeup (e.g. age & gender of young people). If you are working in the community please describe the area (e.g. socio-economic indicators) and how you recruited the young people. If you have any reflective comments regarding the main outcomes or learning please include these here.

### About the participants

#### Number of young people engaged this year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Of which aged:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:</td>
<td>21:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:</td>
<td>22:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Of which, female:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:</td>
<td>23:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Of which, Black, Asian or other minority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:</td>
<td>24:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td>25:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Of which, disabled:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:</td>
<td>25+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other information

Please give any other relevant details about the participants:

### Financial reporting

Please tell us how you spent the budget for this project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Workshop activities and outcomes

Please give details of the workshops conducted. We want to know the activities that you have done within the workshops and what the key learning outcomes of these have been. This narrative report should draw on the evidence from the baseline and evaluation surveys conducted in the first and last workshops. It should provide information on how the activities met the following learning outcomes:

- **LO1** Help young people to explore the global dimension to gang, gun and knife crime including the impact on victims, perpetrators and communities
- **LO2** Raise young people’s awareness and understanding of how poverty, lack of education, gender inequalities and other types of deprivations are linked to violence and crime
- **LO3** Support young people to explore the links, similarities and differences between their lives and the lives of their peers in the Global South
- **LO4** Explore the root causes of gang, gun and knife crime globally
- **LO5** Help young people to come up with creative solutions to tackle the problem of gang, gun and knife crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop #</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please include date and times.</td>
<td>What activities did you do with the young people during each session? Please be as detailed as possible about the sessions and materials used.</td>
<td>Please reference numbers above and include details – e.g. Re: LO2 the group explored how poverty has led to violence in X country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Y CARE INTERNATIONAL**
**Reflection on the Global Youth Work methodology/activities**

Please give your honest reflections as a worker on how you thought the project went by answering the following: Please double click tick boxes to check or uncheck.

**How did you find preparing the activities? (Please tick one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**How did you find delivering the activities? (Please tick one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**How did you find evaluating the activities with the young people (the questionnaires)? (Please tick one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Would you recommend this type of work as an intervention method for young offenders?:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Would you recommend this type of work as an intervention method for young people at risk of offending?:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please use this space to share any additional reflections you may have on the global youth work methodology or activities. For example, specifically what you found easy/difficult about preparing, delivering or evaluating the activities. You might also want to suggest how YCI could better support this type of work.

**Key learning to share**

Please use this space to share any key learning about the project that you would like us to share with our funders and other youth workers. This could be a practical tip or suggestion; a warning about a certain topic; a recommendation of some kind; etc… We would like to use information put here as quotes or endorsements for doing this work in the pack that will be produced in 2012. We will make sure all quotes are anonymised but if you do not want this information shared please tick this box (double click to check).

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form.