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Abstract

The motivations of smugglers can vary considerably, but the strongest appear to be financial, through deprivation or pure gluttony (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, Baily 2013). These smugglers do not often engage in this risky behaviour alone, they are commonly found as a part of a wider Organised Crime Group (OCG). Yeşilyurt (2014) investigated into these networks, and suggested that they can be more efficient when they are hierarchical and organised. This research aimed to investigate how police officers interpret Drug smuggling. Is there a strong consensus or very different opinions between the officers, when considering the seriousness of drug smuggling? Furthermore, has smuggling developed over the past decade? Additionally, what is needed in order to combat drug smuggling? This study attempts to answer these questions through primary research. It found four main themes with the Police Officer participants. The first being, the perceptions of drug smuggling, which includes techniques and motivations. Following on is the opinion of the participants upon the smugglers themselves, which delves into frustration and enjoyment. Next is the perception concerning the punishment for smuggling, comprising of discussions upon recidivism. The final theme relates to the influence of the 21st century and how smuggling has developed in recent years. There is a significant consensus between the officers, albeit with a few diverse opinions with relation to networks and desistance. From the analysis, certain theoretical concepts were drawn upon, the most resilient being Rational Choice Theory and Strain Theory. Finally, recommendations for policy are created, including concepts on punishment and funding. Future research is also proposed, the exploration into desistance and using more experienced officers should aid to the drug smuggling literature.

1 This thesis was submitted in partial fulfilment for the MA Criminology degree at Nottingham Trent University, UK.
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1.0 Introduction

‘Drug smuggling, just like any other type of smuggling, is shrouded by a veil of mystery’ (Antonopoulos and Papanicolaou 2008, pp 425). This mystery is enticing; its secretive nature allows an exciting subject to be explored within the difficult to access realms of organised crime. ‘Drug trafficking is a global illicit trade involving the cultivation, manufacture, distribution and sale of substances which are subject to drug prohibition laws’ (UNODC 2015, para 1). Drugs are smuggled from all areas of the globe to fuel the drug-addicted populations. Consequently, it is a fascinating and current topic of interest.

There have been many current and widely known drug smuggling cases that have sparked many conversations. Mellissa Reid and Michaella McCollum Connolly in 2013 were sentenced for 6.8 years for their roles in drug trafficking (Sky News 2013). They did provide a guilty plea, although they still protest their innocence in that they were under duress to smuggle cocaine (Sky News 2013). This story gripped the nation, mainly because of the contradictory evidence that was appearing in the media and society did not know what to believe. One being that, they stated that they did not know each other, although images of them enjoying social activities appeared to contrast the previous statement (Senley 2013). Therefore, they do not seem to appear as vulnerable victims – perhaps are they making an excuse because they have been caught.

There have also been other high profile cases considering drug smuggling and the punishment responses from the rest of the world. For example, Gallahue and Lines (2010) report that capital punishment is considered when the offence is drug related in 32 countries. Indonesia have recently used their option of capital punishment and Rodrigo Gularte is one of the people who received this punishment for trafficking cocaine (Phipps 2015). This has been a very high profile case in the media due to the home nation of the offender being appalled and attempting to appeal the death sentence – which was unsuccessful (Hurst and agencies 2015, Phipps 2015). Therefore, in accordance with this law, England and Wales’ laws appear very lenient.

These cases have brought drug trafficking into standard conversation. Therefore, what are the views of drugs in society? Petrocelli, Oberweis, Smith and Petrocelli (2014) surveyed American Police Officers about drugs and found negative universality. This pessimism towards drugs is alluded to with the frequent strict disagreement for the legalisation or decriminalisation of certain drugs (Petrocelli et al 2014). Although for Marijuana there is a lesser amount of disagreement at 67.4%, compared to other drugs which were above 80% (Petrocelli et al 2014). While in the UK, decriminalisation or legalisations of Marijuana is at 88% (Mann 2014). On the other hand, when it concerns legalisation of all drugs, then there is a similarity to the American Police with only 3% agreeing to all legalisation (Mann 2014). In addition, drug
legalisation is not an answer to combat drug smuggling, because if an Organised Crime Group (OCG) has lost their main commodity, then what will create a profit for them, people trafficking or extortion (Felbab-Brown 2012). Although Felbab-Brown (2012) does recommend that the Police should focus upon loosening the OCG’s control on society, via tackling the violence that accompanies them, as such, society may work in partnership and trust the police. However, the fear of violence is not the only reason for people to begin drug smuggling – deprivation is a rather strong contender. So irrelevant of the OCG’s hold on society, people may still voluntarily seek them.

This research will investigate drug smuggling in a detailed qualitative context. The layout of this research will be as follows. Subsequently there is a literature review upon the current existing research. This varies from an understanding of the inherent motivations for drug smuggling, to the plethora of drug smuggling networks. And finally leading to the concept of how these people control this risky behaviour. Following with the aims and objectives of the research. These are achieved from the gaps in current literature and a necessity for a further understanding with an alternative population.

Secondly, there is a comprehensive methodology reported. This alludes to the ways in which the researcher collected the data and the reasons behind the selections. There are further validations from the researcher for using qualitative methods that feature interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). Using IPA techniques, the results section is created. It indicates to quotations taken in the interviews and draws upon the researcher’s analytical skills to gauge a deep understanding of the participants’ interpretations of drug smuggling. Next, will be a discussion section, where the results of the analysis are compared to previous literature, and other theoretical concepts. Finally, there is a conclusion that will summarise the findings of the research and suggest further research and policy recommendations.

1.1 Drug Smuggling Motivations

Drug smuggling can be a lucrative business. Throughout the literature there appears to one main theme – a fiscal motivation (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, Baily 2013, Campbell and Hanson 2012). Desroches (2007) reviews Drug Trafficking literature and from ‘Dorn et al., 1998; Dorn et al., 2005; Desroches, 2005; Reuter & Haaga, 1989; Hafley & Tewksbury, 1995; van Duyne, 1996’, he summarises that smuggling is often an egocentric career path with hedonistic monetary goals and perhaps has a similar identity to a legitimate business (pp 839).

‘The actual difference between business organizations and criminal organizations is their goal as criminal organizations seek to increase their own benefit at higher risks, involving crime and violence’ (Yesilyurt 2014, pp 287).

Essentially similar motivations but one may adopt more risky behaviour. Although, the supposable legitimate less risky business, is not totally free of criminal investigation, for
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example, the current FIFA corruption scandal. Agreed there may have not been any violence – but bribery still occurred, thus risky behaviour (Thomas 2015). Hence, do smugglers identifying themselves as businesspersons.

Nonetheless, marginalisation and suffering from a lack of financial support could be a part of the fiscal motivation. It is understandable to why vulnerable and marginalised people could act upon such a dangerous risk if they are desperate (Baily 2013 and Campbell 2008). This can have an inclination to working class Barbadian women, who appear to have been targeted by OCG; they are possibly desperate and vulnerable to manipulation (Baily 2013). Although, one participant for Baily (2013) did mention that her motivation was one of money and not because she was desperate - it was greed, which is often against the grain for women. Campbell (abstract 2008) further alludes to this point by stating that depending upon a females standing within general society, it can cause them to be of a higher status in the OCG. Although this was just one participant for Baily (2013) and only a limited number for Campbell (2008), the majority of participants were frequently desperate and vulnerable. Vulnerability can also be shown through the female’s heterosexual relationships; they may have feared reprisals from their partners, hence they trafficked drugs for satisfaction (Baily 2013).

Additionally, these feelings of hopelessness are not universal to women. Stephen Sutton in an episode of Locked up Abroad (2011) explains the motivation behind his smuggling. ‘When you’ve got nothing there and $15,000, you hear that coming towards you. What you gonna do, you’re not going to say no, not when you’re desperate’ (Martin 2011). Sutton was desperate for money and the more experienced traffickers may have realised that the money would be too tempting for Sutton to say no. They can be very calculated people who hunt for weaknesses in others and exploit them.

However, Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008) argue that once the money was considerable and the smuggler had adapted to their lifestyle, they needed to maintain their gluttonous life and uphold their reputation. Money may have been the primary motivation, but the kudos may override the desire to remain. Motivations can be very diverse and adapt over time.

Nevertheless, there is another ideology to why people may continue to drug traffic - the thrill and adrenaline rush of smuggling drugs. Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008) reported motivations of excitement and the adrenaline rush. However, this sometimes dissipated when they believed that they were untouchable (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). Supplementary support can be drawn from an episode of Locked Up Abroad (2011). Chris Chance became an international drug smuggler and he said that he was continuing, ‘because of the thrill that I was getting out of smuggling, I realised I was addicted to it’ (Narayanan 2011). Chris Chance may have needed the thrill in his life and the money he was receiving was possibly just a bonus. There may a be a few people who may start smuggling because of the desperation like Chance, but then continue for the thrill of the activity. This thrill is the basis of Cultural Criminology, which is interested in the ‘journey into the spectacle and carnival of crime’ (Ferrell and Websdale 2009, pp4). Chance wanted to continue his carnival; this is perhaps why he continued, it was not his biological or sociological makeup. He was enjoying
the exhilaration. This is an interesting concept and it worth understanding if police officers recognise this possible trait.

1.2 Drug Smuggling Networks
Within an OCG there is the concept of a command chain. Antonopoulos and Pananicolaou (2008) write when reviewing ‘Drug Smugglers on Drug Smuggling’, that smugglers often belong to an OCG. For these kinds of activities, it is commonly a requirement for the group to be organised, taking such a large risk against law enforcement and the amount of money that has been invested, having unstructured and unplanned ventures may not nearly be as successful.

‘The key variable that distinguished two large categories of roles was contact with the drugs. There was a clear distinction between roles in which individuals had physical contact with or saw the drugs and roles in which there was no contact. The former category included roles of lower status, and the individuals in such roles were more susceptible to being caught’. (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, pp 90).

The higher members were clever, they would often decrease their direct contact with drugs, and therefore it could be difficult for the police to apprehend them. Although the more indispensable people down the chain, would frequently be handling the drugs, as such increasing their chance of easy apprehension. This is why a hierarchy can be beneficial for higher level people; they may have a higher financial reward and less personal risk. This behaviour is very planned and structured, as if it is flexible then there may be less control in regards to who handles the drugs.

Previously, these illegal OCG’s were compared to legal businesses. Further support for this can be viewed from Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008)…

‘These organizations operated in much the same way as traditional formal organizations, with a chief executive officer responsible for executive officers who were in charge of separate functions of the organization’ (pp34).

Without this structure, it may allow for a free and contestable system with discretion among the members, and there may be a serious chance of a lack of profit or arrest. Therefore, these OCG’s can operate on ‘a strict top down command and control structure … exercising control over subordinates through fear and intimidation’ (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, pp 34). This fear and intimidation could be what the smugglers in Baily (2013) experienced; they may have been manipulated by their partners and were in fear of the possible violence if they did not comply.

These examples of OCG’s from Decker and Townsend Chapman are from the Americas. Hence, is the situation similar in the UK? According to the National Crime Agency (n.d) drug
smuggling is still very organised and regularly consisting of OCG’s with a wide network, it is a serious problem as it costs annually in the range of £10.7 billion. The UK being so culturally diverse could allow for distant family member connections to develop; therefore, the difficult objective of being able to easily and safely obtain the drugs at source from foreign countries, could be accomplished effortlessly without concerns of Police Informants (National Crime Agency n.d). However, this ‘army’ like structure can be varied…

‘Many of the criminal organizations are loose and temporary, that is, their hierarchical structures are in the minority. Organized crime is progressively operating through fluid network structures rather than more formal hierarchies’ (Yeşilyurt 2014, pp 285).

It is traditionally thought that within OCG’s there is still a very strict command structure, very similar to the military. The type of network that may exist may be of personal preference. Possibly, the OCG’s are developing and changing with the more fluid society of today. Although, it appears hard to believe that there is no hierarchy in these networks when they are taking serious risks. Therefore, do these trafficking OCG’s have a hierarchy or is it a more fluid network?

1.3 Risky Behaviour

There is no doubting that this behaviour or this occupation is risky business. There is risk at all levels of the network (Che and Benson 2014). Thereby, a rational mind is often needed to combat this risk. There are a number logically thought out eventualities and techniques, for example ‘people ripping you off, snitches, equipment, time, thinking clearly, and not being nervous’ (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, pp 115/116). To prevent nervousness, Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008) explain how when the person was smuggling drugs, they did not often think of the risks during the act, as it may have clouded their judgement. There is also often a requirement of the people lower down the chain to be rational, clear headed and not act in a manner that may gather attention – for example bragging about their exploits or getting drunk, they are required to ‘[be] smart with money’ (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008, pp 116). The people higher in command frequently have to be more rational and clever to avoid police involvement. However, Desroches (2007) summarises again from ‘Dorn et al., 1998; Dorn et al., 2005; Desroches, 2005; Reuter & Haaga, 1989; Hafley & Tewksbury, 1995; van Duyne, 1996’, how a majority of high level smugglers may not fear reprisals from the Police, as they can be logical people who could weigh up the ‘costs vs benefits’ of a situation (pp 839).

One of the more important risky behaviours is the trust of the others in the network, as Police involvement is perhaps evitable. Thereby, having a smaller group of trusted people connected to the leader of the group and other more expendable members at a distance can be more efficient, safer and less time-consuming (Yeşilyurt 2014 and Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). This was best for risk aversion, due to there being less chance of a Police informant gaining contact to the leader (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). Moreover, Decker and
Townsend Chapman (2008) report how the leader of the network may calculate who should know certain details. This could mean only informing people of their role and not of another’s. This is very rational behaviour and an attempt to contest risk.

This rational behaviour transcends into their methods of transportation. They are very astute in the way they transport drugs, it is not just a person transporting it through an airport – they use secret compartments in everyday objects, for example in a surfboard, in a boat, in a car or in a dog (Bloom 2014, Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). Bloom (2014) further quotes Anthony Bucci who states that ‘Some of the more interesting concealment methods include narcotics concealed in prosthetic limbs, wheels on luggage made of heroin and cocaine and heroin secreted into book covers’ (para 8). They may go to extreme lengths in order to achieve a payday. These techniques are very inventive and rather clever.

Another technique that smugglers could use seems to be the most basic one – research. Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008) state that smugglers could do a considerable amount of research. They found that smugglers may pay attention to the local news in order to gain knowledge of the local law enforcement and their techniques; they may also focus upon the local Police and observe them. Similar to the phrase ‘keep your friends close, but your enemies even closer’. It appears logical to understand how the law enforcement operate in the particular location. With a majority of the possible risks controlled, a lucrative business could begin.

1.4 Aims
With a wealth of literature, this paper will aim to investigate Police Officer’s perceptions upon Drug smuggling and develop the literature upon this area. The motive for using Police Officers is because of Yeşilyurt (2014), who states that further research could investigate if: ‘law enforcement agencies have enough tools and skills to understand organized crime syndicates in terms of network analysis’ (pp 289). Thereby, is there a consensus to how drug smuggling networks operate and what is more efficient? This understanding is important, as for the Police to challenge smuggling; they need a grasp on the OCG’s functioning. This research will examine three main aims…

- To investigate how the previous Drug Squad Officers and Criminal Investigative Officers (CID) who operate within drug offences perceive that drug smuggling is a serious issue.
- To explore the police perceptions of how drug smuggling has changed over the years.
- To explore what combination of proactive and reactive techniques should be used to combat drug smuggling.

2.0 Analytical Method
This research adopts a qualitative approach to investigate its aims. Primary data was collected due to the lack of research that focused upon the interpretations and understanding drug smuggling from specifically a Police perspective. The qualitative method is selected based on the aims and objectives requiring verstehen and a deeper understanding of Police officer’s
attitudes. Furthermore, a qualitative method allows the participants to expand on certain answers, whereas in a quantitative piece they are normally limited to a Likert scale.

There is an idiographic approach taken to the research, as there is a requirement of a specific participant sample – previous drug squad and CID officers who operate in drug control (Blagden, Winder, Gregson and Thorne 2011). This sample ranges from Police Constables, Detective Constables/Sergeants and a drug reception manager. The length of service ranges from 8 years and 6 months to 46 years, with a majority of participants at the latter end of the scale. Therefore, there cannot be any generalisability to the general public or the Police Force as a whole, as this is a small, localised sample. Although a large general sample is not typically required for qualitative research. These participants responded to the questions with expert knowledge and help give a further insight to the underworld of drug smuggling. However, the ideographic approach has come under scrutiny; it has been reviewed as being ‘subjective, intuitive and impressionistic’ by Malim et al in their research ‘Perspectives in Psychology’ in 1992 (Pringle, Drummond, Mclafferty and Hendry 2011, pp 21). However, this is the aim of this research; there is an obligation to achieve an innate, subjective opinion upon drug smuggling from a unique and insightful sample.

Being of a qualitative nature means there are a selection of methods that could be employed. ‘This study will use interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to make sense and explore the personal accounts and lived experience of the participants’ (Blagden et al 2011, pp 4). As such, an exploration of the personal experiences of apprehending drug smugglers can be extrapolated. In addition, IPA lends itself to being of a complex nature; it does not simply view the participants’ based on purely what is written in the transcript (Smith & Osbourn 2003). In that way, IPA recognises that there is a link between what people do state and what they do not and there has to be a consideration to this (Smith & Osbourn 2003). This emphasis upon the interpretation of verbal and nonverbal communication can indicate that IPA has a foundation in cognition (Smith & Osbourn 2003). Moreover, Griffiths (2009) states that IPA has a tendency to be data driven, by which new theories that were not imagined before can be inferred. Thereby, the participant’s experiences that lead to their expert knowledge can be fully interpreted using IPA and possibly create unique ideas, making IPA a useful methodological approach. Conversely, IPA does have some limitations. The process of IPA can be very time consuming, as the transcripts are often analysed repetitively to ensure the correct interpretation (Griffiths 2009). Moreover, as qualitative research can be very bias to the researcher, with IPA there has to be a conscious awareness that over interpretation has not been conducted (Griffiths 2009). Otherwise, the original meaning of the text could become confused. However, IPA has been chosen over other analytical techniques such as Ground theory, because IPA suited this participant sample…

‘IPA differs from other methodologies, such as grounded theory, as in IPA the aim is to select participants in order to illuminate a particular research question, and to develop a full and interesting interpretation of the data’ (Brocki & Wearden 2006, pp 95).
Therefore, these select Police Officers were chosen because of their experience and knowledge on the area, but also because they could add more value to the drug smuggling literature, in comparison to members of the public or standard Police Officers. Consequently, IPA is overall more suited to the aims of this research compared to grounded theory. However, this is not saying that grounded theory is redundant. Furthermore, IPA is suited to the researcher, as the researcher has a background in Psychology and it has been previously used.

2.1 Participants, Recruitment and Sampling
This research uses police officers for its participant sample – specifically previous drug squad officers and CID officers who operate in drug control. These were selected because of the sophisticated knowledge they could have upon drug smuggling and how OCG’s operate. Consequently, this could aid to validity and understanding because the participants have a detailed knowledge upon the topic area.

An email was sent to a Police Station asking for prospective participants, in which one member of their previous drug squad replied. Consequently, a snowball sampling technique was utilized with help from the gatekeeper, who gave the researcher access to other perspective participants. This sampling technique was utilised for convenience and simplicity. The participants volunteered for the research and there was no incentive for them either financial or material. The final toll of participants was a homogenous seven males, with five being previous drug squad officers and two being CID. This sample was homogenous, because they were whom the researcher had contact with via the gatekeeper and they were willing to participate. It would have been beneficial to get a female perspective, although the homogenous sample could represent that this area is one of a male dominated subculture. The previous drug squad officers were a knowledgeable sample, because they have direct experience with drug trafficking and even being undercover within OCG’s. Whereas the CID officers do not have as much direct contact with drug smuggling, but they do have an extensive awareness of OCG’s and drug control. Making both of these samples acceptable choices. Theoretical saturation was reached at seven participants; therefore, no further interviews were needed. The researcher understood that saturation was reached when no further information was being found in the interviews. Similar themes were emerging. Furthermore, Reid, Flowers and Larkin (2005) cite Smith et al who state that seven participants is a realistic sample size for IPA research.

2.2 Data Collection
Before the interviews were conducted and the data collected, a pilot interview was completed to ensure that the questions were appropriate and to notice if there were any flaws. After this, some questions were edited due to their lack of explanation; they were rather confusing and did answer the desired question. Consequently, this added validity to the research as the questions were more relatable to the topic.

All of the participants, bar two, had 1:1 interviews conducted, thus the participants were able to expand on their own thoughts in privacy. The two altered interviews became a group interview. Originally, the researcher was interviewing one participant 1:1, and then the
participant’s superior entered the room and joined the interview. This positively changed the dynamic of the interview, as the participants were ‘bouncing’ ideas off one another, they would help each other for ideas and give further insight to the drug smuggling underworld. This was pure chance and this unique issue has only added to the researcher’s sample and analytical interpretation. The interviews were all completed in a quiet room, as such; the participants could complete the interviews within their full capacity. The interviews ranged from 25 minutes to 1.05 Hours. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim in guidance with ethical requirements. The recorded interviews will be destroyed after the research has been completed. During the transcription process, all of the personal information of any of the participants or any people or locations they alluded to are changed. These are given pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. All of the participants, including the extra participant in the group interview, read the informed consent form and gave written agreement of consent. Each participant was fully debriefed and given the option to withdraw their data up to an agreed date. Ethical approval was achieved effortlessly from Nottingham Trent University. Ethical requirements are strictly adhered to throughout this research.

The interviews are semi structured. This allows the participant and interviewer to expand on the answers to certain questions or even adapt the structure of the interview schedule (Smith & Osbourne 2003). Consequently, it is not restrictive. ‘This interviewing style [is] flexible and allow[s] participants the freedom to elaborate on issues important to them’ (Blagden et al 2011, pp 5). The interview schedule is as follows. It uses the funnelling technique and the researcher has taken inspiration from, Decker and Townsend Chapman (2008), Yeşilyurt (2014), Locked up Abroad (Martin 2011 and Narayanan 2011), Breaking Bad (2008), CPS (2012) and Cross, Parker & Sasson, 2003 cited in Yeşilyurt (2014). The first section was general in nature; it asked very broad opinions on drug smuggling. Although the final part of this section delved more specifically into questioning the drug smuggling networks. The second section then explored deeper into drug smuggling motivations and to the consideration of the thrill and excitement of drug smuggling. Subsequently, the topic of technology and the 21st century was questioned. The final section then explored punishment responses with an interest in the desistance process and policy implications (see Appendix 1 for Interview Schedule).

2.3 Strengths and Limitations
There have been a number of strengths and weaknesses concerning this research. When interviewing the researcher had difficulty interviewing a few participants. Some perceived to be rather restrictive and did not elaborate upon their answers, or they stated that they could not answer the questions. This could possibly be due to their lack of experience. This inhibited some of the depth and variety of the answers. Another weakness consisted of, again, the sample as there was no gender diversity. Having a female perspective would have been of interest, as they could have a more diverse opinion of drug trafficking than males. However, these appear to not have inhibited the analysis significantly, as theoretical saturation was established.
3.0 Results
There are four superordinate themes have been established throughout each transcript (See table 1). The first main theme is the Perceptions on the workings of Drug Smuggling. This theme refers to the participants’ ideas on how drug smuggling works and what is perceived to be needed in order to have a successful business. The second superordinate theme is the Police Officers’ opinions on Drug Smugglers and their actions, in which varies from annoyance to pleasure. It discusses the somewhat negative attitudes that the participants have with consideration to a constant ‘cat and mouse’ chase between them and the smugglers. Additionally, it alludes to the occasional enjoyment they receive from this chase. The third theme is the attitude upon the punishment for Drug Smuggling, which diverges from there being a need for more punitive punishments as these people cannot change, to a necessity in helping them desist. The final theme is the impact of the 21st century. Technology and the media have influenced society, and it has affected drug smuggling in terms of new techniques for both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Themes</th>
<th>Subordinate Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers opinions on the person behind the drug smuggle.</td>
<td>The annoyance of Drug Smuggling. Drug Smugglers perceived foolishness and their need for reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes on punishment for Drug Smuggling.</td>
<td>Beliefs upon desistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Superordinate theme 1: Perceptions on the practice of drug smuggling.
3.11 Drug smuggling motivations
There is a rather consistent ideology for the participants to why drug smugglers are motivated to smuggle drugs. There appears to be one main fiscal motivation, along with more trivial motivations, which are not as potent.

Participant 4 - errrrrm I think, I think in my experience, if the one timers, if they get away with it, then the temptation is that then they will make a few thousand pound from it, so if they’ve got away with it, then the temptation is to do it again. I know, I, it depends what country you’re talking from. Some people can be used over and over. Line - 72-76.

Money is clearly a motivator for drug trafficking, as such; they can become greedy. Additionally, this is a very common ideology throughout all of the participants. This need for www.internetjournalofcriminology.com
material acquisition can become addictive meaning that desistance is unlikely to occur before apprehension. It may be a rational choice to engage in this pursuit of illicit material gain but these traffickers are themselves often vulnerable people who can be exploited. However, he sees that there can be a considerable amount of luck and a lack of skill when trafficking by the statement ‘if they get away with it’. It is frustrating by somewhat the lack of control they can have over the pure chance of them succeeding. Although, sometimes greed is not only behind the fiscal motivation.

*Participant 5 - Well they did target women in Jamaica because there’s a lot of single women and who are short of money. So $5000 to swallow some drugs and taken em to England and if they catch em they deport you was the like. But you get 5 years. And [prison] has got loads. Err so to some extent they were targeted. Line - 395-399.*

Calculated higher status members of the OCG may target vulnerable, deprived and expendable people to complete the risky behaviour of being the mule. They can deceive them into thinking that the consequences are not too severe, thus, they do not need to be concerned about the risks. This could be a clever technique, as why tell their mule the real risks and have them terrified, of which could alert the police to a possible suspect. There is a distinction made for these expendable people, in that they are normally at a lower level fuelled by desperation. Although, this might not be universal for all low status members.

There is a difference between the fiscal motivations. Greed and deprivation appear to be the distinction and it is not clear to whether the higher status members are initially motivated via greed, or that is a consequential motivation. However, it is not purely about money.

*Participant 5 - Some extent it’s about power and some extents it’s about showing off. It’s about having the kudos of being a drug dealer. And one lad actually said that in court, he said that, his barrister said he was attracted into it for the kudos of being a drug dealer. But there’s no kudos for 12 years. Bazaar thing to say in court, but some of em think that it’s a big thing. Line - 327-331.*

Kudos and a decent reputation are apparent motivations too. This naive motivational reason is an unconventional excuse, especially in a court scenario where stating vulnerability could be favourable in terms of punishment. Although this excuse could show some vulnerability. As for someone who needs respect and reputation could suggest that they are not receiving it from ‘normal’ society. Thus, they may turn to an OCG to receive respect and reputation through power and control. The OCG’s lifestyle is attractive to them.

*Participant 5 - Yea, we’ve had one drug dealer in fact I’ve just heard that he’s finally been arrested... Errrrrm he used to say I’m bored, I’m gonna put an ounce of heroin In my pocket and drive around [location]. And he just used to drive around in the hope of getting a bit of a car chase out of it. So there is some excitement to and some do miss it. Line - 423-429.*

Toying with the police gave this participant’s person in question a buzz; he may have thought that he was untouchable. He would taunt the police and show their possible ineffectiveness.
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This participant does recognise that there can be some excitement to drug smuggling, via acknowledging that there can be excitement at all levels of an OCG. The mundaneness after apprehension could also cause some to crave the thrill of smuggling again. He is not saying that the thrill is the only motivation but for some, they enjoy the thrill seeking that accompanies the underworld of drugs. The strongest motivations appear to be fiscal; they are often not satisfied with their current state through often greed or deprivation. As a result, this can transcend from a criminal activity into a ‘regular’ business for the higher status members.

Participant 1-2 - R2: I think they become ingrained in it. R1: Yea, I think once they are down that route, it’s like a way of life... R2: Yea that becomes the norm, that becomes your life. Like you come to work every day, that’s what they do. Line 140 – 146.

These two participants complement each other and aid the development of this answer, there is an agreement regarding the similarity of OCG and legal businesses, as it can becomes a normative role for them. This is perhaps not a second life career; it can be their identity. Participant 2 could be viewed to be very fatalistic, as the repetition of the word ‘become’, could suggest that there is a trapping connotation attached to smuggling. Once they start, they cannot stop; it may be who they are. Overall there are a selection of motivations, in which may vary between smugglers, but the monetary motivations have more resilience. However, when apprehension occurs it can be a different story to their original motivations.

Participant 4 - Haha, well some say I didn’t know they were there. I was told there was nothing in it. See this is the difference as if you are a large level importer of drugs, then errm what excuses can you give, other than like its far cop gov, so that’s it isn’t it. But the lower level ones the excuses are, I didn’t know it was drugs, they told me it was just a statue, I didn’t know there was anything inside it. Well those that swallowed it, well there’s. Well I was forced into It, I was made to do it, I was threatened. And I’m sure they are, people are threatened. Line 316-323.

Dependent upon status, the excuses can vary. A high status member may not bother with excuses because they can be so ingrained, they could not possibly claim that they were forced into this situation. There is perhaps an air of respect and professionalism surrounding this situation, neither want to create further embarrassment. However, with lower status members this respect appears to be lowered. Even if gluttony or deprivation are the primary motivations, after being apprehended the ‘innocent’ denial ensues. There is possibly no admittance of responsibility as sentencing is reliant on this. This participant is somewhat blasé about their excuses, due to constant repetition of them. He does recognise though that some are forced into this behaviour and are possibly victims in their own right. Nevertheless, there appears to be little sympathy for them.

3.12 Techniques in how to be successful.
These OCG’s may use vulnerable people in order for the higher status members to be successful. There are many techniques that OCG’s use to be able to achieve a successful business.
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Participant 5 - As soon as you make enough money, you can start to pay people to take your risks for you. And then you can start to pay people to bully people to take your risks for you. An you become very difficult to catch ... An and the big thing about that it, that you never have to touch the drugs. The main people we arrest who are behind it all have never touched the drugs, they make some phone calls, an then arrange meetings and tell people what to do. So it’s a career path. Line 113-122.

Considering the high risk of apprehension when carrying drugs, logical people could reduce this and distance themselves. Selfishness is frequently a quality of OCG’s and people below them need to be expendable. He somewhat respects these OCG’s leaders. There is recognition that they may want to better themselves and progress. They are not often irrational chancers. This technique is perceived to be annoying for the police though; smugglers are decreasing their chance of being directly connected to drug importation. This can be a necessary skill for success at the higher level.

Participant 4 - To change it at the last minute, move things. It’s a risk. I mean there are risks involved in changing things at the last minute aren’t they. So if you have pre planned something, n you change that. There are risks involved. But yea, there lots. They might get a hint, they might think somebody’s informing on them, so if they think that then they’ll change things. They do it on purpose to try and bring the informant out. So to test the informant. So yea they do change, I mean. They do. They do that; tactics change all the time don’t they. Line 356-364.

Due the concept of risk, some participants did not believe that last minute changes were beneficial. Conversely, others did. While acknowledging that last minute changes can increase risk, as there could more chance of unpredictable problems – it is still a technique. This behaviour can be viewed as fluid and dynamic; they might not be so regimental in their tactics, probably due to the constant threat of the police. They possibly cannot be predictable, as the police could adapt and maybe infiltrate. Thereby, routes may change for reasons of group safety. Perhaps they are calculating the risk for changing the route, against having a possible informant. Before these methods could change though, finding the correct people to smuggle the drugs is often desired.

Participant 5: Some of em are so bloody obvious haha... Yea some of em are sweating panicking and twitching ... You have just got to look normal and fit in ... Look for Mr. and Mrs. normal and acting calm and yet again people that aren’t going to draw attention to themselves and do daft things. We’ve known people who say o, I’m bring drugs In, ooo I can bring in some extra duty free it’s, and they get caught for duty free and it’s the bags. So people who aren’t going to take stupid amount of risks a look normal. Line - 558-569.

Participant five finds humour in what he perceives to be the more pathetic and naive attempts to traffic drugs. The OCG’s often rationally seek out average looking people who will not attract the attention of the Police. Furthermore, a person has to act smart; they cannot draw attention to themselves – either positive or negative. Both status levels can be alluded to here;
possibly the higher status people need to astutely recruit the correct people, while the lower status people regularly need to think logically and act in the manner to which they are expected. It is conceivable to think that they weigh up the cost and benefits of a situation and then will act upon them accordingly. Irrational people may not think of possible risks and attempt to combat them.

Participant 5 - But instead of not doing it because of the risks, they try to work their way around the risks. ... Now I have thought of the risks and I’ll do that and I’ll do that. Line 484-487.

Criminal behaviour may never decease. Even if there are too many risks, a person may find a method to decrease that risk to a realistic prospect. It can be very rational behaviour as people may intend to manage risk instead of ridding of it, as that can be an unrealistic thought to have no risks. They may manage and control risk as a rational being using the above techniques. Although, not matter how rational and methodical a person is, a large proportion of success can be down to chance.

Participant 4 - Coming through customs knowing that they could get found out like that, in seconds init. It’s second to whether somebody is vigilant or not on a particular day. Line 371-373.

Luck can play a large part in successful smuggling. A person could have all the risks lowered and controlled, but if law enforcement want to choose the smuggler for a random search then all of the preparation can be useless. Chance to whether a person is paying attention is the key to success. That is the only main thing that the OCG’s cannot control. However, if they are of some power then they may have the ability to bribe people into not paying attention and letting them through. Yet, not everyone can be bribed, so luck can be the final instalment to trafficking.

3.13 Understanding of drug smuggling networks.
Previously mentioning vulnerable people being exploited can be one of the clever techniques used by these OCG’s in order to be successful. These OCG’s can have a structure to how they operate. The people higher in the OCG may want other people to be in direct contact with the drugs, thus they may recruit other people to take that risk. These OCG’s can have a detailed web of connections. And when asked which network is more efficient they responded with a strong consensus (see Figure 1 for question).

![Networking Question](image)
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Participant 3 - So that’s how drug dealing works [B]. I’m not saying that’s more efficient, that’s just how it works. It’s all about higher up the chain you are the less people you want to know... because people tell cops that they are dealing. So the least number of people you have involved, there is less chance of that getting out. But if you know, if it’s got out you know where it’s come from. So you wouldn’t do that [A] cuz that’s too many people knowing. Whereas that’s four people knowing n they have their own customer base. Always that one [B]. Line 88-97.

This was the typical response for a majority of the participants, except one. Network B is how drug smuggling can operate, a strict hierarchy in which the higher-level members are often a tight nit group. The highest member may keep their trusted members very close and the other members at a distance. However, he suggests that it may not be effective; it is just how it has developed. Although, he contrasts himself by explaining then why B is more efficient due to the distancing compared to A. Police involvement can be a rational fear; a real prospect and someone can never be too careful, thus distancing from other members can be essential. It is perceived to be a very balanced thought process in terms of risk aversion. Conversely, another participant has a different view on network efficiency.

Participant 6 - This person here [A] won’t get nicked because that person their won’t get closer to the commodity to get arrested, as there are too many people around him. Everyone in this particular area could be possible informants but having said that none of them are close enough to the source. People, the next one up the chain and the next one up the chain may get nicked, but this person won’t. This person here [B] you’ve not got much in between the chain, you’ve got this lieutenant there when he gets nicked, what happens if he has a bad day he gets nicked, he gets nicked and he gets nicked. Line - 253-261.

Accordingly, network A is more efficient. The leader of A is assumed to be in a stronger position due to more distancing, because too many people blur the lines to the leader and thus there could be less chance of them being connected to the drugs. Moreover, in network B, if a large proportion of the group is arrested, then it may be harder to find more trusted members to replace them, as their connections may be not as strong. Whereas in A there can be more trusted people to replace someone if they are arrested. These groups are perceived to be very expendable and fluid. This participant mentions how OCG’s appear to be selfish. The leader is often only concerned about themselves. They may want more people between them and the lower status people, and if someone is caught then they are replaceable. Friendships are perhaps not of a concern.

Participant 5 - They are fluid and loose in the sense that if you mess up you’re out ... So you can lose your position within in the group by messing up being arrested or by someone close to you being arrested. Line - 286- 293.

Not matter of someone’s status within a group they can be expendable. He still recognises that there is a hierarchical structure, although if law enforcement become involved then all connections may be broken. OCG’s can be very rational, they may forget about personal
connections or friendships, it can be all about the business and their concern with further police involvement. Suggesting the perceived selfish nature of these groups. Police involvement can be a serious issue for any group. Additionally, is there a gender divide within these groups?

Participant 5 - Ooooo. Yea mainly men err women tend to have lower roles. Err partly because of the violence. You know there’s some nasty women in the world cuz I’ve met a few but actually. Women seem not to have it in em to say to a group of blokes I want you to go n shoot him ... There’ll have women at lower levels but the top, men ... And the women were mainly couriers. Err so mainly men. Line 337-355.

These smuggling OCG’s are viewed as male dominated. It appears that women conform to the general societal stereotype. Although, he does admit that there can be evil women who could commit such acts, but it may not be a regular occurrence. Yet, it appears to be ordinary for a male to order a shooting. He appears to be more negative about women and labels them as evil, possibly because it could break the gender stereotype. Women often remain at the lower status roles; they may be the mule and be expendable. They may not be in the higher rankings due to their more maternal nature and the high degree of physical violence that could occur.

Participant 5 - Yea well the role of women often on a low level is cuz you’ve got a lot more knacks and crannies to hide the drugs in and errr because less women get stripped searched. ... So it is to make it look more natural and and we get women carrying drugs around on the school run, as they aren’t going to get stopped you know. They pile the kids into the car, oh we are just stopping at such and such’s house, and deliver the drugs. Couriers because they do drive around more. Line 357 – 369.

As women can be more inclined to fulfil stereotypical roles such as the school run, there may be less of chance of apprehension, as it appears to be normal. He mentions how, yes, women can be of a lower stature within the group. However, they can be successful, as they could rely on the chivalrous and stereotypical behaviour that is accustomed to them, along with physical differences. He possible perceives that they are very clever in which they can exploit their gender roles. Again, it is very rational and calculating behaviour for risk aversion. They may be purposely choosing women for the mule role, as they may be more successful.

3.2 Superordinate theme 2: Police Officers opinions on the person behind the drug smuggle.

3.21 The annoyance of drug smuggling.

This was a rather apparent theme throughout all of the interviews. All of the police officers stated some level of frustration about the drug smuggler or the OCG. They were also annoyed at some of the current England and Wales legislation and they recommended certain changes in order prevent further smuggling.

Participant 7 - We are trying to play catch up. And the issue is we have to show our tactics and how we proof things and then they learn from that and then they change theirs. Line 302-305.
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The police are observed to be in a ‘cat and mouse’ chase with the smugglers. He appears to be frustrated with the current legislation, as they cannot be proactive. A good OCG member could research the Police’s new tactics and utilize this, via quickly managing the new risk that has approached them, and find a new method. To beat OCG’s there should possibly be a shade of secrecy about the police’s tactics likewise, there is often secrecy with the OCG. The police cannot be proactive if all of their techniques are available. If policing is not effective and efficient then perhaps there can be no results, thereby; there appears to be a high amount of frustration with policy decisions.

Participant 6 - We should have phone tapping. Not to everybody but to be able to listen to the right people. Err again it’s, you. We do have it but it’s in London at [name] you have to have, a liaison officer has to listen to it, who then has to ring you. It it’s, they do it. They’ll listen 24 hours a day. When I was in [Country] errr the minute I made contact with the target n he’d given me is number and I’d sent him a text. They’d got it an they could listen to conversations from there on. They’d got his number n they’d got mine. That was it. Safer for everyone. Line - 662-672.

Due to the UK’s apparent conservative nature, it appears not to be reasonable to phone tap, which is annoying for this participant. Accessible phone tapping could lead to empirical proof that may not require covert policing, which could put a number of people in a lot of danger. He is further annoyed at the seemingly laborious nature in the UK to achieve a phone tap. He acknowledges that there could be issues of privacy for the public, but he rationalises that to have proof of the offenders actions, is more of a priority and safer. This annoyance lies deeper within the Criminal Justice System too.

Participant 5 - En ya the courts have changed a lot since they came out, it’s all about the positioning on the sentencing guidelines. Rather than I’m really sorry. They used to just say I’m sorry err. I asked a solicitor when I was a young cop and what do you actually say to someone when you go to court. Say sorry a lot, get a job offer, get your girlfriend pregnant errrrr an wear a suit. And now nobody wears a suit. Most of em get their girlfriend pregnant and nobody says sorry. It’s all about fitting in those sentencing guidelines. Line 634-642.

There is a persistent view of frustration with the sentencing guidelines. This participant views that there is almost a lack of respect today for the system from the criminals. They may not care about how they present themselves or achieving sympathy; they can be seen as being selfish and conniving in order to have a reduced grade, and this perhaps appals this participant. There is almost an absence of accepting responsibility. These officers have showed their varying issues with the Criminal Justice System, and it needs to change in order for effective policing and desistance from crime. Although it is not all negative.

3.22 Drug Smugglers perceived foolishness and their need for reputation.
The officers reported on many occasions of how they perceived that some have taken idiotic attempts to be successful. That need for money and reputation can force these people to do
what the officers believe is thoughtless. In addition, it appears that they are sometimes entertained by these attempts and it perhaps makes them enjoy their job – as they are the ones that occasionally are a step ahead.

Participant 1-2 - R2: you still get the daft lads who, who I’ve had experience with a few years ago, that they sat in a boat n they go across [Sea]. N we watched them do this, in our surveillance vehicle. They set across the [Sea] the busiest shipping lane in the world, to [place], in an inflatable boat with a motor on the back, to pick up cocaine from [place] you know. N that’s the kind of risk they’ll go to... It was only because we had the intelligence in what was happening, that we got anywhere near that. Line 219-227.

Some may be foolish and are perceived to take irresponsible risks in order to get their reward, i.e. using a rubber boat. He perhaps belittles them and views them as reckless. Although, he contrasts himself within this statement, as he mentions that without intelligence the police may not have known about this adventure. Therefore, the people in question who are evading customs via their own unconventional methods may be quite clever. Furthermore, he reports that their perceived stupidity could also be down to them attempting to travel in a busy shipping lane, which can be extremely dangerous. Although, it may be more risky to their payday if they travel on a ship or plane. Thus, they manage the risk and make their own way. However, it might not just be their travels in which they are perceived to be foolish.

Participant 6 - And of course they can’t resist, they can’t resist Snapchat and all that stuff. They will take photos of their own drugs and their drink. N they will take photos of piles of cash and firearms and that’s how they get caught. It’s ridiculous, because the technologies there. Line 484-487.

Smugglers can create many inventive ways to prevent detention. However, some are seen as foolish in their behaviour, as they may want to show off and brag about their consignment or their money. This behaviour could contrast the more thorough behaviour of before. It is unknown to whether this behaviour is limited to the lower status people. The higher status people appear to be more organised, rational and risk aware, thereby, maybe they would not take such an unnecessary risk. A person at a low level, who might want to increase their kudos, might not understand the risks as fully compared to someone of a higher status. They may only be thinking in the short term and not the longitudinal impacts of their actions.

Participant 4 - It’s about kudos isn’t it. N to be considered a drug smuggler. Although, you wouldn’t want to be known as that. If you were the, that would be the last thing you would want to be known as. You are just drawing attention to yourself aren’t you? So everybody wants a low profile, but within that circle, you need the reputation, the reputation of that’s what you are... But I do think, within that, within that circle then the reputation is everything especially if you’re that level, the importation level, n you’re an organized crime group then your reputation as an organized crime group, it’s massive. Line 152-161.

A good OCG may not want any attention of a smuggler label attached on to them in society due to perspective Police involvement. There appears to be two levels of kudos. There is the www.internetjournalofcriminology.com
kudos that seems be non-existent in society; they should blend in. However, when it comes to the kudos and reputation within the OCG, it is something that could be strongly preferred, such as behaviour that produces power such as fear and intimidation. It can become their identity and appears to be of extreme importance for their individuality. Further on from this is how the police can even support this reputation even when apprehension occurs.

**Participant 5 - This is one of me big things to cops when I talk to. If someone is a criminal, then they are a criminal, like there’s one in [location] called [Name] and everyone calls him [Name]. No it’s not, it’s [Surname] or oi twat come here. You do have to be very careful, they do live up to their reputation and cops help them do it sometimes. Oh, hello Mr [Surname] and what? You know treat them like a criminal. Line 211-217.**

If smugglers are slightly empowered by the officers then they may bring their fierce reputation to prison, which could have serious consequences. As such, these people should be called ‘oi twat’ or not referred to as ‘MR’. These negative and dehumanising labels could have originated because of the lack of respect that the participant has for that member of society. In his view, they have perhaps committed a crime against society and he may believe that they do not deserve to be treated with any reverence. This behaviour may not help that particular person desist from crime, if they are treated like a criminal and labelled as one then how can they move on from this identity?

3.3 Superordinate theme 3: Attitudes on punishment for drug smuggling.

3.3.1 Beliefs upon desistance

In the previous section, labelling was drawn upon and how that may not aid the desistance process, due to the negative identity as a criminal. There is a rather consistent view upon how the punishment should be dealt within in England and Wales. There is a main view that these people could not change from their criminal past, thus punitive punishment is needed. However, others were more optimistic.

**Participant 1-2 - R1: The cases I can think about because perhaps they have only been sent for 4 or 5 years, I know that they then come out n carried on. N I know of one where he is actually carrying on while he is in prison. Errrr I don’t think you can change them. I think they are all. It it’s, from what I’ve seen, it’s money, it’s just money. It’s an easy way of making money. Line - 347-351.**

Smuggling can be very similar to a legal career and thus how can you change people’s rational view for material acquisition. Possibly, because of his negative experiences, he has a somewhat pessimistic view of desistance. Smugglers are perceived to not be victims of society; they are greedy criminals. He shows further annoyance for the lack of years of punishment. They need to be punished more in his view, although what could that accomplish, as prison may not have been a deterrent before they started their criminal career. Thus would the reason be to keep them away from society, but when they come out, they may become a problem again for the police.
Participant 6 - Yea well, yea. They do need to lock these people up, cus they are a danger to society. And it’s as simple as that. Whichever way your parcel it, they need to be locked up. Cuz it’s not just about drugs. With drugs comes the violence, the prostitution, people trafficking. An so they do need to, society need to be protected from them. Line - 585-589.

These can be very dangerous people, not respectable businessmen. They can have control over a lot of other dangerous people and schemes and he has a very firm view that they should not be in society. He states that there may be many conservative and liberal views that may portray the smuggler alternatively, but public safety is the priority. His view can be perceived as pessimistic, as there is perhaps no consideration to the smuggler, he may label them as their crime. Rehabilitation should occur; otherwise, there will be constant revolving door of crime. However, there was strong view that rehabilitation was impossible.

Participant 4 - I think you have gone beyond rehabilitative on drug smuggling. Rehabilitation for some crime yes, but once you are into drug smuggling, you are way beyond that. You can’t rehabilitate someone that they are, the incentive is money. So there’s not, what is there to rehabilitate. What put them into a program that’s says that moneys not good. Hahah. Like hypnotize them to say you don’t need money. Oh no you are way beyond that. Line- 521-527.

Participant four appears to find it humorous at the prospect that you could change a smuggler. He laughs at potential programs and even mocks at hypnotism. Again, they are perhaps not viewed a victims; they are often calculated people who are just greedy. This participant may also not see beyond the criminal in terms of their past; they could have been victims themselves. He is perhaps very fatalistic, as he perceives that these people cannot be altered once they have taken this path. However, he sees that nothing needs to be changed. He somewhat does not view them as evil criminals; they are just people who want to make money, like every other member of society. However, this negative view was not universal within the sample.

Participant 5 - It should be both and I think that’s where we fail. Errr we bring, we lock em up and we bring em out and we monitor them, but I’m a big believer in old, when someone comes out for prison on license they should be forced into work. Not work houses, but similar a sort of thing, where they fill their day doing something good and worthwhile than, oo what we gonna do, oh hay up mate, come an have beer. My mates got a good business at the moment in coke, are you interested? And that’s how they get sucked straight back in. So they ought to be more rehabilitation as part of their punishment. Line 706—714.

When leaving prison having the wrong company and no will power to resist could cause them to re-join the OCG - it can be an easy and recognisable way to make money. Rehabilitation is vital, but there also needs to a punishment; their behaviour is unacceptable, although desistance could be included in order to possibly reduce crime. Consequently, if they are forced into work then they may want to lead a legal life, as they may not be bored and frustrated. However, if their job is tedious and it does not give them the financial rewards they are familiar with, then forcing someone into work may not lead them to the desistance process. This participant has a
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more positive view than others do, although he does not recognise that if someone does not have the motivation to change then you cannot force someone to.

Participant 6 - You can rehabilitate someone till the cows come home but if they. The [Nationality] have got it right, in relation to penalties. If someone in [Country] is arrested then the city hall from the area that they err arrested, if they go to prison will adopt that person. They call it Adopt an Offender. And they visit them in prison and they say to them you’re gonna get released in 6 months time, have to get somewhere to live, have you got a job and if so, where. If they haven’t got anywhere to live and they’ve got no income. The city hall will find them somewhere to live and they will make sure their benefits starts as soon as they leave prison. Line - 597-606.

Conversely, though, this participant does recognise that rehabilitation could only work on someone who wants to change. For desistance to occur, belief in them is required, but a blank refusal to try may not help. If someone has a supportive and positive network behind him or her, along with a house and a job then they may be more likely to desist from crime. Leaving a person to fend for themselves may not help, as they may revert back, because they may have no positive and encouraging environment in order to desist from crime. He believes that the UK needs to be productive and actively help someone desist.

3.4 Superordinate theme 4: Impact of the 21st Century.

3.4.1 The usefulness of technological developments
Technology has developed rapidly in the past decade and it has affected every environment, either in a positive or negative manner. The exact locations of potential offenders could be mapped. Whereas it is, negative due to the criminals possibly being able to evade detection effectively.

Participant 5 - So what we need to address differently is drug smuggling on a large scale but drug smuggling on a smaller individual scale. But we’ve had a lad, a 15 year old lad die who’s bought every single drug and he’s bought everything off the internet, errr from abroad and had them posted to his house and that’s new. That’s the last couple of years really. Line - 7-12.

The internet has perhaps made drugs very accessible and anonymous for people who previously may not have known where to start. The police can try to gather intelligence about individuals but without being able to view their communications; technology can be more of a hindrance. This anonymity may have made the Police’s job increasing more difficult and frustrating, as there can be no attachment, other than the anonymous dark website or the postal service, thus the Police are perhaps in a constant pursuit. Although it is not all negative for them.

Participant 4 - I mean talking about the drug smugglers not just the cops, cause the cops, I mean. Can surveil people, bugging people. I mean talk about, I mean everybody knows it happens. I mean filming people doing it, which you couldn’t do before. So you’ve got, the
evidence you could provide as well as cop. You’ve got visual evidence, audio evidence, you can track people can’t you, you can see where they’ve bin and gone. Line - 384-399.

Some technological developments can positively aid the police. It may be less time consuming and cost effective, as now there can be covert, instant, autonomous and accurate filming. This participant appears to be very admirable of the changes; it seems to make his job of securing convictions easier, as there could be reliable and empirical proof. Additionally again it can be safer; there may be no need to manually follow someone, it can be completed remotely. A majority of these participants were positive about how technology has helped them, although only one did seem to acknowledge that technology has not helped in terms of locating drugs.

Participant 1-2 - R1: I’m not sure that the technology on our side has helped us as much as it probs could. I mean detection of drugs and stuff. I mean they have been experimenting with sniffer machines n stuff ant they. I think we still rely on dogs a lot don’t we [laughter]. Technology wise dogs haven’t really moved on [laughter] in the past thousand years av they. They probably use a bit more, they’ve got the advantage I’d say. They are probs a bit ahead of us in some aspects aren’t they? Line- 267-273.

There is possible humour at the Police in this statement, who may still rely on rudimental methods of drug control. This could suggest that he is embarrassed by their own technological standards, compared to the perhaps more technological advanced smugglers. This is conceivably frustrating for the police, as they may be constantly playing catch up. When they do create something, the advanced smugglers could easily adapt to this new development. Technology has perhaps positively developed the underworld of drug smuggling and aided the police. Yet, technology could also be more problematic for both groups.

3.42 The influence of the media upon drug smuggling.

The media in the 21st century has developed dramatically over the past decade; it has become ever more pervasive and accessible to anyone of any age. Moreover, it should be considered to its impact upon drug smuggling. When participants are asked about the glamorisation of drugs from the TV show Breaking Bad (2008), this participant responded with following statement.

Participant 5 - But Breaking Bad has, we hardly ever get crystal meth in this country but it made people think, yea it’s good and its attracted people to it, and you can buy it on the internet on these Dark websites. People buy crystal meth who weren’t bothered before. So it has developed an interest. And in fact we’ve got a lad selling something in [location] at the moment and he says it’s crystal meth and its blue. ... It should never be blue, it should be completely clear and that’s to see how pure it is. And err all he’s doing is putting blue food die in something. Line 600-608.

Breaking Bad (2008) has perhaps glamourized crystal methamphetamine (crystal meth), as it is now a somewhat sort after product. The media in his view may have a negative influence, glamourize this underworld, and perhaps make this ‘veil of mystery’ exciting (Antonopoulos and Papanicolaou 2008, pp 425). He points out the smugglers inventive skills and possible
desperation in order to achieve a sale; they may be deceiving people into believing that they have re-created *Breaking Bad’s* (2008) wonder drug. The internet also has expanded this underworld and maybe made creating a solid case against smugglers extremely hard, due to anonymity. However, the media does not always have a negative influence.

**Participant 7** - *I think things like Locked up Abroad are a decent deterrent, you know it’s nice to be showing the public these are the risks that you are actually taking, it’s like educating people about smoking it’s the same thing. Make people aware of the risk. Line 333-336.*

Scaring people of the horrors that could happen to them is maybe a good deterrent. This program could denounce the success stories that may surround the OCG’s when they are attempting to recruit someone and could put the consequences into reality. He appears to be pleased with this type of media, as it could show the harsh truth of drug smuggling; it is not often a glamourous life surrounded by money and power, it is frequently of desperate or greedy people who are eventually caught. However much of a deterrent this program can be, it is not that simple.

**Participant 5** - *I think it scares some, but it also makes people think oh if that’s gonna happen to me I’ll just have to be more careful. Because we’ve still got people prepared to take the risk, So yea It scares em but not enough to put em off, enough to make em think well how did they get caught. That’s what it makes em think. Line - 616-620.*

It can be like a school of crime for some people. Participant 5 perceives how there are people irrespective of the risks may smuggle. They could be calculating in order to minimise the risks and one method could be viewing this program. They may learn from a whole series of programs of what led people to be a caught. They can develop their methods to prevent these costs from reality. He perceives that these people may not be lucky chancers. They can be serious logical people who may do a considerable amount of research. This is why these people can be difficult to catch.

### 3.5 Results Summary

These participants understood in grave detail, the workings of drug smuggling. The length of service has portrayed how deeply they grasp how OCG’s operate. Smuggling can be harmful to a prosocial society, its hierarchal structure can generate difficulty when attempting to apprehend the higher status people – they can be deemed as untouchable. Smugglers are perhaps sometimes more advanced than the Police are; they remain in a constantly frustrating cat and mouse chase. As such, proactive techniques should be utilized more, but policy or perhaps being out done by the smugglers could be continually holding them back.

When considering the punishment responses and methods of desistance, some views are perhaps draconian. The smugglers punishment should be more punitive, due to pessimism with regards to rehabilitation. This could be because of the nature of the participants’ career. They perhaps view smugglers as rational, calculating people, who operate on a revolving door of
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crime and they may not often encounter the ones who do desist. However, others were more liberal and believed in the desistance process. There are reasons to why people commit this crime, and their perception needs to be changed before the external issues can be fixed.

4.0 Discussion
The previous section has alluded to perceptions’ on drug smuggling and the plethora of techniques, motivations and opinions that surround this underworld. Accordingly, a discussion will follow; it will enlighten on the important features of the research and then relate them to previous literature and theoretical philosophies.

There are a selection of themes and strong elements of this research, which can relate to theoretical concepts. Firstly, though Yeşilyurt’s (2014) recommendation for future research should be assessed. He questioned whether ‘law enforcement agencies have enough tools and skills to understand organized crime syndicates in terms of network analysis’ (pp 289). There are some different ideas with regards to network efficiency for OCG’s. Overall though, the participants had the skills that allowed them to effusively understand how drug smuggling and OCG’s function. They grasp the understanding of network analysis – which is understood as ‘how structural properties influence actions outside of the effects of standard solutions, individual attributes, and reciprocal relationships’ (Yeşilyurt’s 2014, pp 282). There is a recognition that there are often more benefits for OCG’s, in terms of risk and reward for the use of separation from others and drugs, compared to lone smuggling. There is some deviation though in terms of structure. This deviation could be one participant’s experience of how certain groups operate. However, generally the underlying principle that higher status members often separate themselves from the drugs remains.

4.1 Literature exploration
To be successful, there are a plethora of techniques adopted by the smugglers. They can be very rational people who calculate every move, they may be smart in their choice of people and the routes they use to smuggle the drugs (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). Consequently, this research provides empirical support for the Rational Choice theory of crime. Hopkins-Burke (2014) refers to the logical mind of criminals; they understand how they can achieve their goals easily, via calculating the costs and benefits of the situation. They may not complete the action if the risk outweighs the incentive and visa-versa (Hopkins-Burke 2014). However, the participants in the current study explain that smugglers may manage the risk that may be posed to them and decrease the costs, instead of not smuggling because the costs are too high. Consequently, they could be considered to more rational in their own mind, as they may be reducing the potential hazard, therefore perhaps reducing the risk and likelihood of being apprehension. Yet, this theory does not recognise the influence that society and other individuals can have upon certain people (Hopkins-Burke 2015). This is something that this research found, as even though smugglers may be rational, if they are threatened then the Rational Choice Theory may not apply, as they may still take the risk no matter of the high
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cost. However, one could be considered still a rational being if they are completing such an act under duress, as they cannot afford for the cost to occur.

This inclination of ‘managing risk’ is an important concept. Smugglers may not eradicate risk; they perhaps control it. Similarly, the Police can manage the risk of the smugglers, as they understand that crime will be constant. This is risk theory. Elliot (2002) explains Beck’s Risk theory. Due to modernisation, there are modern risks that have not been managed effectively, consequently, society has to now, control risk (Elliot 2002). This theory is predominantly based upon environmental disasters either natural or synthetic (Cantelli, Kodate, Krieger 2010). However, it can be applied to smuggling. The smugglers may encounter new technology and problems from the Police; as such, they may need to manage and decrease this new risk, instead of not completing the action. Conversely, the Police can suffer from this risk society too, as McCahill and Norris in 2002 report how the Police cannot afford to be reactive in their methods, there is a requirement for them to be proactive in order to control risk (Hopkins-Burke 2014). Indeed the Police could try to be proactive and therefore control future risk. Although that is increasingly difficult when the Police have to often openly announce their new techniques.

Managing risk is very rational behaviour, and this rationality can also be alluded to with regards to the distancing of the higher status members. They may consciously use the lower status people to handle the drugs and also may not be in any direct contact with these people, as such, this may decrease the chance of apprehension for the leaders (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008 and Antonopoulos and Papanicolaou 2008). These type of networks are thought of as being more efficient because it could may be less time consuming, as the leader may not have to deal with each individual person (Yeşilyurt 2014). There is an agreement in this research that possibly having less people in connection to the leader is more efficient, as there may only be a small number of close trusted people, which is perhaps safer for the group. Although this was not ultimately accepted, as one participant stated that the more people directly connected to the leader but still operating within a hierarchy may be best, as there may be more distancing and blurring between them and the drugs, compared to only four people. However, overall they all agreed that separation from being in direct contact with the drugs often occurs further up the ranks.

An original concept that was brought out of this research is the indication that the Police can be increasingly frustrated by drug smuggling. The smugglers are occasionally more advanced than the Police are. Smugglers perhaps learn and understand their techniques, develop and outwit them (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2008). This is a possible paradox as the police should be on par or above the OCG’s in order to combat them, not behind. Yet, they are not always frustrated with the smugglers. Sometimes they are in control and this could lead them into sometimes believing what they perceive as the smugglers being naive; they enjoy what they observe to be the more pitiful efforts to receive a reward. It can be a game of cat and mouse, as on occasions the Police are in control and others they were perhaps out witted by the smugglers.
Another innovative idea is the theme of how the media can affect drug smuggling. Television shows such as *Breaking Bad* (2008) can influence this underworld; as such, people have started to produce blue Crystal Meth. This has an inclination of hyper-reality. Usher and Edwards (1994) cite Baudrillard in 1988 and describe hyper-reality as

‘The communication/media ‘revolution’ means that people are engulfed by ‘information’ to the extent where the distinction between reality and the word/image which portrays it breaks down into a condition of hyperreality’

(pp 11).

The person in the anecdote from participant 5 is maybe confused between the story of blue Crystal Meth and the reality of Crystal Meth. Thereby, lines may become blurred. Furthermore, another program being *Locked up Abroad* can have further insights into hyper-reality. Some participants viewed that this was almost a school of crime. Some smugglers might mix fiction from the program with reality and believe that they could learn from these episodes. They both perhaps do not distance themselves from fiction; they appear to want to make it a reality.

This blurry reality is often because of money. There is a strong consensus for money as the motivation, which could lead to gluttonous behaviour, along with deprivation being a strong contender (Decker and Townsend Chapman 2014 and Baily 2013). Robert Merton in 1938 explains that during the depressionary period in the United States of America (USA), there was an onslaught of crime due to the ambition of success and achieving the American Dream (Hopkins Burke 2014). He complied four categories of people in the USA, but the most relevant category to this research are innovators. These may aim for the American Dream of wealth and success; although may often use criminal methods to achieve this (Hopkins–Burke 2014). They may choose this criminal path due to feelings of strain because legitimate opportunities are blocked, thus they may engage in crime to alleviate their feelings of dissatisfaction (Hopkins–Burke 2014). The need for material acquisition and a lack of societal support causing crime is very coherent. However, his work is solitary to the USA, thereby; could it be extrapolated to other locations? This research supports this concept strongly. Smugglers may want material/monetary success and perhaps because of deprivation, they may not be achieving their goals, consequently they may turn to crime. This could apply to both statuses within an OCG. As both may have blocked opportunities for success, thus they may initially begin a criminal career. These people are not often born wealthy, thus they may all feel deprivation, and just some are more ambitious than others are. This then could develop into greed and a criminal identity for a select few.

Equally, DeKeseredy, Alvi and Schwartz (2006) refer to Lea and Young’s concept of Relative deprivation and build upon Strain Theory. It is possibly not capitalism and the media that portray the American Dream that causes crime – it is conceivably dependent upon on diverse poverty (DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, 2006). Someone’s deprivation can be equated to another, in which can cause jealously and frustration with his or her current situation (DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, 2006). Thereby, prospective smugglers could compare their situation with others and are perhaps discontent, as such, they may smuggle drugs to assuage
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themselves. Yet, not all who feel relative deprivation may turn to crime. Hence, there needs to be an element of moral fibre too.

Fiscal motivations are not the only incentive in this research though. There is the concept of the thrill, excitement and the need for the reputation and kudos. Katz (1988) in his book the Seductions of Crime refers to John McVicar a career criminal, in which he stated that the monetary reward he was receiving was immaterial; he did not desist due to the buzz and adrenaline rush he was attaining from evading and toying with the Police. This behaviour is comparable to this research, which found that toying with the Police is a possible characteristic of drugs/smuggling, along with the craving for the reputation and kudos. They can be motivated via the carnival that results. However, the majority of the smugglers that the sample encountered did not report the smugglers continuation for these particular reasons, unlike McVicar. Thus, the thrill and excitement that accompanies drug smuggling may be motivation for a select few, but for the majority it could be a bonus that is lost when apprehended and people then maybe crave for the excitement among their laborious incarceration. However, because of the participants’ careers they may not encounter such motivations, as the offenders may not explain why they continued, they might be concerned with reducing their sentences.

Generally, though these above ideas pose that these people may belong to a subculture. Perhaps they are different to mainstream society. These people are often ‘dismissed, denounced and canonized; treated at different times as threats to public order’ (Hebdige 1979, pp2). Smugglers could ruin the societal consensus about criminal behaviour, consequently they may form a culture surrounded by ‘secrecy, masonic oaths [and are a part of] an Underworld’ (Hebdige 1979, pp 4). All of the participants grasped the excess of rules that governed these OCG’s, in which trust and privacy were frequently the key to success, in a career that lies within the territory of criminal activity. The motivations of such individuals can also be indicated to in terms of subcultural theory. The perception of the kudos of smuggling according to Albert Cohen in 1955 can create a subculture (Hopkins-Burke 2014). These working class people want to obtain a status within society that is valued (Hopkins Burke 2014). ‘He argued that juvenile gang members in fact stole for the fun of it and took pride in their acquired reputations for being tough and hard’ (Hopkins-Burke 2014 , pp 147). This research strongly suggested the need for a reputation; some smugglers perhaps need the status and power due to status frustration. Thereby, they may turn to an OCG to enable these and therefore may feel content.

These subcultures are often efficient and very homogenous. Women in these OCG are usually, vulnerable, desperate and did not occupy high statuses. Some participants did not reject that women can become powerful in these OCG, although the majority of them are mules (Campbell 2008). These ideas have connotations within the Chivalry Thesis. This concept is primarily interested in the lower custodial sentencing of women and this has a considerable amount of support (see Embry and Lyons 2012, Koons-Witt, Sevigny, Burrow & Hester 2012 and Doerner and Demouth 2014 ). Rodriguez, Theodore and Gang (2006) explain the Chivalry Thesis in terms of how males aim to be courteous and protective towards women as they can be defenceless. Thus, they may receive less punitive punishment. Chivalry could be applied to
this research. The higher status males may aim to protect the women from the high amount of violence and danger. Thus, they may act chivalrous towards them and keep them at the lower, less dangerous levels. Furthermore, few participants in this research did distinguish that OCG’s can exploit gender stereotypes, in their favour, by the female mule sometimes conforming to their gender role (Campbell 2008). These mules could conform to their gender role of the nurturing and innocent female. Consequently, it may not look out of the ordinary, and maybe due to the chivalrous nature of the male public, they would not approach the females. As such, female drug smugglers could be very successful.

However, the participants did not discount that some women could be of high status role. They were sometimes particularly harsher upon these women and labelled them as ‘nasty women’. Belknap (2014) enlightens this concept via explaining that women who break their societal gender role can be viewed as eviler than their male counterparts are. Thus, when women are in a higher status role of an OCG, wherein violence is a realistic prospect, it perhaps does not align with the stereotypical nurturing view of women.

All of the above motivations are all equally viable, yet when a person is apprehended, specifically a lower status member traditionally, then the rational motivations and responsibility are often lowered. These acts are inclined with Sykes and Matza’s Techniques of Neutralisation, in which Antonopoulos, Winterdyk and John (2005) explain. Out of the main five techniques, only one suited the excuses that the participants repeatedly heard. The smugglers would sometimes deny all responsibility, including they did not know they were in possession of drugs, they were pressured into such acts by other smugglers, as such, they may believe they are free from any responsibility (Antonopoulos, Winterdyk and John 2005). Consequently, they maybe neutralising their guilt, thereby, desistance may not befall even when apprehended, as they could be in denial. However, this research did suggest that the higher members often do not bother to create such excuses as they are to ingrained, of which is interesting, as it would be thought that they may neutralise their guilt and thus continue upon this career. However, due to the sample choice, high-level smugglers may naturalise their guilt, but the police may not encounter these excuses. This this is something that could be further researched.

Guilt neutralisation leading denial is something that does not aid desistance and they may enter the Police radar once again. These participants held a strong belief that these people could not change their criminal identity, possibly due to the frequent revolving door they observe. However, a minority were optimistic. They requested that reintegration should be more of a priority. They touched upon the need for employment; a lack of boredom; support and adequate housing. These ideas are something of similarity to Travis Hirschi’s control theory. Pratt, Gau and Franklin (2011) explain four components to this theory in how people could control themselves in order not to commit crime…
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• He necessitates upon the importance of pro-social attitudes. These attachments to society could control possible deviating behaviour.
• Bonds are of critical importance. If illegal behaviour were not advocated by society, then committing such acts could decay this positive relationship. Consequently, criminal behaviour may not occur.
• This next idea is something of similarity to employment. If people are kept occupied then they may not participate in crime, due to not enough available time and no boredom.
• The following concept is something that is the panicle. It is the belief that a person holds concerning the law and how important adhering to that is.

(Source: Pratt, Gau and Franklin 2011)

These are valuable concepts, in order for people to resist crime, they need to have pro social bonds/attitudes of importance to them and be occupied, and these topics were adhered to in this research. However, this theory does not explain the importance of external factors such as housing. Rehabilitation Services Group and Maruna (2010) explain that there are more variations for the desistance process...

‘Getting older and maturing; Family and relationships; Sobriety; Employment; Hope and Motivation; Something to give; Having a place within a social group; Not having a criminal identity; Being believed in’ (pp 1-2).

These participants did suggest that desistance is rather simple, in that, if they have a job and a house then they will not commit crime. They did not fully grasp the complex desistance process (Maruna 1999). As such, it is not an event; it can be a hard zigzagging process of reoffending, to eventually gain full desistance (Guilfoyle 2014). Although, there is a pivotal acknowledgment from the participants in the belief of change, which is vital.

A criminal identity was drawn upon from Rehabilitation Services Group and Maruna for one of the requirements of desistance. If someone is labelled as a criminal then, how can they move on? Participant 5 explains how criminals should possibly not be shown any respect and they perhaps should be treated as a lesser member of society. However, conversely later on he is one of the advocates for desistance. He perhaps does not recognise the significance of his negative labelling and may believe desistance is mainly concerned with external features. As when people are labelled as evil, they may begin to self-identify themselves as that label (Hopkins-Burke 2014). As such, they may adhere to that label and not desist crime. So, with all of the good intentions of participant 5 for desistance, his negative censure may not change the smugglers identity into a pro-social one. There is no need for the criminal to be punished twice.

In summary, a number of theories that have gained more prominence than others have. Two rather important theories considering drug smuggling are Rational Choice and Strain Theory. Smugglers may be logical people who calculate the costs and then manage that risk, while others can be desperate people who are strained by society. There appears to be two levels of drug
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smuggling, the higher and lower level members, which can coincide with the two main behaviours, respectively. Although, initial motivations of strain could be applied to both member levels. However, when especially the lower level members are apprehended, the more common latter motivations disappear and an onslaught of lesser responsibility ensues. Moreover, probably because some smugglers rationality, the sample did not view that recidivism for offenders could occur. Consequently, desistance theory may not apply. Albeit, a minority did recognise the need for distance and control theory, as such it should be employed more.

5.0 Conclusion
The ideographic approach has enabled for an in depth qualitative report that has a considerable amount of verstehen. There are many interesting concepts. Police Officers understand the complex techniques and OCG networks. Albeit with some variation. There are a number of items for consideration that have been brought out of this research.

- This thesis has highlighted that there are at least two distinctive levels when considering drug smuggling. On the one hand, there are the rational higher status people who often distance themselves from the commodity. They can identify themselves as businessmen who are calculated and rational. On the other hand, at a lower level, the mule is sometimes exploited and can be fuelled by desperation and vulnerability.
  - Albeit, more minor motivations consist of the thrill and kudos of smuggling.
- This thesis has revealed that distancing can be a technique for the complex OCG networks. This can point towards notions of separation. Higher-level people may detached themselves from the drugs and the lower ranked people, for safety and a lesser chance of apprehension, because there could be no direct ties.
- This thesis has also exposed that a combination of tactics are often utilised in order for the smugglers to succeed. This regularly fluctuates from selecting the right people who will ‘be smart’ and act in a way to not draw attention, to the pure luck that law enforcement are not being vigilant. Smugglers can control a number of elements, but the latter cannot be as manageable and can rely on chance.
- This thesis forces us to acknowledge that smuggling methodology has been revolutionised in the 21st century. The internet has possibly expanded the smugglers networks dramatically. They can communicate anonymously and track their packages remotely. Technology has also aided the police too. Yes, technology in drug detection is perceived to not have developed considerably; yet, the ability to gain empirical evidence against someone has become significantly easier.
- This thesis has tapped into police perceptions and highlights select tensions between feelings of pleasure and frustration. They enjoy what they perceive to be the more pathetic attempts that occur. Yet, the ingenious smugglers, who sometimes manage to outwit them, increasingly frustrates them. The former appears to be a less of a manifestation, which could lead to pure pleasure when it appears.
This thesis points towards perceptions of smugglers as career criminals with pessimism about the potential for desistance. There is often a blank refusal to accept that these calculating people want to desist from crime. Although optimism for recidivism for smugglers is adhered to also, but in the minority. Proactive methods for desistance are required, as often prison does not work alone as a deterrent. This is backed up by Summers, Townsley, Laycock (2007) who write in summery that policy makers should note that, ‘Merely locking people up will not alleviate the problem nor will prohibition-orientated polices by themselves be sufficient to cripple the drug supply business’ (pp 17).

Additionally, there are a number of recommendations for action that this research can point towards.

1. Funding is an issue, whilst currently being in a recession it may be difficult to achieve such aims. Although, there should more staff within crime squads focusing on certain OCG’s, instead of a small team focusing on a plethora of OCG’s. Consequently, this increase in concentration and proactiveness should hopefully decline their many schemes and hold on society. Funding is required from Central Government, due to drug smuggling being a nationwide issue. Initially the more serious OCG locations should receive funding first.

2. For rational and calculating career criminals, desistance motivation is perhaps unlikely to befall them. As such, punishment that is more punitive is required, due to their being often no meaningful deterrent or a considerable lack of time away from society. As currently, someone who is found to be trafficking 5 kg of Cocaine and has a leading role, of which refers to controlling the OCG, could receive 14 years (CPS 2012). Albeit, that maybe a substantial amount of time, although with good behaviour they could be re-joining society and their OCG in half that time. Consequently, the courts should have more power to use more punitive discretion when concerning the career established rational offenders.

3. Nonetheless, desperate and vulnerable people who smuggle to alleviate their deprivation should be given a lesser punishment, as they may be more tameable to the desistance process than someone whose motivation is greed. Currently being vulnerable and exploited is considered in the guidelines, but they can still be given serious punitive punishment (CPS 2012). These lower ranked vulnerable people’s punishment should focus more on rehabilitation. The National Probation System have a responsibility to act upon desistance. They need to aid with such developments as employment, housing and pro social support, to prevent the somewhat fatalistic revolving door.

This research has made an original contribution to knowledge, via using primary research to successfully achieve empirical evidence concerning drug smuggling. Albeit, it is still a small, homogenous, localised study which does not account for all Police Officer opinions. Therefore, I would like to shape future research two fold. Firstly, utilizing the perceptions of a larger
Serious and Organised Crime Squad specialising in drugs may be of use. In that, they may be more experienced compared to some of these participants, which could alleviate previously mentioned sample issues. In addition, due to the gender bias in the present study, female perspectives would be welcomed.

Secondly, due to the often pessimistic response from this sample and the repeatedly recurrent revolving door with regards to the Criminal Justice System and social interventions which aim at desistance, it is essential that recidivism should be viewed with optimism and perceived as effective. This could build on Campbell and Hansen’s (abstract 2012) work on desistance from smuggling and the importance of societal connections, media glamorisation and labelling. When methods for desistance are possibly established in the UK, then proactive approaches that may aid recidivism or perhaps decline initial motivations could be employed.

6.0 Appendix

6.1 Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Section 1: Is drug smuggling a serious issue

1. Do you believe that drug smuggling is an issue that needs to be addressed, and why?
   a. What crimes are related to it and do you need to address this or drug smuggling?
   b. In your opinion are there any drugs that are more popular with smugglers?
2. What is your definition of drug smuggling and what drugs do class as smuggling?
   a. Just illegal drugs or cigarettes and alcohol?
3. Do you believe there are different types of drug smugglers – for example prolific and organised crime and one timers?
   a. Can the one timers become the prolific smugglers?
   b. Are the organised crime groups more dangerous than the one timers are and why and if not why not?
   c. Is drug smuggling committed by groups or individuals
      i. Do they have a shared belief and thoughts?
         1. Eg about crime?
         2. Are they different to mainstream society
   d. To what extent do you think that defining someone as a drug smuggler influences their identity of how they see themselves?
   e. Are there types of areas in a city that you are more likely to find drug smugglers?
4. Within organised crime there are certain networks, in your opinion which organised network either A or B would be more efficient and why?
   a. What type of people are in the network – eg close relationships or friends.
   b. Loose/ fluid or hierarchical?
   c. Why do people learn towards groups?
5. Similarly again in organised groups there are certain types of networks, in your opinion which network either A, B or C would be again more efficient and why?


Section 2: Drug smuggling development

1. Do you think organised crime smugglers and one timers motives are the same or different and why?
   a. Do you see that it is a very gendered crime?
   b. What is the role of women in drug smuggling?
2. In your opinion do you believe that people who smuggle drugs in organised groups may also have another reason to continue?
   a. Thrill and excitement of getting away with it?
3. Do you think that there is a factor that people could become addicted to the pleasure of smuggling drugs?
   a. Eg if they have enough money they do it for the thrill?
4. Do you believe that when people are smuggling they think of the risks?
   a. Or is it an afterthought?
   b. And if they do get caught do they give any excuses?
5. How do you think that the smugglers reduce the risk/chance of them being apprehended- what techniques are used?
   a. Doing research
b. Do groups factor in that they could lose X amount? And what would that lose be?
c. What state of mind is needed? (can they get rid of fear)
d. Not to divulge any information?

6. Technology has developed in the 21st century and do you believe that the underworld of drug smuggling has been impacted and why for police and smugglers?
   a. TV
   b. Phones
   c. Internet
   d. Media is more accessible.
   e. Travel

7. Speaking of TV do you believe that there is an argument that programs such as Banged Up Abroad and Breaking Bad have glamourized drug smuggling and people cannot tell reality from fiction?

Section 3: How to combat drug smuggling

1. Do you agree that organised crime syndicates and single timer drug should be treated differently in terms of punishment and why?
   a. Taking the lead role or lesser role?

2. Do you agree with the different extremes of punishment that exist around the world?
   a. Should be adopt a similar basis?
   b. Should British people be extradited to the UK or serve full sentence where they committed the crime?
   c. Would harsh punishments eg of 25 years deter people?
      i. What Is needed to deter someone?

3. Should the punishment for smuggling be punitive or rehabilitative?
   a. Can you help people whose crimes are mainly economic (if they said that)
   b. But people know the punishment in South America and still commit crimes?

4. Do you believe that is it a very rational crime for both sets of smugglers?
   a. Same motivation at the start?
   b. Does it change when you become a prolific smuggler? (only if believe they can become addicted)

5. Should there be a proactive or a reactive movement towards drug smuggling and the causes?
   a. But can you help poverty?
   b. Should you be on top of it and actively looking for drug smugglers or wait till there is someone who has been caught?
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