Theme: Methodological Challenges in researching Organised Crime

Word of Welcome

Before presenting to you the new issue of the SGOC newsletter, we would firstly like to wish you a very happy, successful and prosperous 2007! One year and 3 successful issues has passed since we took on our task as new editors of the SGOC Newsletter and we have just finalised the January Issue for 2007. We are also pleased to see that the blog (http://sgoc.blogspot.com) is increasingly visited with now an average of 7 visits each day. The blog is the prime SGOC channel for bringing you interesting news on organized crime, up-to-date calls for papers and announcements.

Maybe the most interesting aspects of researching organized crime are the methodological challenges that this research entails. By nature organized crime is a closed and sometimes plainly dangerous world for academic researchers. You can’t just walk up to a capo and start asking him questions…or can you? Also those that have easier access to this world like law enforcement not always share the same interests as academic researchers and are unable (or unwilling) to give access to their data. It is therefore understandable that one of the SGOC panels at the conference is Pisa this year is fully dedicated to the measurement and methodology involved in the study of organised crime. In this issue of the newsletter we present some appetizers that certainly will invoke increased interest in this field.

We start with two very interesting articles giving an overview of two very recent projects that have been dealing partially or in depth with methodological issues in relation to organised crime. The first article is about the ‘Assessing Organised Crime’ project funded by the European Commission, which has designed not to simply amend or modify existing approaches but to go back to a fundamental re-evaluation of the concept of ‘organised crime’. The project has officially ended in December 2006 and the participants of the project provided us with a brief overview of its main outcome – the outline for a New European Common Approach (NECA) to the assessment of ‘organised crime’. For the purpose of developing an adequate methodology the work of the project has been ordered into three distinct phases, (1) a broad examination of the state of the art, (2) the development of a new common European approach, and, finally, (3) the testing of the feasibility of the new approach taking the cigarette black market as a case study about which you can find much more information in the article itself.

The second article, prepared by two researchers from University of Bath (UK), Vassilis Kostakos and Panos Kostakos, deals with Social Networks Analysis (SNA) as a key tool within the law enforcement community in investigating criminal cases involving serious organised crimes. They argue that the potential usefulness of applying the network analysis lies in understanding the structure of criminal groups as well as identifying the social, cultural, political, economic and geographic characteristics of these groups. More in specific, in their article they describe some of the initial results of the Cityware project, which aims to (i) develop a systemic understanding of emerging mobile technologies the urban environment, and (ii) identify communities and sub communities of people within the city of Bath, UK.

In this issue we have also prepared for you a book review written by Natasha Kingstone, PhD candidate at Bath University (UK). In an attempt to examine some methodological challenges in researching organized crime, she has chosen to review the book Vista d'interni- Diario di carcere, “di scuri” e seghe, di trip e di sventure, Manni, Lecce, 2003, (Seen from the inside - A prison diary, “mafiosi” and hand-jobs, trips and misfortunes) written by Antonio Perrone and published in 2003. This book is currently being made into a film by Fluid Video Crew.

Finally, it is important to say that this year is full of interesting conferences, seminars and colloquiums. Throughout the newsletter you will find a section with various calls for papers, news and announcements. The ECPR General Conference that will take place in Pisa, Italy (6-8 September) is approaching as well. From 1 February on-line registration begins and all interested people are encouraged to take place in this event.
You can read much more about this and other conferences in this newsletter and you can always send us your suggestions and comments! You are also highly encouraged to send us various announcements and articles.

In the next issue (May 2007) we will focus on cocaine smuggling routes in Europe. Can we make sense of the erratic patterns that these routes show and what do these indicate? Contributions (1000-1500 words) are as usual welcomed; the deadline for submission is 1 May 2007.

Once again we wish you a very Happy New Year and we sincerely hope that you will enjoy this issue of the SGOC Newsletter!

The editors
Jana Arsovska
Ludo Block


On May 1, 2004 10 new countries from Central and East Europe joined the European Union, on January 1, 2007 two more countries will follow them. This enlargement provided not only new economic possibilities, but also created new opportunities for organized crime. Politicians, journalists and scholars emphasize the fear that West Europe is about to ‘import’ crime from the East Europe. But also West European criminals ‘discover’ new illicit markets and clients in East Europe. How serious is the problem of import/export of organized crime to- and from East Europe?

In order to discuss and analyse these and similar questions, the Center for Research and Information on Organised Crime (CIROC) organised a seminar on 20 December 2006. CIROC has tradition of organising 3 seminars on organised crime per year, and the last the last seminar in this series was entitled ‘East meets West’.

Dr. Dina Siegel (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, CIROC) and Prof. Dr. Henk van de Bunt (EUR/ CIROC) opened the seminar, presenting the topics as well as the guest speakers present at this event. Dina Siegel in her presentation “The criminal import/export between East and West Europe” introduced the core problems that were further discussed and put forward important questions such as to which extend Western Europe imports crime from Eastern Europe and vice versa?

At this seminar there were 4 additional guest speakers presenting various topics related to East European criminality. Prof. Dr. Vesna Nikolic-Ristanovic, (Victimology Society of Serbia) talked about transnational organized crime, illegal markets and human trafficking from Serbia to the Western Europe.

Tihomir Bezlov (Center for Study of Democracy, Sofia, Bulgaria) spoke about Bulgarian organised crime and Jana Arsovska (Researcher, Catholic University Leuven, Belgium) elaborated on the evolution of Albanian organised crime groups in Belgium and the Netherlands particularly after 1996.

After the presentation a very fruitful discussion followed. The seminar was visited by approximately 50-60 researchers, law enforcement officials, academics, students and people from international governmental and non-governmental institutions.

Conference announcement
CIROC Seminar February 21st 2007, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

‘Italian Mafia, extortion and deals with the government’

What do we actually know about the Italian mafia, about extortion and protection? What can we learn from foreign experiences with unorthodox methods of investigation and ways to persuade members of the mafia to cooperate in the investigation?

On Wednesday February 21st 2007 national and international experts share their knowledge about these questions: Antropologist Anton Blok performed research on the social meaning of the mafia on Sicily for several years, Letizia Paoli published an impressive book about contemporary mafia in 2003, Federico Varese about protection / extortion and migration of mafia groups, and Ernesto Savona about Italian experiences with extensive methods of investigation and ‘collaborators of justice’.

The seminar will be rounded off by a presentation by professor Fijnaut about the weaknesses of Dutch promises to cooperative witnesses, followed by a discussion about what we can learn from experiences from abroad.

For further information and program see www.ciroc.nl/en_agenda.php
The New European Common Approach to Assessing Organised Crime (NECA)

Petrus C. van Duyne
University of Tilburg
Petrus@uvt.nl

In early 2003 the European Commission invited proposals under the 6th Framework Programme for research projects that would contribute to an improved knowledge-base on organised crime. One project that has subsequently been financed is “Assessing Organized Crime” which officially ended in December 2006. In this paper we will try to provide a brief overview of its main outcome, the outline for a New European Common Approach (NECA) to the assessment of ‘organised crime’.

The consortium of the “Assessing Organised Crime” project has consisted of the following institutions: Tilburg University, The Netherlands, (coordinator), Gent University, Belgium, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany, Durham University, United Kingdom, (first project year), London School of Economics, United Kingdom, (second project year), and the University of Tartu, Estonia. The following individuals have participated in the project: Annelies Balcaen, Maarten van Dijck, Petrus C. van Duyne, Ulrich Eisenberg, Dick Hobbs, Rob Hornsby, Klaus von Lampe, Anna Markina, Tom Vander Beken, Karen Verpoest.

The ‘Assessing Organised Crime’ project was designed not to simply amend or modify existing approaches but to go back to a fundamental re-evaluation of the concept of ‘organised crime’. For the purpose of developing an adequate methodology the work of the ‘Assessing Organised Crime’ project was ordered into three distinct phases, (1) a broad examination of the state of the art, (2) the development of a new common European approach, and, finally, (3) the testing of the feasibility of the new approach taking the cigarette black market as a case study.

These individual steps, going from the general debate on organised crime over the collection and analysis of data across academic and official fields to the specific question of how to assess organised crime, eventually led to the development of a “New European Common Approach for Assessing Organised Crime” (NECA). However, for various reasons the project did not arrive at a comprehensive conceptual framework of organised crime as foreseen in the project proposal. Rather a methodological frame-work for the systematic collection and analysis of relevant information was developed and some of its aspects tentatively tested in a pilot-study of the cigarette black market.

The new approach marks a fundamental departure from the current framework of organised crime reports in various respects. Perhaps most fundamentally, with NECA the question “Is it organised crime?” is no longer raised on the level of data collection and data entry. This implies that the collection and processing of raw data no longer hinges on any definition of ‘organised crime’. The only initial delimitation that is suggested for practical purposes is to confine the assessment process to crimes for profit, possibly above a certain threshold level. Instead, data are collected and processed with a view to the final analysis and the answering of questions like: “To what extent is crime organised?” and “How do criminals cooperate?”. In this sense, ‘organised crime’ is not treated as a coherent phenomenon but as a thematic frame of reference within which various issues are examined that are commonly addressed in the debate on ‘organised crime’.

The four essential principles of the New European Common Approach (NECA)

If ‘organised crime’ is a construction and not an observation, then one has to go back to the observational elementary ‘roots’. Broken down into its observable component parts, the elusive concept of ‘organised crime’ refers basically to individuals who commit certain (profit oriented) criminal acts in a context of collaboration, collusion, communication and social support. This implies a first important step:

• a shift in focus from ‘criminal groups’, which are a construct as well, to criminal activities and to the individuals involved in these activities.

This basic angle entails that the counting units at the observational level will be the conduct of the individual: who does what. Collecting data at this elementary level implies:

• a shift from lay-theory led ‘organised crime’ assessments to empirically grounded theory building.

This approach implies that one does not start with a theory of ‘organised crime’ but strives to theory building from basic empirical observations. As this perspective is very close to the police and criminal justice practice (the police observe deeds of suspects) we also propose a basic revision of the assessment methodology:

• a shift from separate to integrated raw data collection following the principle of one-time only data input for multiple use (criminal investigation, crime analysis and ‘organised crime’ assessment).

Basically this entails that observing and registering will virtually be the same act, which results in a (electronic) document that (if a criminal case is made) ‘travels’ with the case, like a bill of lading travels with the cargo. At every stage in the ‘journey’ through the judicial system data can be added, deleted and/or changed while the officer in charge is at close observational range. A fourth related principle addresses the question of input bias with

• a shift from the qualifying-as-organised-crime collection mode to ‘brand-free’ data gathering in order to avoid the mixing up of data input and interpretation.

This contributes to the separation of dependent and independent variables at the basic observational level. The first two of these four basic principles of the New European Common Approach represent the most fundamental theoretical changes compared to the present approaches to assessing ‘organised crime’. The third
and fourth principles concern a change in methodology entailing new methods and techniques.

Methodology and techniques

Phase 1: Raw data gathering integration

Our analysis of the current system of ‘organised crime’ reporting has revealed significant flaws in how the raw data are collected and processed. There are essentially two reporting procedures in place: one requiring front line investigators and intelligence analysts to provide data input separately from their routine tasks. The other requires investigators and analysts to share their data with those who are charged with drawing up situation reports. The former procedure increases the workload of investigators and analysts and additionally burdens them with making judgments on whether or not particular information is relevant for the assessment of ‘organised crime’. The latter process produces compliance problems, particularly within the culture of law enforcement agencies where information is jealously protected. NECA overcomes this impediment by integrating the collection of raw data for the purpose of strategic analysis into routine (electronic) file keeping. Data collected in the course of a criminal investigation are drawn from the electronic file in an anonymised form. Strictly speaking this is not a real innovation as every research based on criminal file analysis is carried out on the same basis. But these are retrospective investigations. The innovation will be that the case agents enter the relevant information into the electronic file as the case progresses and that these collected data are available for use in strategic analyses without any time delay.

Phase 2: Computer generated statistical analysis

The (anonymised) raw data input is automatically available for statistical processing and analysis. This analysis may serve various purposes. Apart from rough overviews (like the ones provided by the German BKA in its annual situation reports), it can be used for quite detailed analyses, depending on the variables involved.

In general, the statistical analysis can highlight hotspots that warrant closer inspection. Three types of categories appear to be particularly suitable as frames of references:

a. crime types defined by material criminal law;
b. crime regions defined by the geography of crime commission (by crime type or crime-for-profit in general); and
c. criminal networks defined by (suspected) co-offending.

Phase 3: In-depth (strategic) analysis and additional data collection

In a third phase the statistical findings can be projected against other data, which may be derived, for example, from:

• in-depth file analysis;
• interviews with investigators;
• data from non-law enforcement agencies like administrative supervisors;
• informants from trade and industry;
• data from NGOs.

These data will move the analysis beyond a stock taking or a description of offend-ers, offences or structures. It will also include environmental variables concerning legal, social, economic and cultural conditions, which interact with the criminal play-ers. This does not necessarily entail a society-broad survey, as the selection of such variables depends on the particular research questions which will be addressed. In order to ensure that the collection, processing and organisation of data is done along the same lines by all officers involved, a fairly rigid conceptual framework needs to be applied and adhered to.

Phase 4: Formulation of research questions and subsequent investigation

The descriptive observations made in the previous phases have to be evaluated against the background of assumptions on cause-effect and inter-relational links that need to be continuously formulated, tested and reformulated where necessary. For this purpose and in order to produce the insights essential for a meaningful interpretation of data in the long run, empirically grounded theory building is required. This does not necessarily lead to a comprehensive ‘organised crime theory’. If a coherent ‘organised crime phenomenon’ does not emerge in the analysis, different theories will have to be elaborated. Subsequent assessment activities, including threat assessments and scenario building, would then have to deal with various discernable fields (or markets) rather than with the ‘organised crime situation’.

The four phases are summarised in the following figure.

Intended outcome

The intended outcome of the assessment process is a report produced at regular intervals. The statistical analyses, accompanied by a brief description of the main trends, could usefully be produced in short sequence, e.g. every three or six months. Reports that combine the
findings of phases 2 and 3 should be issued on an annual basis in accordance with the current practice. Research results from phase 4 might take more than one year to produce, but in the long run it could be possible to have an annual assessment report, which combines findings from phases 2, 3 and 4.

Advantages of NECA

NECA is seen to have a number of advantages compared to current approaches to assess ‘organised crime’, including the following:

- reduction of workload for front-line officers through one-time-only data input;
- reduction of compliance problems through automatic anonymisation of data used for the assessment;
- cross-nationally standardised data collection;
- assessment relatively independent from the specialisations, investigative preferences and politically induced bias of organised crime units;
- analysis of crime patterns independent from national boundaries;
- reduction of intervals between data collection and assessment, especially with regard to the statistical analyses conducted in phase 2 which allows real time use of data;
- continuous monitoring of trends regarding crime areas, crime regions and co-offending networks;
- integration of data collection, crime analysis and research to arrive at more meaningful interpretations.

Outlook

NECA is an approach to take stock of a multifaceted criminal conduct – the organisation of crime for profit – and to move beyond this stock-taking by widening the circle of information for strategic analysis to account for the findings and to develop grounded theories. It can only be implemented to its fullest extent in a properly developed IT and analytical environment. Concerning these conditions existing and envisioned difficulties and shortcomings must be recognised:

- low standard of electronic equipment across EU;
- low standard of data management;
- incompatible data systems within and across jurisdictions (police/courts, federal/state, national/international);
- low level of harmonised data formats.

These caveats not withstanding, there is reason to be optimistic about the implementation of NECA:

- the electronic case management and analysis tool EASY (Bavarian police) can serve as an example for a database system with high acceptance by practitioners and wide and increasing implementation (in Germany and other countries), interestingly not following a central decision but more in the fashion of a grassroots movement;
- historically one might want to draw an analogy to the introduction of computers in police work: what was a PC with MS Word for every officer 15 years ago is a computer network of compatible electronic file keeping software today, an utopian vision, but one with a good chance of becoming reality in a not too distant future.

The “Assessing Organised Crime” Project Consortium

www.assessingorganisedcrime.net

Book Review


Natasha Kingstone
PhD Candidate
University of Bath, UK

When examining the methodological challenges of the study of organised crime (OC), it is apparent that the subject of the variety of sources available and the differences between these sources comes into play. Throughout the history of the study of OC, educators, researchers, and students alike have sought to examine this issue, debating the validity and merit of primary vs. secondary sources, and whilst the value of both is clear, one must consider to what extent research can be helped or hindered by the types of source chosen when aiming to produce a coherent and well-rounded research project.

In an attempt to examine the problems of methodologies in OC research, I have accordingly chosen to review the book Vista d’interni- Diario di carcere, “di scuri” e seghe, di trip e di sventure, Manni, Lecce, 2003, (Seen from the inside- A prison diary, “mafiosi” and hand-jobs, trips and misfortunes) written by Antonio Perrone and published in 2003, currently being made into a film by Fluid Video Crew, a group of Italian filmmakers who found themselves inspired by the text.

Perrone was born in Trepuzzi, Apulia, in 1957, and is currently serving a prison sentence of 49 years for crimes associated with being a member of an organised crime group according to the law 416bis. Today he is in Lecce prison, subject to so-called carcere duro (hard imprisonment), a special regime of imprisonment brought in to force for members of the various mafie across Italy, which limits the contact between prisoners themselves, visits with family members and friends on the outside and even letter-writing and receiving and telephone call rights, all in an attempt to hinder them from continuing their involvement with their mafia associates both within and beyond the prison walls.

Written in the form of a diary spanning June 1997 until January 2001, and with the use of flashbacks (fourteen) scattered throughout the diaries pages, Perrone describes life under the gruelling carcere duro, his relationship with the other prisoners and the prison staff, the difficulties within his marriage, how he came to be a part of the Apulian underworld, namely the Sacra Corona Unita (SCU), and his activities once involved, as well as depicting his own personal struggle during his time in prison.
Perrone opens the book, writing: ‘I have been, I am, completely isolated: I can’t exchange even one word with anyone, not even those in the next cell otherwise the guards will close the partitions, and even the smallest benefit would disappear’ (pg. 7).

What immediately comes across is the author’s intelligence and capability in terms of writing; breaking with the stereotype of young new-recruits to organised crime gangs, Perrone describes his life at university and his quickly adopted drug-taking habits, having started a degree in Literature at the University of Padova. This is apparent in his writing style which is reminiscent of someone with a respectable educational background and an eloquence often unexpected in this type of text. Perrone’s frankness also proves interesting as he quickly evokes the sympathy of the reader in detailing his own difficulties in adjusting to life in incarceration. As the title suggests, Perrone’s text details sexual abuse at the hands of the other prisoners and this also provokes empathy for the writer and his plight, in spite of the crimes he has committed.

Going in to further detail about his life outside, Perrone writes: ‘We're talking about the spring-summer of 1982, I think. I'm not that sure about it though, but I think so, it was around that time. The fact is that when I have to establish a chronological order, distances which elapse between different events and periods of time throughout my life become a blur, my senses mixing the dates in to one monotonous and indistinct memory…’ (pg. 30)

Whether it be as a result of years of drug dependency or simply disorientation as a result of imprisonment and the passage of time, by the author’s own admission, the information he relays within the text needs to be read with a critical eye, bearing in mind its accuracy, at times questionable, a problem in terms of the use of a primary source, such as a personal diary, in organised crime research, again raising the question of methodology in the field.

Within the flashbacks used by the author, making up approximately a fifth of the book, Perrone goes in to exhaustive detail about his membership and activity within the SCU, describing the arrival of Cutolo's fugitives ‘hanging around our area’ (pg. 40) as part of the description of the SCU’s own history. Of his own introduction to the organisation, Perrone writes:

November 1997
‘...Gianfranco...told me that there were certain rituals of a secret sect which were necessary to observe in order to comply which wasn’t, contrary to what I had always thought, part of prison folklore: the respect of certain behaviours and hierarchies could help to avoid lots of unnecessary nastiness, where needed’ (Pg. 53).

Whilst many of the statements made by the author ring true according to what is known about the organisation and running of the SCU, it is necessary for the reader to bear in mind that what he writes is most certainly a subjective account of events, detailed on the part by a dangerous and violent criminal, and not to be mistaken as concrete evidence for the history of the organisation itself and its members time in prison.

In terms of advantages of such a text as a part of the methodology of OC research, it is clear that an account as personal as a diary offers us with an insight in to the other side of OC studies; the people involved and how they are drawn in to the web of gangs. The authors own adeptness at relating to the reader the difficulties he himself has faced during his time in prison also serves to force us to reconsider these criminals, providing the reader with a sort of appeal on Perrone’s part for compassion and comprehension. This text provides us with a human face of the organised crime debate, personifying that which had previously remained faceless. The first book of its kind referring to a member of the SCU, Perrone’s account is useful in that is offers a first person experience of the SCU phenomenon, counteracting the literature currently available on the topic.

Nevertheless, the problems with the subjectivity of such an account can simply not be denied. The reader is immediately struck by the way in which Perrone describes his own problems, and whilst this may evoked sympathy, it may also push us to consider to what extent one must feel sorry for a man convicted of violent crime. Furthermore, the validity in terms of the information provided in such a text by the author is equally questionable; how is one to know whether what the author is writing is the truth? Whilst it seems there would be little motive for Perrone to fabricate the information he includes in his diary, the book cannot be read without maintaining in consideration the dubious reliability of the author himself and, consequently, the facts, figures and statements he provides in the text.

However, whilst trial transcripts, secondary texts, historical accounts and newspaper articles can provide us with an articulate and concise picture of the movements and workings of criminal organisations, primary resources, such as diaries to autobiographies, are able to provide the reader with a singularly frank and personal take on history, something which traditional, historical books on OC simply cannot do.

This book is truly a gripping read, written with an apparent candidness that is, at times, capable of putting the reader ‘in the shoes’ of the protagonist. As to what purpose it serves in terms of building up an historical account of the SCU during the 1980’s and 1990’s in Apulia, during a time when the culture and society in the region
began to change forever, is debatable for the reasons discussed in this review and one will never really know the reliability of such a subject. Nonetheless, its does provide us with something genuinely original in terms of OC history in Apulia and also prompts us to consider the debate about the use of sources and challenges to methodology in the field of OC research, in some way encouraging us as both researchers and readers to seek to define where we find and how we use the information we come across in our own studies.

Conference announcement


Call for Papers: Theme: what is known about the development of crime-markets in Europe while the European Union has extended and after a pause will probably continue to extend. What will remain the same and what is likely to change? Potential topics within this framework:

* The (organisation of) underground trade in prohibited substances, e.g. drugs.
* The ‘criminal services markets’, e.g. human smuggling.
* The ‘upperworld’ crime-economy: financial and economic crime.
* Criminal money management: laundering and the role of crime-money in the upperworld.
* Developments and changes in the international organisation of crime from a national perspective
* Upper- and underworld: crime, power and corruption.

For further information: http://cross-border-crime.net

Social Network Analysis (SNA): Real world methodological challenges... Catching up with technology...

Vassilis Kostakos
Department of Computer Science
University of Bath
BA2 7AY, Bath, UK
vk@cs.bath.ac.uk

Panos A. Kostakos
Department of European Studies and Modern Languages
University of Bath
BA2 7AY, Bath, UK
pkostakos@bath.ac.uk

Introduction

Social networks analysis is a key tool within the law enforcement community in investigating criminal cases involving serious organised crimes. The potential usefulness of applying the network analysis lies in understanding the structure of criminal groups as well as identifying the social, cultural, political, economic and geographic characteristics of these groups. Researchers usually gather raw data from court transcripts, phone taps and police files, newspapers, as well as from direct observations and interviews. However, few researchers have direct access to such information and quite often such studies are difficult to replicate. Furthermore, data are subjective to the bias of the researcher, the formalisation of police reports, the straightjacket of court hearings and legal proceeding, and sensational or bad journalism. In short, the validity and reliability of both the data and the methods of acquiring data is still a major obstacle, and in some instances forces the analyst to accept the easiest and simplest explanation.

Inevitably, any investigation employing Social Network Analysis on a large scale will sooner or later identify gaps and shortcomings in its datasets. Collecting real world data is no easy task, and in most cases our analysis is based on assumptions and incomplete data. In this article we describe some of the initial results of the Cityware project (http://www.cityware.org.uk), which aims to (i) develop a systemic understanding of emerging mobile technologies the urban environment, and (ii) identify communities and sub communities of people within the city of Bath, UK. The Cityware project is used as an illustrative example of the various ways researchers and law enforcement officers can gather data suitable for network analysis. The work we describe is the result of passive observation carried out by electronic equipment.

Additionally, we highlight how from a relatively simplistic dataset, and certain assumptions, we were able to derive a much more complex and richer dataset that we can use for analysis. Besides urban spaces, the method used for data collection (Bluetooth scanning) can also be used in confined spaces, for instance, prisons or areas where there are significant indicators that drug trafficking, prostitution and other crimes are likely to take place. Town squares and other known sites used by criminal elements are just few examples. Note that in Europe, there are no legal constrains for issuing Bluetooth scanning and the cost for such devise is minuscule.

Setup

One of the many aspects of the city we want to understand is people. This involves understanding the way people make use of the city’s urban spaces, how people form groups of friends, and how different groups and communities interact with each other in the urban setting.

In an initial study [1] we employed Bluetooth technology typically found in mobile devices. Bluetooth technology has a characteristic that renders it appropriate for our study. In contrast to the wireless signals emitted by typically static WiFi access points, the signals emitted by Bluetooth devices map very closely to the movement of people around the city, which in turn is one of our primary concerns.

Our basic setup, replicated across a number of sites, involved installing a computer that constantly recorded the Bluetooth devices within a 10-meter range. Each
Bluetooth device emits a unique identification number, so we are able to distinguish between different devices. In previous work, we found that approximately 7% of observed pedestrians in Bath, UK, had Bluetooth discoverable devices [2]. This number most certainly varies between different cities, but still it shows that a considerable portion of the public can be recorded using our method.

The method we used to scan for Bluetooth devices generates discrete data about the presence of devices in the 10-meter radius of each scanner. A visualisation of such data can be seen in Figure 1. Here, each dot represents a discovery event, i.e. a point in time (x-axis) when our Bluetooth scanner picked up a specific device in the environment. For example, in Figure 1 we see that device 16 was present in the environment between approximately 18.5 minutes and 19.5 minutes.

![Figure 1: A timeline visualization of our Bluetooth gatecounts. Each device is given its own timeline (dashed lines) and each discovery event is plotted as a circle on the timeline.](image)

**Figure 1:** A timeline visualization of our Bluetooth gatecounts. Each device is given its own timeline (dashed lines) and each discovery event is plotted as a circle on the timeline.

**Analysis**

Our first step was to study the patterns of people’s encounter in our data. Encounters in the city are one of the key aspects to society’s generation and regeneration. A lively and interesting city offers its inhabitants the chance to meet new people every day. To carry out our analysis, we first had to identify instances where two or more devices were present at the same place and the same time. For example, in Figure 1 we see that devices 12 and 13 encountered each other. We developed filters that analysed our data and gave us instances of devices encountering each other at each of the four locations in our study. These initial results took the form of records: device1_id, device2_id, location

At this stage in our analysis we had a long list of such records, describing which devices (and subsequently people) encountered each other and in which location. Note that this is an assumption, as we simply know that those devices were within 10 meters of each other. For example, in Figure 1 we see that devices 12 and 13 encountered each other at 15.5 minutes and were near each other for approximately 1 minute. This list of encounters is a textual representation of the patterns of encounter across our locations.

To further study the patterns and structure hidden within this list, we transformed it to a social network graph. Assuming that each device from our dataset becomes a node in the social graph, then the list of encounters indicates which nodes are connected. Proceeding in this manner, we generated the social network graphs shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: A graph visualization of the encounters that we recorded in the city of Bath.](image)

**The graph in Figure 2 contains approximately 5000 nodes (most nodes are occluded) that represent people who live in the city of Bath. In this graph we show which people encountered each other at some point in time. This graph is amiable to traditional network and social network analysis techniques and algorithms.**

By slightly changing our assumptions about encounter we can begin to explore different facets of the city. For instance, rather than connect any two devices that encountered each other, we can choose to connect only those devices that in addition to encountering each other also appeared and disappeared at the same time. For instance, in Figure 1 we see that devices 12 and 13 encountered each other, but they also appeared and disappeared at the same time. Such instances of encounter are most likely to indicate people who are walking together and are likely to be friends. We can further enhance such this filter by only connecting devices that repeatedly appear and disappear at the same time. The resulting graph is also amiable to traditional analysis tools, with the results being related to friendship networks as opposed to simple encounter.

**Conclusion**

In this article we describe some of the techniques that we have used to understand people’s use of the city and the social networks that make up the fabric of everyday life. We describe how by altering our assumptions about the recording data, and developing various filters, we can derive various social network graphs from our data. These graphs represent various facets of the social structure of the city of Bath, and we can use traditional social network analysis to carry out our investigations. Similar techniques used by the Cityware project can be used in various locales in towns, clubs, prisons and town square and by shaping our assumptions according to our needs we can achieve a more objective as well as practical approach in understanding criminal networks.
References


Conference announcement
Crime, crime prevention and communities in Europe

The 2007 Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology will be jointly organized by the University of Bologna, Department of Education Sciences (Faculty of Vocational Training Sciences) and the Service of Safety Policies and Local Police of the Region Emilia-Romagna. The conference will be held in Bologna on September 26/29, 2007.

Following the tradition of the European Society Conferences of the past years, the Bologna Conference 2007 will embrace most of the issue about crime, crime prevention, deviance and criminal policies which are currently at the centre of criminological thought in Europe, with a particular focus on the topic of local/global crime phenomena, of the role of local communities in crime prevention reaction and strategies, of the overlapping and coordination of European institutions, national states, regional and local governments in the governance of crime. In a word: in the changes and crossing of boundaries both of crime phenomena and of prevention and control strategies in post-modern societies.

For further information: http://www.eurocrim2007.org/

Fighting Crime in the Backyard: EU Internal Security Policies in the Balkans
Pre-conference Young Researchers Workshop
11 September 2007

Convenors: Cornelius Friesendorf and Ursula Schroeder
ECPR Standing Group on International Relations "Making Sense of a Pluralist World: Sixth Pan-European Conference on International Relations" University of Turin, Italy, 12-15 September 2007

Call For Paper Proposals

We would like to invite interested colleagues to submit paper proposals to our pre-conference Young Researchers Workshop on “Fighting Crime in the Backyard: EU Internal Security Policies in the Balkans”. Transnational forms of organized crime are transforming international affairs. Drug dealers, small arms brokers, human traffickers, smugglers of nuclear material, and terrorists have extended their reach across borders, struck alliances with one another and adopted networked forms of cooperation. Starting from the assumption that this rising number of transnational security challenges limits the capacity of individual states to provide internal security within their own territories, the workshop explores the development of EU-wide counter-strategies. It specifically focuses on the phenomenon that internal security assistance has started to play an increasingly large role in the EU's policies towards its neighbouring states. Using the complex internal security dynamics in the Balkans as a laboratory, the workshop aims to compare the successes and difficulties of the EU's response to the rise of transnational security challenges.

Numerous policy initiatives that cut across the EU's three legislative pillars address problems of transnational crime and internal security in the Balkans. The workshop brings together researchers working on different aspects of these internal security policies (i.e. policies that concern mostly police forces, border guards, or intelligence agencies, rather than the military) in order to explore the patterns and possible pathologies of interaction between EU institutions, other involved external actors, and South-Eastern European states. The workshop analyses EU strategies of security governance in South-Eastern Europe by drawing on a diverse range of conceptual perspectives. Encouraging theoretical contributions from the fields of International Relations as well as European integration and governance, it hopes to join up ongoing debates in both fields of study. How do theories of EU external governance, policy transfer and Europeanization on the one hand, and IR approaches to democratisation and post-conflict state building, transnational net-works and interdependence, international criminal justice, security communities and security complexes on the other, speak to the question of how the EU fosters internal security in the Balkans? The workshop provides a forum for both empirical and conceptual papers, although we at this point explicitly seek papers that ad-dress theoretical debates and/or offer comparative perspectives to questions of EU security governance in the Balkans. We invite submission of proposals for papers (300-word abstracts) on any of the following themes.

Conceptual perspectives: How do transnational security challenges impact on traditional strategies of fostering security in Europe? Against the backdrop of the complex empirical challenges of internal security provision in the Balkans, papers broaden the theoretical debate on EU strategies against crime, discuss the trend towards externalizing internal security agendas and its impact on the international system of states, and compare the leverage of different theoretical approaches to the question of how the EU exports its internal security agenda to the Balkans.

Policy Coordination: Papers in this panel discuss the coherence of the different EU instruments to fight crime and foster internal security in the Balkans. The emergence of the EU’s institutional architecture in the field of
fighting transnational crime, questions of cross-pillar coordination and the EU's conceptual approach to the external dimension of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice are discussed.

> Impact and Implementation: Papers assess the implementation of EU internal security strategies for the Balkans. They discuss the generic role of external actors in reforming domestic security agencies in South-Eastern Europe, explore the impact, achievements and shortcomings of their projects and missions; and comment on the match or gap between political concepts and their implementation.

The deadline for paper proposals is 20 March 2007. A decision on proposals will be made by mid-April. Travel and accommodation costs for paper-givers from South-Eastern Europe will be fully covered; costs for all other participants will be partially covered, subject to availability of funding.

Please send all abstracts, and direct any further enquiries, to:

Cornelius Friesendorf
Postdoctoral Research Fellow
Geschwister-Scholl-Institute for Political Science
University of Munich
39 Boulevard Carl-Vogt
1205 Geneva
Switzerland
Email: c.friesendorf@isn.ch

Ursula Schroeder
PhD-Researcher
European University Institute
Department of Political and Social Sciences
Via dei Roccettini 9
50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy
Email: ursula.schroeder@eui.eu

GENERAL REMINDER:
ECPR GENERAL CONFERENCE
6-8 SEPTEMBER 2007, PISA, ITALY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Table:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 February 2007:</td>
<td>On-line registration begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 February 2007:</td>
<td>Notification by organisers about whether paper has been accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March 2007</td>
<td>Submission of Proposed Section to ECPR by the Standing Group on Organised crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2007</td>
<td>Full information on all sections/panels including timetable available on ECPR website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 June 2007: Deadline for early-registration
15 July 2007: Deadline for minor revisions to programme information
August 2007: Submission and circulation of papers
6-8 September 2007: ECPR General Conference in Pisa, Italy

**Panel One: The Measurement and Methodology involved in the study of Organised crime**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel please email Petrus@uvt.nl or kvlampe@zedat.fu-berlin.de

**Panel Two: ‘Mafias in the World’**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel, please email g.parini@unical.it

If you would like to present a paper in this panel please contact Jana Arsovska at jana.arsovska@law.kuleuven.be

**Panel Four: The Sex Trade and other forms of Modern Slavery**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel please email pao.monz@libero.it

**Panel Five: Changing Perceptions of Criminal Organisations**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel, please email Sayaka Fukumi at sayapuu@hotmail.com

If you would like to present a paper in this panel, please email: Diana Schmidt at dschmidt@kices.org

**Panel Seven: Organised crime and the ‘new order’ within the global political arena**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel, please email: danielairrera@yahoo.it

**Panel Eight: The Nexus Between Terrorism and International Crime**
If you would like to present a paper in this panel, please email: Wyn.Rees@nottingham.ac.uk

For further information on the conference:
http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/generalconference/pisa/index.aspx
CONTRIBUTIONS

For the newsletter we are looking for:

- Book reviews of approximately 500-900 words, original books in language of your choice but reviews should be written in English. Indicate the language of the book.
- Conference reports of about 1000 words in English. Share your experience at conferences with those who are unable to attend them;
- Information on Calls for Papers, coming conferences and any other interesting material for our readers.

For the newsletter we are looking for short original articles (1000-2000 words) on the themes of the newsletters. You are also invited to propose a theme. The theme selected for the May issue is “Examining Cocaine trafficking in Europe”. The deadline for that issue is 1 May 2007.

Please send your (ideas for) contributions to: oceditor@lycos.co.uk

Disclaimer: While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information contained in this newsletter, neither the Editors nor the ECPR can accept responsibility for any errors.
Invitation to contribute to a special issue of
TRENDS IN ORGANIZED CRIME: Interviewing “Organized Criminals”
(revised: 20061218)

While in the past research on organized crime has primarily relied on official and journalistic sources, more and more studies prove that direct access to ‘organized criminals’ is possible. The purpose of this special issue is to give readers an idea of the difficulties and possibilities of conducting offender interviews in the area of organized crime and to provide a basis for answering questions like: Are offender interviews more valid and reliable than other data sources? Can interview-based research on organized crime be planned and replicated, or does it always depend on uniquely fortunate circumstances? Are interviews with ‘organized criminals’ dangerous; and if so, for whom? Are there significant differences between interviewing incarcerated and non-incarcerated offenders?

Researchers who have interviewed offenders associated with activities or structures commonly labeled ‘organized crime’, (whether incarcerated, in witness protection programs or on the street, whether active or retired,) are invited to share their experiences and views.

Manuscripts must conform to APA style and should stay within the range of between **2,000 and 5,000 words**. While authors are free in what they write, in the interest of comparability they are asked to address the following points:

**Information about your research in general**
- Description of the research project (purpose, conceptual framework, sample size, data sources besides offender interviews, duration of project, funding, major findings, publications, etc.)

**Information about the offender interviews that you have conducted**
- Sampling method
- Access (contact prior to interview, intermediaries, failed attempts, etc.)
- Security concerns (interviewer/interviewee, security measures, guarantees, etc.)
- Interview settings (location, recording devices, people present, etc.)
- Form of interviews (structure, interview techniques, length, etc.)
- Thematic scope (self-imposed limits, agreed limits, non-responses, etc.)

**Your retrospective assessment of the absolute and relative value of offender interviews**
- Absolute value of offender interviews (scope and depth of information, validity, reliability, etc.)
- Relative value of offender interviews (incarcerated/non-incarcerated, offender interviews/other data sources, etc.)

**Problems you may have encountered**
- Ethical problems
- Legal problems
- Obstacles for extension/replicability of study

**Your advice to other researchers**
- What to do, what to avoid

Please submit manuscripts in electronic form (MS Word, RTF) by e-mail to Klaus von Lampe (editor@trends-in-organized-crime.net) no later than **15 April 2007**.