

**What works in  
child sexual exploitation:  
sharing and learning**

**Final Report  
July 2004**

**A Daphne Programme  
project partnership  
between  
Barnardo's, UK and Stade Advies, NL**

**Paula Skidmore  
Barnardo's Research & Development**

# Daphne Programme – Year 2002

## Final Report

Project Nr.: 02/333

Title: What works in child sexual exploitation; sharing and learning

Start Date: March 2003

End Date: April 2004

Co-ordinating Organisation's name: Barnardo's UK

Contact person: Dr Sara Scott

Name: Dr Sara Scott

Address: Barnardo's Policy and Research Unit, Tanners Lane, Barkingside, Ilford, Essex

Postal code: IG6 1QG

City: London

Country: United Kingdom

Tel. N°.: 0208 550 8822

Fax Nr.: 0208 551 6870

e-mail: sara.scott@barnardos.org.uk

Partner Organisations' names and countries: Stade Advies, Netherlands

## **Acknowledgements**

On behalf of Barnardo's and Stade Advies, the author would like to thank all the colleagues and service users at the following services who helped with the research for this piece of work:

Asja, Netherlands  
Barnardo's Child Sexual Exploitation Service, UK  
Beauty and the Beast, Netherlands  
Birmingham Space, UK  
Bristol BASE Project, UK  
Glasgow Streetwork Team, UK  
Merseyside Scheme, UK  
Missing in Yorkshire, Bradford, UK  
Missing in Yorkshire, Kirklees, UK  
PMW Humanitas, Netherlands  
Pretty Woman, Netherlands  
Polepark, UK  
Protocol 13, Netherlands  
Scharlaken Koord, Netherlands S.E.C.O.S Project, UK  
Southampton Missing Persons, UK  
Southampton's Young Women's Project, UK  
Streets and Lanes, UK  
Young Men's Project, UK  
Young Women's Project, UK

We would also like to acknowledge the team at the Daphne Programme for funding this research and for their support throughout the year.

*“You live with shame, and this term, ‘sexual exploitation’ takes that away from you.”*

(Female service user, Netherlands)

### **1: Aims of the project**

The 12 month project aimed to;

- a) analyse and share ‘what works’ in the prevention of child sexual exploitation and the support of victims involved;
- b) begin to measure the impacts of interventions with children and young people in the UK and Netherlands; and
- c) make this information available to other experts and engaged groups.

The objectives of the project were to exchange knowledge between schemes in both countries working with sexually exploited young people and those at risk of exploitation; set up a systematic comparative evaluation of their work; and disseminate findings via a preliminary report, translated publication and a Netherlands based seminar for experts in child sexual exploitation.

The schemes represented by Stede Advies were primarily ‘Pretty Woman’ and ‘Beauty and the Beast’, based in Utrecht. However for the purpose of the project Stede also represented, Scharlaken Koord (Amsterdam), Asja (Leuwarden), PMW Humanitas (Rotterdam), and Protocol 13 (Utrecht). In the UK, Barnardo’s manages 14 different schemes located throughout the UK in major conurbations such as Glasgow, London and Bradford.

### **2: Implementation of the project**

The planned activities for the project included; sharing and implementing a specifically designed monitoring tool for measuring the impact of service provision on young people; exchange up-to-date descriptions of all schemes involved and the outcomes they hope to achieve; two exchange visits for the project co-ordinators to negotiate and embed the monitoring system being used; a visit to the UK by NL staff and service users for joint meeting and visits to UK schemes; qualitative interviews with UK and NL service users and collection of case studies; translation into English of a booklet describing NL intervention schemes; analysis of monitoring data and production of preliminary report; hosting of expert seminar in NL to be attended by UK staff; production of final report (to be translated in to Dutch).

The only major change to the original project proposal was the extension granted by the EC, following initial problems regarding the speed of implementation of the monitoring tool in the NL. This allowed the duration of the project to be prolonged by 3 months until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 in order that the original timescale for collection of monitoring data could be satisfied. A minor change to the original project was the implementation of the monitoring tool in an additional associate partner scheme ‘Loverboys’ at the Youth Bureau, Zwolle.

## **Exchange visits by project co-ordinators**

The initial visits between the UK and NL staff proved very successful. The first visit by UK staff to the NL enabled meetings with staff from Pretty Woman (Utrecht), PMW Humanitas (Rotterdam), Protocol 13 (Utrecht) and Scala (Rotterdam), as well as with Stade partners to discuss and clarify the aims and objectives of the project.

Prior to the visit Barnardos had piloted a monitoring tool for use by schemes in the UK with their service users. This had led to the revision and improvement of the categories being monitored in the UK. This revised form, with completion guidance was shared with the schemes on the visit and its implementation discussed (an extract from this tool is provided in Annex A). UK staff were able to describe in detail the issue of 'evidence based practice' as having emerged in the UK as an important factor in social care provision. Staff explained how the monitoring tool they had devised related to the idea of 'evidence', specifically through the determination of outcomes for young people who use Barnardo's services. The specific areas being monitored by the tool were explained and discussed at each of the schemes visited (these are presented in the Results section below). This enabled NL staff to ask critical questions about the parameters being monitored, their applicability in the context of the NL and the technical issues regarding implementation (such as IT capabilities and access of staff). For the UK staff this visit enabled them to collect literature on the schemes visited and to determine the likelihood of each scheme being able to undertake monitoring of young people and the outcomes for them during the period of the Daphne funded project.

A second visit to the NL partners from the UK was facilitated in order to firmly embed the monitoring tool and discuss the possibility of gathering qualitative case study material. An additional scheme, the 'Loveboys' project based at the Youth Care Bureau in Zwolle was visited and the monitoring tool negotiated. A visit to meet the practitioners who run the young women's shelter, Asja (in Leewarden), was undertaken, as was a second meeting with staff from Protocol 13 (Utrecht). As a result of this second visit the schemes who would implement the monitoring tool were agreed as Pretty Woman (Utrecht), Protocol 13 (Utrecht), Asja (Leeuwarden) and Youth Bureau/Loveboys (Zwolle). In addition it was negotiated that the same schemes would complete a case study template to gather more in depth material about the background and current circumstances of the young people they assisted (see below).

The first visit by NL staff to the UK enabled the Stade co-ordinators to visit a number of Barnardo's services. The NL partners visited the Young Women's Project in London and Birmingham Space in the Midlands, to see the monitoring tool being used in practice. The visits enabled NL staff to exchange information with UK practitioners and ask questions about the application of outcome monitoring in their everyday work. Key information was exchanged about Barnardo's services explaining their method of intervention, prevention and social care for young people at risk of sexual exploitation. A number of service users were also present and involved in discussions at one of the visits. Examples of the pack 'Things we don't talk about' were given to the Stade partners. This is a prevention education pack on risk and sexual exploitation devised and produced by Barnardo's practitioners for use in educational and youth work settings. It contains a specially produced video, audio tape, teacher/facilitator notes and practice tools (worksheets and posters) to raise awareness about the risks of sexually exploitative relationships.

### **Implementation of the monitoring tool**

The outcome monitoring tool had been devised in a UK context through research consultation with practitioners working in Barnardo's sexual exploitation services. However following meetings in the NL it was judged by practitioners to be entirely appropriate in the areas of intervention monitored and the full translation of the form into Dutch was completed by Stade (see extract in Annex B). The Stade partners then continued the negotiation of its implementation by schemes and it was successfully adopted in four locations; Pretty Woman (Utrecht), Protocol 13 (Utrecht), Asja (Leeuwarden) and Loverboys/Bureau of Youth Care (Zwolle). These schemes were judged the most appropriate after the initial consultations outlined above. The original schemes consulted (PMW Humanitas, Rotterdam and Scharlaken Koord, Amsterdam) had judged it too difficult to implement the tool in their working contexts, primarily with adults for the former and on outreach for the latter.

In the UK, the outcome monitoring tool was revised after consultation following the results of a pilot, prior to the project. Through the period of the Daphne funded project all Barnardo's services used the tool and data was collected and analysed for service users throughout the UK. In total 6 months UK data and 3 months NL data was collected, input and analysed by Barnardo's researchers.

### **Service user involvement and qualitative case studies**

After these visits the partners discussed the possibility of establishing contact with service users for interviews and case studies. A decision was made that face-to-face interviews by researchers with service users were often inappropriate in circumstances of continued vulnerability and risk for the young person. Such a technique depends on the young person being willing and able to recount the often very difficult and personal experiences of their life to a stranger in a context of limited trust. Young people at risk of sexual exploitation are usually developing a fragile trust with a key worker/ social worker to whom they often already recount details of their current problems and difficulties relating to risky sexual behaviour and exploitative relationships. It was decided that it would be more appropriate to use practitioner accounts, taken from these disclosures by young people with their permission, for input to the research. All accounts would be anonymous and collated by the practitioner following the same 'template' for identifying key qualitative elements of a young person's story (an extract of this template is in Annex C).

In addition service user involvement to the project was organised through the participation of young people in a number of meetings during the exchange visits. Service users from the UK were invited to meet Stade staff at a project visit, where they were able to discuss the situation for young people in the Netherlands in contrast to the UK. Four service users from the NL were enabled to visit the UK for a two day stay. With their key workers, they visited the London Young Women's Project to see the facilities on offer, meet staff and service users and discuss the situation in the UK in relation to risks for young people. They were able to attend the meeting of NL and UK staff the following day and report back their thoughts and feelings about the visit to over 25 participants in attendance.

### **Joint meeting in the UK and expert meeting in NL**

The purpose of the UK joint meeting was to enable practitioner representatives from all Barnardo's services to meet the Stade partners and a range of NL practitioners at a specialist event in Central London. In addition the visit enabled 4 NL service users to accompany their

Key workers and attend part of the meeting as well as visit a UK scheme for young people. On the second day of the meeting Barnardo's services facilitated visits by two separate groups of NL practitioners to the Bradford 'Streets and Lanes' project in the North of England and 'Southampton Young Women's service' on the South East Coast.

The meeting in Central London heard presentations from managers and practitioners of the Street and Lanes project (Bradford, UK), Secos (Middlesborough, UK), Young Men's Project (London, UK), Pretty Woman (Utrecht, NL), and Loverboys (Zwolle, NL). In addition the participants received presentations from Barnardo's Policy and Research Unit about the context of Barnardo's work in the UK, how services had developed their practice over the last 10 years and the implications for working with children and young people of the proposed new statutory legislation in the UK (Sexual Offences Act, 2003). Four service users from the NL's participated in part of the meeting with each young person giving a short presentation about their visit to the UK London Young Women's Project as well as talking about their experiences of intervention and support in the NL. The provision of continuous interpretation at the meeting enabled a lively discussion to take place between all participants about methods of social care intervention, prevention measures, issues relating to criminal justice and government policy, in both the UK and NL.

The expert meeting in the NL's took place in March 2004 in Utrecht. The meeting was divided into two parts; the morning enabled presentations about use of the monitoring tool and the findings from this to be shared between practitioners and partners of the project and the afternoon was a meeting for invited experts to discuss in particular the role of local government policy for prostitution regulation and young people. Presentations were given from specific schemes in the NL about their social care, prevention and counselling work with young people at risk of abuse through prostitution. In addition copies of the translated booklet 'Girls Prostitution; prevention and social care' (from Dutch into English) outlining the work of the 6 schemes partnered for the project, were distributed. Consecutive interpretation was enabled by the project for the Expert Meeting so that all parties could fully participate.

The only problems regarding the implementation of this aspect of the project were some difficulties regarding travel in the UK and when in the NL (due to a security evacuation at Amsterdam station).

### **3: Results and impacts of the projects**

#### **Exchange of information & sharing knowledge**

The exchange visits between the sexual exploitation schemes in the UK and the NL's enabled the project to identify common practitioner interventions and identify similarities in support to service users. The schemes in the UK all work to a common model of social work practice about the risk factors for young people and routes into sexual exploitation that has evolved over the last 10 years. Barnardo's has produced a number of publications identifying these and outlining their practice model based on the 'prostitution triangle' (Barnardo's 1998, Palmer, 2001). This model is set against a range of factors, or indicators, which have been associated with the onset of sexual exploitation, which include;

- going missing or running away;
- periods of homelessness or unsuitable accommodation;

- experience of being in public care;
- poor school attendance or being excluded from school;
- drug and/or alcohol misuse;
- disrupted and/or violent family backgrounds;
- poor or broken relationships with primary carers;
- a history of abuse and/or sexual abuse
- associating with risky, abusive adults, especially those who control using violence and threats;
- lack of awareness of sexual exploitation risks;
- association with and being influenced by others involved in prostitution
- low self-worth, including self-harming behaviour.

The model of a coercive relationship by an older friend or more powerful adult is set alongside these factors. In this triangular relationship, the stereotype of the 'child prostitute' is replaced by that of an abused child, the traditional 'pimp' is described as an abusive adult and the 'punter' who pays for sex or sex acts is now considered as a child sex offender. Barnardo's service experience is that this 'coercive' triangular model is very common, although it is recognised that the coercive person could be a boyfriend, drug dealer, streetwise friend or even a parent (Liabo, et al 2000).

The majority of Barnardo's services work primarily but not exclusively with the under-16 age group. Services are young person centred, providing a range of activities, including drop-ins, recreational events, and key worker contact. Referrals come directly to schemes from the police and social service and less commonly from street outreach. Barnardo's services aim to work through an inter-agency model, facilitating access by young people to local provision elsewhere, such as health, education, housing, substance misuse and counselling or mental health services.

A specialist education/prevention pack has also been devised by practitioners from the 'Streets and Lanes' service in Bradford, called 'Things we Don't Talk About' (2000) for working with girls and young women on abusive relationships, the risk of sexual exploitation and abuse. This comprises a three stage workpack of exercises and activities, including a video/audio tape, worksheets and posters for use by practitioners in education, youth & community work settings. Copies of this education tool were given to the Stade partners during the exchange.

It was found through the exchange visits and meeting in London that as schemes were located throughout the NL, they worked in a broad variety of ways, subject to regional priorities and organisation, but a number of schemes operated to very similar social work principles as Barnardo's. In particular Pretty Woman and the 'Loverboys' programme operated by Zwolle and Scharlaken Koord were very close to the 'triangle' model outlined above. The description of the 'Loverboys' phenomenon mirrored the experiences of UK schemes about coercive and abusive 'boyfriends' of young female service users. In the NL 'Loverboys' is the term used to describe young men who befriend young women, act as their boyfriend but ultimately force them into prostitution. The boyfriend/Loverboy succeeds in making the young woman emotionally and financially dependent on him to the extent that she can become detached from family and other friends. Schemes in the NL had to concentrate on effective education prevention programmes, such as 'Beauty and the Beast' in order to raise awareness with young women in schools, youth and community settings, about the tactics of these young men. In addition schemes had devised social care and shelter programmes for young women

who were being exploited, with the intention of breaking the dependent relationships with 'Loverboys'.

A number of key distinctions were apparent in the way schemes operated in the NL. Most notably all the schemes under the partnership focused on the exploitation of young women and ways to intervene and prevent this. Barnardo's UK recognises that young men are also at risk of exploitation through prostitution and has dedicated service provision for such instances. The other difference was the accepted use of 'secure provision' in a closed setting within the NL, such as that provided by 'Protocol 13' as well as in the open setting of the young women's refuge 'Asja'. In the UK, Barnardo's schemes do not seek or promote the use of 'secure accommodation' for young people exploited through prostitution, nor do schemes have the capacity to provide safe 'refuge' accommodation.

Connected to this there was a distinction in the NL's regarding terminology and the identification of 'young prostitutes' was still common. In some part this seemed to be strongly connected to the legalisation of the adult sex industry and the wider societal acceptance of working as a prostitute if over the age of 18. In contrast the favoured terminology within Barnardo's schemes was that young people are sexually exploited through prostitution, in the wider context of the criminalisation in the UK of adult prostitution. The young woman at the centre of the prostitution triangle described above is exploited and abused by others and UK Government guidance reinforces this child protection approach (Department of Health, 2000).

Some of these differences were underlined by the NL service users who attended the London meeting who reported to the participants about their visit to the Barnardo's Young Women's Project. They commented that there was no overnight accommodation at the service and that for them the provision of a safe secure place to stay had been important in escaping from prostitution and restoring their relationships with parents/carers. The young women from the NL identified the things that helped them to stay away from exploitative situations as being;

- having a safe place to stay, far away
- learning to love themselves again
- being in school, or having a job
- seeing their parents searching for them
- the police being active and making contact
- the police knowing what to tell parents
- being locked up/put into secure accommodation by parents

In addition they suggested that there was a need for groups or support for parents/carers in order for them to be able to understand and cope with what has happened to the young person.

Also the difference in terminology between the NL and UK was strongly highlighted by the young women, who emphasised that they preferred this idea of 'sexual exploitation' rather than being labelled a 'young prostitute'. As one young woman eloquently commented;

*"You live with shame, and this term, 'sexual exploitation,' takes that away from you."*

(Female service user, Netherlands)

## **The outcome monitoring tool**

*What the outcome monitoring form (OMF) is for:*

A tool has been devised by Barnardo's UK for services to use in monitoring their direct support work with young people. The tool is available as an electronic Xcel form and can also be printed out and completed manually on paper. The OMF enables research data to be collected from social care services about the outcomes for young people who use the service as well as basic demographic data, such as age, gender, and ethnicity. The form includes 13 areas of concern for the young person, related to their risk of sexual exploitation and practitioners can monitor these over time, such as 1-3 monthly intervals (Review Stages 1-5). The precise time of a 'Review Stage' will depend on both the individual service, the practitioner/key worker and the young person concerned and the flexibility is an essential aspect of service delivery for this client group.

The areas monitored on the form are; overall level of sexual exploitation; lifestyle risks for sexual exploitation; structural responses to risk (such as child protection/social services actions); sexual health/behaviour; substance use/misuse, including alcohol; accommodation needs; going missing/running away; experiences of violence; engagement in education and/or work; relationship to carers (parents/foster/substitute care); young person's awareness of exploitation, risks and their own rights; the level of contact/engagement with a service. Each of these areas has indicated levels for 'higher' to 'medium' to 'low' risks or needs and ultimately that needs are being fully met and there is no continuing risk for a young service user. An example of this assessment process can be seen by looking at the stages for 'going missing/running' as a risk:

1. Highest risk = "frequent and prolonged missing episodes"
2. High to Medium risk = "frequent, brief missing episodes"
3. Medium risk = "occasionally missing"
4. Low risk = "staying out late, but no missing episodes"
5. Minimum risk = "whereabouts known, no missing episodes"

The hope would be that through continued service contact a young person would be supported to reduce their risk from the highest to the lowest category being monitored. At the same time, the tool monitors the increase of possible protective factors for a young person, such as a recognition of exploitation and assertion of their rights, or an improved relationship with parents/carers

In addition, a specific assessment of different lifestyle risks has been formulated. This monitors 10 specified risks that young people take that are known to be connected to an increased risk of sexual exploitation;

- Regularly going missing (running away)
- Staying out late (or all night)
- Parents/carers do not know whereabouts of YP
- In conflict with carers/parents
- Associating with a 'risky'/controlling adult (or 'boyfriend')
- Peers involved in prostitution or 'clipping'
- Has money/items/clothing without explanation
- Being out of school/college/work
- Being bullied at school

- Having a history of being in local authority care

The form enables the average number of risks to be calculated for each young person, and assessed over time to detect reduction of risk, and which specific ones appear to be more significant with respect to improving the young person's situation.

The aim of this monitoring tool is to identify the reduction in risks over the period of service contact with a young person, which risks are reduced in the short term in contrast to longer term, and if specific aspects of service intervention and support relate to these reductions. The ultimate aim of outcome monitoring in this way is to identify which service interventions make the most impact on young people who are at risk of sexual exploitation.

### **The findings from using the OMF for this project**

The outcome monitoring tool was shared and translated into Dutch (see Annex X). This was then applied in four of the NL schemes whilst data was collected across all Barnardo's schemes. The monitoring of the NL schemes produced 10 individual forms, whilst that in the UK produced 283 returns because of the larger number of schemes using the tool. The findings from the UK monitoring will be outlined below in a separate section. However to illustrate similarities and differences in the data, the returns from one UK scheme will be concentrated on for clarity.

A comparison with 15 returned monitoring forms from the UK Southampton service shows similar levels of sexual exploitation risk evident at initial assessment of young women (all the cases compared here were female service users). For the NL schemes, half of service users were assessed as definitely at risk/currently sexually exploited, with a slightly higher percentage (66%) of the Southampton cases in this category. Linked to this were the number of 'lifestyle risks' judged at evident by practitioners at the schemes, at a young person's initial assessment. Here there was a notable difference between the UK and NL assessments; for the NL an average of 4.5 risks per young woman were indicated, whilst for the UK this was higher at 5.9 average risks. The nature of these risks was also differentiated between schemes. For the NL, the dominant risks assessed were;

- Conflicts with carers (8 young women);
- Being out of school (7 young women);
- Associating with a risky adult (6 young women);

and to a lesser extent;

- Involvement of peers (4 young women).

For the UK, the dominant risks assessed were;

- Staying out late (13 young women)
- Associating with a risky adult (12 young women);
- Being out of school (11 young women);
- Conflicts with carers & going missing (both 10 young women);

and to a lesser extent;

- Involvement of peers (8 young women).

One of the key tasks of the outcome monitoring is to determine the impact of service intervention in assisting young people to reduce their risk of sexual exploitation. This is assessed at 2-3 monthly intervals by practitioners through their normal service contact with a young person. A comparison between the NL and UK was made in terms of overall

assessment of the risk of sexual exploitation. For the NL cases (10 in total) one young woman was judged to have exited prostitution and be in a current stable situation by Review stage 3 and the number of 'high risk' young women had reduced to 3 young women. For the UK Southampton scheme, there were 4 young women assessed as exited/stable by Review stage 2, and only 3 young women still assessed as at current 'high risk' of sexual exploitation.

Change in the numbers of average 'lifestyle risks' per young person were also monitored. For the NL cases, the average number of risks had reduced to 3 by Review stage 2 and to 2.8 risks per young person by Review 3. In contrast the UK cases had a greater number of risks at initial assessment and therefore saw a proportionately bigger reduction to an average of 4 at Review 1 down to 3.3 per young person by Review 2. It would be necessary to compare a much greater number of cases to determine if these differences were sustained through all schemes, over a longer time period of service support, in both countries.

The cases were analysed across all the monitored areas to look for any significant differences or similarities in change for young people, between the UK and NL schemes over the Review stages. The relative low number of monitored cases meant that there were not many clear areas of significance detected in relation to change over time. It was identified that there was a similarity in the change for young people regarding their relationship to primary carers; both NL schemes and UK saw a small shift by Review 2 that indicated increasing communication and significant trust between young people and their carers. Over the same time period the young people were assessed in relation to their awareness of risk and ability to assert their own rights. A slightly stronger change was identified in this respect for the UK young women than the NL cases;

- For the NL cases at initial assessment, 5 out of 9 young women had no awareness or assertion of rights; by Review 3, this had reduced to none, whilst 4 young women had some awareness, 3 challenged oppression and 1 asserted their own rights and recognised their exploitation;
- For the UK cases at initial assessment, 6 out of 14 young women had no awareness or assertion of rights; by Review 2 this had reduced to 1 case, 3 young women had some awareness, and 5 asserted their own rights and recognised their exploitation;

It is important to note however, that this change may be due to the differing time period of monitoring in the UK to the NL. As change was monitored for a longer period by the UK schemes this could produce the finding of a stronger assertion of individual rights by a young person, as trust in a key worker or scheme takes time to develop.

The findings from the monitoring of the UK schemes overall are useful to record, in order to determine if the small differences identified above are at all persistent over a larger sample of returns. For a 6 month period the 13 Barnardo's schemes were able to complete 283 individual monitoring forms for young people throughout the UK. The majority of these were for young women, (87%) aged 14-16 years old (62%), and who were of white ethnicity (73%). The vast majority, 71%, of these cases were assessed as at high risk of sexual exploitation with 30%, judged by practitioners as at risk of 'definite and current exploitation' and only 5% as currently not at risk and in a stable situation. A total of 88 young people were monitored through to Review stage 3 by practitioners, and by this stage high exploitation risk had reduced to 66% of the sample, whilst those exited and stable had increased to 13% of those monitored; the number of YP who were judged to be 'definite and current' risk of exploitation had reduced to 18% from an initial 30% of the sample. The average number of

lifestyle risks for each YP at initial assessment was 5 and after 2-3 months service contact these had reduced to 3.7 risks. The dominant risks were staying out late (69%) involvement with a risky adult (60%), carers not knowing whereabouts and going missing (both 59%) and conflict with carers (57%). The biggest effect on risk reduction over 3-4 months of service contact was reducing episodes of 'going missing' & 'staying out late' plus 'associating with risky adults', whilst improving relationships with carers and meeting accommodation needs.

These are only early indicators of outcomes for young people in the UK and although they represent a much larger number than the NL cases, their interpretation must still be subject to caution. The time period of engagement is still relatively short (6 months) and these young people are very vulnerable and socially excluded at first contact with a support scheme. As a result they have very complex social needs and it takes time for services to build a trusting supportive relationship in this context. It would be necessary to monitor over a much longer period to determine if these early indicators were sustained for young people after more substantial, long term contact with services.

### **Feedback from practitioners on using the tool**

In the UK and NL the shared meetings between practitioners and project partners enabled discussion of the relevance and application of the tool in the different settings. The NL practitioners found that although the areas monitored were applicable there were differences that would need to be adapted for continued use in their schemes. The risk factors or 'signals' being used in the NL were judged to be wider than those used in the UK. Practitioners would have liked the tool to include issues of mental health, self esteem, counselling and medication, information about finances and debt, and more detailed questions about sexual health & contraception. NL practitioners found the list of drugs/substances too long and that it wasn't clear how to indicate the social networks of a young person, such as contacts with family and friends. A major difference was noted about the social care situation, such as placement of a young person in a 24 hour secure setting if they are seen working as a prostitute, obviously inter-connected with the legalisation of adult prostitution for those over 18.

The overall assessment of the monitoring tool was positive and NL practitioners pointed out its applicability at three levels;

- **Micro** - using it as an assessment instrument within an organization;
- **Mezo** - using the instrument to assess the methodical way of working, to compare with other organizations (for example, in relation to rules and regulations, on a local and national level, such as for housing etc.);
- **Macro** - using the instrument to detect the weak spots and other needs to provide good social care and develop prevention methods (possibly using the results for lobbying on a local/national level as well).

It was judged by UK practitioners that this overall assessment was similar to the applicability of the monitoring tool in their schemes also. Practitioners were quickly able to identify the change for the young person through their use of the forms and therefore positive outcomes could be built on in their social care practice. At an organisational level use of the monitoring tool could enable UK comparisons to be drawn about levels of risk for young people who were sexually exploited and similarly gaps in social care provision could be identified.

Through consultation with UK practitioners and the researchers in Barnardo's the original monitoring form had been adapted and a new section on experiences of violence had been included. However, some of the suggestions from NL practitioners regarding mental health, sexual health and contraception could not be effectively utilised by UK practitioners because of restrictions on this information internally within schemes. In the UK such service provision comes from medically trained staff who are constrained by patient confidentiality and could not readily share this information with social workers in schemes, to enable the monitoring of it using the tool.

## **Case studies**

### **Case study analysis**

The project enabled data to be collected simultaneously by UK and NL practitioners using a common template for case study information. This template identified 4 key areas in a young person's life to identify information judged of possible significance in understanding their exposure to exploitation through prostitution. These were

- Life history
- History of sexual exploitation
- Current situation
- Involvement/interaction with an SE service/scheme

Within each of these areas key data was collected on numerous sub-issues

- a) Life history – Geographical/cultural origins; family background; early life; school/education background; parental relationships; sibling relationships; other exploitative relationships; other protective relationships; involvement with social care services; history of going missing/running
- b) History of sexual exploitation – childhood inter/extra familial sexual abuse; childhood abuse (physical/emotional/domestic violence); past violence (physical and/or sexual) from others (e.g. peers, associates, boyfriends, other adults); routes into sexual exploitation; discovery/disclosure of SE
- c) Current situation – housing; drug use; health; experiences of violence; self-harm; self-image; hopes/dreams/plans; specific needs (self defined)
- d) Involvement with workers – initial contact (referral history); establishment of a relationship; pattern of service use; support needs over time; content of interactions (e.g. prevention, harm reduction, escape); role of counselling; exit strategy/story; young person's evaluation of the project.

These issues had been previously identified and successfully used within a case study methodology by Barnardo's (Scott, 2001).

The project was successful in analysing 5 case studies from each country; the young people ranged from 14-19 in age, the majority were female and were of white ethnicity. The comparative analysis of these cases revealed some common patterns in their background and history that led to their sexual exploitation in both countries.

#### *Life history*

All the young people had some difficulties identified in their family backgrounds such as death of one parent or divorce, physical & emotional parental abuse and neglect. In a number of

cases these were pronounced such as domestic violence and sexual abuse. The young people could identify few 'protective' or stable relationships in their lives other than those with key workers and staff and an occasional girlfriend. In contrast the cases revealed substantive 'exploitative' relationships in common, such as, 'boyfriends'/pimps, older men, gang members/friends of 'boyfriend'. In addition the educational history of the young people was one that had often become disrupted at age 12 – 14 with a pattern of absence from school combined with staying out late or missing episodes away from their primary carers.

#### *History of sexual exploitation*

The young people had in common violent sexually abusive experiences such as rape, group rape, possible familial sexual abuse and violence from peers and/or boyfriends in the past. Another common pattern was isolation by an older man or 'boyfriend' who coerced and manipulated them into exploitative relationships with others, whilst 'normalising' this situation through the offer of 'protection' and 'gifts'. Sometimes these exploitative relationships were also determined by the acquisition of drugs, staying out late and going missing. Related to this many case details revealed young women yearning for attention, affection and 'love' and a lack of clear knowledge about sexual boundaries, leading them to seek out such relationships.

#### *Current situation*

All the case studies showed young people having ongoing problems regarding accommodation needs, chaotic home situations and problems 'removing' themselves from contact with exploitative relationships. Some were still experiencing violence from others, were involved in substance misuse, had a poor self image and would engage in self harming behaviour. Many expressed the desire to find a 'protector' or just a 'good relationship' and wanted love, attention and a 'normal' life. Some young people had very specific hopes, such as doing well at school, going back to college, finding a flat or training to be a lawyer.

#### *Involvement/interaction with an SE service/scheme*

The majority of young people had sustained contact with SE schemes in both countries. Most were referred to services either by police or child protection professionals with a minority of self referrals. Young people used schemes in a variety of ways, through drop-ins and individual appointments, for information and advice as well as practical support. Common approaches were harm reduction related with attempts made by practitioners to build trusting relationships with service users. The majority of young people were identified as regular users of services when voluntary and most were described as motivated and ultimately engaged with key workers, even if after a long period of time. However in a small number of cases where a young person had subsequently been in closed settings through a compulsory order, practitioners commented on the damage that had been done to the trust between them and the young person and the reaction against the intervention by schemes as a result.

Young people themselves expressed varied responses to their involvement with support schemes. Some were uncertain how they felt about the projects, others that they did not believe they needed assistance from them. However the majority were positive, recognising different practical and/or emotional support they had received to avoid exploitation. One NL service user described the project she used as "a safe haven" and said;

*"Pretty Woman is wonderful; it does a lot for me".*

Similar sentiments were expressed by a young woman from the UK:

*“I love going to SaL’s – I would cry if I had to stop. I have been coming for a long time. I can talk to the staff without feeling bad or guilty”*

## **Expert meeting**

The results from the expert meeting held towards the end of the project were;

- Provisional report of the findings from the outcome monitoring in the UK and NL to all partners (‘Powerpoint’ presentation distributed);
- Discussion of the findings and debate about the possible reasons for the differences detected;
- Distribution of the English translation of the NL booklet ‘Girls prostitution, Prevention and social care; Description of 6 projects’;
- Presentations from NL experts about the national situation, including the role of local government in policy and action;
- Presentations from schemes providing successful social care intervention for young people, identifying the ‘chain approach’ of prevention, outreach, social care and shelter/refuge that is utilised.

## **Summary of findings from the project**

The project has completed a comparative evaluation of the social care prevention and intervention work around commercial sexual exploitation, of schemes in the UK and the NL. It has done so through implementation of a specifically designed monitoring tool and case study template, to gather quantitative and qualitative data about young people at risk, as well as through exchange visits and meetings of practitioners, service users and engaged experts.

The findings outlined above indicate the following common aspects of service provision in the UK and NL;

1. Serious vulnerability and social exclusion in the backgrounds of young service users
2. Similar risk indicators or ‘signals’ being used by practitioners in assessments
3. Similar methods of service intervention utilised, using a ‘prevention-harm reduction-support & advocacy to reduce risk-exit strategy’ model
4. A ‘chain approach’ model (NL) and ‘multi-agency’ approach (UK)
5. Concerns about structural constraints to service provision including legislation and criminal justice, local policy, and resources.

## **4: Dissemination and follow-up**

Dissemination internally of findings from the project took place throughout the period of partnership, with meeting notes, leaflets and summary information being shared in the NL by Stade and UK by Barnardo’s. The immediate results and Final Report from the project will be translated into Dutch and shared with all schemes under the partnership. The dissemination of the findings will be carried out in the respective partner countries; by Stade Advies through the National Platform on youth prostitution and by Barnardo’s through its national policy influencing work, including presentations at conferences and practitioner events. The visibility

of the EC has been ensured through the acknowledgement of funding from the Daphne I programme on all printed and electronic materials made available to participants.

The specific partnership between Stade and Barnardo's will continue as we have successfully applied for funding from the EC 'Agis' programme (2004). This will enable a third partner to join us, the Tartu Child Care Centre in Estonia, and the proposed project will focus on crime prevention and effective inter-agency working to support sexually exploited young people.

To follow up the success of this project we have submitted a proposal to Daphne II programme for a 12 month project that will enable us to continue using the devised and translated monitoring tool and collect and analyse further data from schemes in the UK and NL's. If successful this project will enable us to produce a number of synthesis reports based on data analysed from the previous implementation and continued use of the monitoring tool.

## **5: Conclusions**

The project 'What works in child sexual exploitation; sharing and learning' was a very successful partnership between Barnardo's UK and Stade Advies, NL. The partners achieved all the stated aims of the project to;

- d) analyse and share 'what works' in the prevention of child sexual exploitation and the support of victims involved;
- e) begin to measure the impacts of interventions with children and young people in the UK and Netherlands; and
- f) make this information available to other experts and engaged groups.

Through a number of exchange visits & meetings, the implementation of a specially designed monitoring tool and collection of case study materials, the project set up a systematic comparative evaluation of the work of UK and NL schemes. This enabled schemes in both countries to compare their assessments of young people at risk of sexual exploitation. Through this method, common ways of working to prevent and intervene against child sexual exploitation were clearly identified, as well as some national differences. Preliminary findings of the data collected by the monitoring tool indicate strong similarities in risk indicators being used by practitioners in both countries. Small and subtle differences have been detected regarding specific outcomes for young people as a result of service contact, but overall sexual exploitation risk was found to be successfully reduced by intervention in both the NL and UK. The data collated was over a relatively short time period and for a very small number of cases in the NL; the sample would have to be much larger to determine if the slight variations detected were fundamental differences in outcomes for young people in the two countries.

One of the objectives of the project was to exchange knowledge between schemes in both countries working with sexually exploited young people and those at risk of exploitation and this was successfully implemented through exchange visits & meetings, involving practitioners and service users, including the final expert meeting in the NL's. At these events it was identified that, although the specific structural constraints are often different in the UK from the NL's (with the latter notably adopting the legalisation of adult prostitution), forms of successful social care intervention and prevention for those under 18 are in practice very similar. A combination of early intervention, including the use of educational prevention programmes, consistent and persistent key worker support of a young person, harm

reduction approaches and targeting the exploitative adult/'boyfriend', were strategies utilised by all schemes in the NL's and SE services in the UK. A key difference was that Barnardo's UK see this as equally applicable to young men at risk of sexual exploitation, whereas all the NL schemes monitored worked exclusively with young women.

The project successfully translated key documentation from English to Dutch in order to disseminate findings via a preliminary report and translated publication of the booklet 'Girls' Prostitution; Prevention and Social Care' from Dutch to English. The final Expert Meeting hosted by Stade Advies enabled this information to be widely shared between practitioners of the partner schemes as well as with NL experts in child sexual exploitation. The final report of this project will be translated into Dutch from English, disseminated to all partner schemes and made available through the World wide web, accompanied by a copy of the data collection tools utilised (Barnardo's UK, Stade Advies, and Ecpat internet sites).

## References

Barnardo's (1998) *Whose Daughter Next?* Barkingside: Barnardo's

Department of Health, Home office, Department of Education and Employment, National Assembly for Wales (2000) *Safeguarding Children involved in Prostitution; Supplementary Guidance to Working Together to Safeguard Children*; London, Department of Health

Liabo, K., Bolton, A., Copperman, J., Curtis, K., Downie, A., Palmer, T. and Roberts, H. (2000) *The sexual exploitation of children and young people in Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham* Barkingside; Barnardo's

Palmer, T. (2001) *No son of mine!* Barkingside: Barnardo's

Scott, S (2001) *PHASE: A Case Study Evaluation*. Barkingside: Barnardo's

## Annexes

### 1: Keywords (see overleaf)

### 2: List of materials produced

- the outcome monitoring tool (Xcel, in English, translated into Dutch)
- the case study tool (Word document, in English, translated into Dutch)
- notes from the UK meeting (Word document, in English)
- preliminary report on project findings (Powerpoint)
- notes from the NL Expert meeting (Word document, in English)
- NL booklet describing 6 schemes (Word document, translated into English)
- final report to the EC

**Annex A: Extract from Barnardo's monitoring form**  
**C O N F I D E N T I A L**  
**Sexual Exploitation Projects Outcome Monitoring Form**

<b>BASIC DETAILS</b>
Project Name:
Worker Initials:
Case Reference Number (Livelihood/CRMS):
Age in years:
Gender (M or F):
Ethnicity (use livelihood categories):

<b>DATES FOR REVIEW</b>
Initial assessment
Review 1
Review 2

<b>If case is closed</b> or you do not see service user for three months, <b>record date:</b>	
<b>Write in the reason</b> for case being closed:	
If service user starts again <b>note the date</b> and continue to record change:	

<b>1. LEVEL OF SEXUAL EXPLOITATION</b>		
Please tick a number to indicate your assessment of the young person each time you update the form.	<b>Initial Assessment</b>	<b>Review 1</b>
1=Definite and current exploitation with controlling adult/peer pressure to continue		
2=Previous exploitation definite, not current but high risk of recurrence		
3=Previous suspected and high current risk		
4=No previous history indicated, but current high risk (e.g. clipping, lookout for others)		
5=No previous but medium risk indicated by lifestyle assessment		
6=No previous and low risk indicated through lifestyle factors		
7=Exited/stable current situation with low/no lifestyle factors		
98=Unknown		

<b>Background information</b>	Add further info here	Add further info here
-------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<b>2. LIFESTYLE RISKS FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION</b>		
Please tick a number to indicate your assessment of the young person each time you update the form.	<b>Initial Assessment</b>	<b>Review 1</b>
<b>Tick any that apply</b>		
1= Gone Missing during previous month		
2= Stays out late or all night		
3= Parents/carers do not know whereabouts		
4= In conflict with parents/carers		
5= Out of school/college		
6= Bullying at school		
7= History of public care		
8= Associates with controlling/risky adult (includes 'boyfriend')		
9= Peers involved in clipping/prostitution		
10= Has money/items/clothing without explanation		
11= Other (specify)		
98=Unknown		
<b>Background information</b>	Add further info here	Add further info here

This form enables your project to collect information about some outcomes over time for your service users. Please complete this form as part of your initial assessment of a new client. Review regularly and use the following columns to record changes. It is probable that reviews of most young people's progress will take place at intervals of between one and three months, but these intervals will vary according to the individual circumstances and level of service use.

## **Annex B: Extract from Monitoring tool in Dutch**

### **Monitoring Tool**

<i>Pretty Woman</i>
Naam Begeleider:
Naam cliënt:
Culturele achtergrond:
Leeftijd cliënt:

#### **Handleiding:**

Dit formulier geeft u de mogelijkheid om informatie te verzamelen over de voortgang die samen met een cliënt is geboekt tijdens een bepaalde periode. Wanneer een bepaalde onderzoeksgebied niet van toepassing is op de situatie van uw cliënt, of wanneer u denkt dat het onderwerp niet past binnen uw begeleiding, sla dit dan over.

Wanneer de onderwerpen niet relevant zijn voor een nieuwe cliënt in het begin van de begeleiding, bekijk dan telkens na een volgende ontmoeting of registratie toch nodig is op dat bepaalde gebied.

De eerste en tweede kolom zijn een leidraad om de mate van risico of probleem te bepalen.

Bepaal waar u denkt op welk niveau de cliënt is op dit moment, en vink het bijbehorende vakje dat de hoogte van het risico aangeeft aan onder eerste beoordeling. Beoordeel regelmatig en gebruik de daaropvolgende kolommen om veranderingen te registreren.

<b>Registreer a.u.b data van de evaluatie</b>	
eerste assesment	.....datum
Evaluatie 1	.....datum
Evaluatie 2	.....datum
Evaluatie 3	.....datum
Evaluatie 4	.....datum
Evaluatie 5	.....datum

<b>1. Mate van Seksueel misbruik</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
Absoluut en huidig misbruik en exploitatie van een beheersende volwassene/leeftijdgenoot met de druk om verder te gaan	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Verleden van seksueel misbruik/exploitatie, maar momenteel geen hoog risico van herhaling	<input type="checkbox"/>					
In het verleden (verdenkingen van) seksueel misbruik/exploitatie, en op heden een hoog risico	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Geen verleden van seksueel misbruik/exploitatie, maar nu wel een hoog risico.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Geen verleden, maar wel in enige mate een risico door leefstijl	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Geen verleden van misbruik/exploitatie en een laag risicofactor, aangegeven door de leefstijl factoren.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Stabiel huidige levensomstandigheden, met een laag risico gehalte als gevolg van de huidige levensomstandigheden	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Onbekend	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Opmerkingen						
<b>1</b>						
<b>2</b>						
<b>3</b>						
<b>4</b>						
<b>5</b>						
<b>6</b>						

## Annex C: Extract from Case study template

<b>Livelihood /other Ref No.:</b>	
<b>Gender:</b>	<b>Age:</b>
<b>Life History:</b>	
Geographical/Cultural origins:	Family Background:
Early Life:	School/education background:
Parental relationships:	Sibling relationships:
Other relationships -exploitative:	Other relationships - protective:
Social services involvement:	Missing/running history:

<b>History of Sexual Exploitation:</b>	
Childhood inter/extra familial sexual abuse:	Childhood abuse (physical/emotional/domestic violence):
Past violence (physical and/or sexual) from others (e.g. peers, associates, 'boyfriends', non-familial adults)	
Route/s into sexual exploitation (link to our risk indicators):	Discovery/disclosure:

<b>Current Situation:</b>	
Housing:	Drug use/ misuse:
Health:	Self-harm:
Experiences of violence:	Self-image:
Hopes/dreams/plans:	Specific needs (self defined):
Any other info:	