

# UNITED KINGDOM

Georgios A. Antonopoulos, Georgios Papanicolaou, Claire Tupling & Louise Wattis<sup>1</sup>

## (Preamble) COUNTRY/LOCALE:

### a) Overview of general (national) population:

The United Kingdom (UK) comprises of four territories: England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. These four territories co-exist in a single state; however, there is some devolution of power. The chapter generally refers to the UK; however, information is not always available on the level of the UK so there are many instances in which we refer to England and Wales. The population of the UK is approximately 61.8 million of which the English population constitutes 81.5% (Office for National Statistics, 2011). 40.1 million or 65.1% of the population of the UK is between 16-64 years old and constitute the biggest age group of the country. According to Matheson (2010), the proportion aged 16 to 64 increased from 64 to 65 per cent in the last decade, while the share of those aged 65 and over also increased from 15% to 16%. The remaining age group is 0-15 year olds which are approximately 11.5 million and constitute 19% of the overall population. In relation to gender, women constitute the slight majority of the UK (approximately 31.4 million) as opposed to approximately 30.5 million men.

According to 2001 Census data, the majority of the UK population in 2001 are White (92%), whereas only 7.9 % belong to other minority ethnic groups. Indians are the largest minority ethnic group (22.7% of minority groups), followed by Pakistanis (16.1%), those of mixed ethnic backgrounds (14.6%), Black Caribbeans (12.2%), Black Africans (10.5), and Bangladeshis (6.1%). The remaining minority ethnic groups each accounted for less than 0.5 per cent of the UK population. In England, Wales and Scotland, the number of people who came from an ethnic group other than White grew by 53 per cent between 1991 and 2001, from 3.0 million in 1991 to 4.6 million in 2001 (Office for National Statistics, 2004). It should be noted that the sizes of minority ethnic groups vary considerably by territory, region and locality.

### b) Information about the country (in focus):

The UK is the third largest economy in Europe after Germany and France. Over the past two decades, the government has greatly reduced public ownership and contained the growth of social welfare programs. Agriculture is intensive, highly mechanised, and efficient by European standards, producing about 60% of food needs with less than 2% of the UK labour force (1.9% of the workforce). The UK has large coal, natural gas, and oil resources, but its oil and natural gas reserves are declining. Services (a sector employing approximately 80% of the workforce of the country), particularly banking, insurance, and business services, account by far for the largest proportion of GDP while industry continues to decline in importance. In 2008 the global financial crisis hit the economy particularly hard, due to the importance of its financial sector. The US, major economies of the EU as well as China constitute the major trading partner of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The names of the authors are in alphabetical order. The authors would like to thank Liam Corby and Emma Richardson who worked as research assistants in the project.

UK (U.S. Department of State, 2011; see also Office for National Statistics website for detailed accounts per economic sector).

The United Kingdom is a Constitutional Monarchy in which the Head of State is Queen Elizabeth II, although the Head of the Government is the Prime Minister. The legal system is based on common law tradition with early Roman and modern continental influences. The country has non-binding judicial review of Acts of Parliament under the Human Rights Act of 1998, and accepts compulsory International Criminal Justice jurisdiction with reservations (U.S. Department of State, 2011).

**c) Information about the specific locale (city in which the institution resides and the survey was administered):**

Middlesbrough, the specific locale in which the survey was administered is a unitary authority in the North-East of England (in Cleveland County) with a population of approximately 140,500. Of these, 69,100 are males and 71,400 females (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit, 2011). Although Britain is an ageing country, it includes localities with a younger age structure such as Middlesbrough. Specifically, 28% of the population of Middlesbrough is younger than 19 and only 19% are older than 60. However, if we limit our view to the *economically active* population, the picture is similar to the rest of the country (Middlesbrough Council, 2010).

In relation to origin, 95.6% of the population of Middlesbrough was born in the UK, 0.4% was born in the Republic of Ireland, 0.7% in another EU country and a further 3.3% elsewhere. 76% of the population of Middlesbrough identify themselves as 'Christian', whereas 10% of the town's population have no religion altogether. 4.2% designate themselves as 'Muslim', 0.3% as 'Hindu', 0.3% as 'Sikh', and a further 0.3% are followers of 'other religions'. There is also a relatively high percentage (8%) of the population for which religion was not recorded. It is interesting to note that Middlesbrough has the highest percentage of Muslims in the Cleveland County (1.5%), the North-East of England (1.1%) and England & Wales as a whole (3%). Of those people who are aged 16 and over in Middlesbrough, 47.3% live in a couple and are married or re-married, whereas 8.7% are cohabiting, 26.9% are single, 8.8% are separated or divorced 8.4% are widowed. In 2006, 13.8% of the households in Middlesbrough are single parent households when the equivalent national figure is 8.4%.

Middlesbrough is one the most deprived districts on the Government's index of multiple deprivation. One such indicator of this index is unemployment. In 2010, Middlesbrough had the highest unemployment rate in the county (37.8%) and much higher than the national rate which was 26%. In addition, in 2007, 33.3% of the children in Middlesbrough were in poverty, when the equivalent national figure was 21.6%. Finally, data from the 2001 in Middlesbrough indicates that 41% of households had no car, 28.2% of the population were in social housing and 22.3% had a health problem (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit, 2011).

**d) A brief overview concerning the country's/locale's criminal justice system (CJS) in terms of**

The Home Office publishes regular bulletins on the extent and trends in crime. These bulletins are based on data from the British Crime Survey (BCS), a face-to-face victimisation survey, and the police recorded crimes which involve crimes reported to and recorded by the police. Because of the nature of the offences and sensitivity, the BCS does not collect information on a number of offences (e.g. rape) and/or crime that are considered 'victimless' such as possession of drugs. In relation to the police recorded crimes, there are approximately 100 notifiable offences that are

recorded in the official statistics in England and Wales, and they are grouped into major categories (also known as ‘offence groups’) such as ‘Violence against the person’, ‘Robbery’; ‘Fraud and forgery’ etc. The available data from the Home Office suggest that crime in England and Wales is overall in decline in recent years (and specifically after the mid-1990s). According to the 2009/10 BCS, the risk of being a victim of any household crime was higher in the most deprived areas compared with the least deprived areas in England and Wales. In addition, the 2009/10 BCS found that the risk of being a victim of any household crime was higher in urban areas than in rural areas. Finally, police recorded crime figures for England in 2009/10 show that crime rates were higher in areas defined as ‘predominantly urban’, than in areas that were classified as ‘predominantly rural’ (Higgins *et al.*, 2010). Overall, in 2009/10 there were 79 offences recorded per 1,000 population in England and Wales as opposed to 69 in the North East of England, and 85 in Cleveland (the county in which Middlesbrough is located). The rates per offence group in England and Wales, the North East of England, and in Cleveland are summarised in the following table (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Recorded Offences by offence group, England and Wales, North East of England, and Cleveland, rates per 1,000 population, 2009/10

	Violence against the person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Burglary	Offences against vehicles	Other theft offences	Fraud & Forgery	Criminal damage	Drug offences
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	16	1	1	10	9	19	3	15	4
<b>NE of England</b>	13	1	0	8	7	16	2	17	4
<b>Cleveland</b>	17	1	1	10	7	21	1	20	5

Source: Various tables from Flatley *et al.* (2010)

Middlesbrough has one of the highest police recorded incidents rates in the county. Specifically, in 2009/2010 there were 123.1 incidents recorded by the police per 1,000 people. The rates (per 1000 population) for violent crime, sexual offences, robbery, burglary, vehicle crime, theft, and drug offences were 28.4, 2.0, 2.0, 14.1, 20.6, 41.4, and 8.2. The rate for criminal damage was 26.5 per 1000 population. The most recent crime and disorder consultation found that the vast majority of residents of Middlesbrough (81%) identified ‘anti-social behaviour’ as their number one concern. The rate for ‘anti-social behaviour’ in 2009/2010 was 131.8 per 1,000 population (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit, 2011).

An independent study on police expenditure found that police expenditure grew by 48% in real terms from £9.83 billion in 1998/1999 to £14.55 billion in 2008/2009. It also found that much of the burden of this rise fell on local council taxpayers, rather than the Home Office (Mills *et al.*, 2010a). The total expenditure for Magistrates Courts and Crown Courts rose by 17% from 1998/1999 to £1027.89 million in 2008/2009 (Grimshaw *et al.*, 2010), whereas the total expenditure for the National Offender Management Service (NOMS), which manages the prison and probation services in the country was approximately £4.9bn in 2008/09 (Mills *et al.*, 2010b).

According to the 2007/08 British Crime Survey (BCS), 44% of adults in England and Wales were confident that the ‘CJS was effective in bringing people who commit crimes to

justice'. This is higher than the equivalent percentage for 2002/03 which was 39%. Victim and witness satisfaction with the police and other CJS agencies remained stable from 2002/03 to 2007/08. The 2007/08 findings indicate that women were more likely to be confident in the CJS than men, and that levels of confidence in the CJS were more likely to be higher among younger people, minority Ethnic groups, those living in private rented accommodation and those who had not experienced crime in the past 12 months. In 2007/08, the CJS agency with the highest rating by the public was the police (Smith, 2010). Bigger experience with CJS agencies is considered to be a way to improve confidence to the CJS, although recent research has shown that direct experience with a CJS agency has only marginal effect on evaluations (van de Walle, 2009). There is not much evidence in relation to public confidence in CJS agencies in Middlesbrough although there is a small piece of information published by the Cleveland Criminal Justice Board published in 2007. According to the Board, Confidence in the effectiveness of the criminal justice agencies in bringing offenders to justice in Cleveland, the county which Middlesbrough is situated, had increased by a fifth from 2003 to 2007 (Cleveland Criminal Justice Board, 2007).

According to a study conducted in 2007 (Gray *et al.*, 2007), the UK is more supportive of the capital punishment than any other country of Western Europe since 50% of its population *strongly favour* or *somewhat favour* this type of punishment. 47% of the UK population thought that the capital punishment would be a deterrent to murder in the country although they still thought that the most appropriate way of dealing with murder is imprisonment. To the best of our knowledge, there is no published data or evidence about public sentiment concerning capital punishment issues in Middlesbrough.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Previous research has shown that there are clear links between crime rates, fear of crime and criminal justice policy in the UK (see Ditton and Farrall, 2000; Garland, 2001; Farrall, 2006; Farrall and Hay, 2011). This section aims to highlight how the three may relate to each other but acknowledges that mapping direct and unequivocal relationships is problematic. The first expression of fear in relation to crime in the UK has been identified as fear of 'the racialised Other'<sup>2</sup> and occurred amidst the moral panic about black crime in the early 1970s (Hall *et al.*, 1978; Gilroy, 1987; Walklate, 2007). However, crime as a public and political concern in the UK and the attendant concern with fear of crime gathered momentum at the end of the decade as a result of its politicisation (Hall *et al.*, 1978). At the end of the 1970s, the political right focused on and arguably exaggerated the problem of crime (Young, 1992), rendering it an electoral issue and policy concern (see also Savage, 1990). However, this had a base in the actuality of rising crime rates alongside increasing disaffection with welfarism and the rehabilitative ideal (Garland, 2001). Further, as well as rendering crime politically visible, the Conservative government from 1979 onwards adopted a tougher stance on offending, stressing individual responsibility, deterrence and increased punitiveness. This is evidenced in the introduction of a prison building programme, wider use of incarceration for juvenile offenders, a 'political desire' for longer custodial sentences, greater police powers, the cultural erosion of rehabilitation, the

---

<sup>2</sup> Stanko (2000) makes similar parallels with the emergence of fear of crime in the US amidst civil unrest related to racial tension in the late 1960s.

championing of prison as the key means of punishment, and the favouring of situational crime prevention (Farrall, 2006)<sup>3</sup>.

### **Data on fear of crime**

Concern about crime entered the public consciousness from the late 1970s onwards – manifest in ‘new levels of crime and a preoccupation with crime’ (Leys, 2001 cited in Farrall, 2006: 271). Fear of crime per se came into its own as a visible issue with the introduction of the British Crime Survey in 1982 (Walklate, 2007), which aimed to get a more accurate picture of the extent of criminal victimisation in the UK and correlate fear against objective levels of risk (Wood, 1984). Questions on fear were first included in the 1984 survey and revealed significant anxieties relating to criminal victimisation, which declined throughout the 1990s and 2000s (Farrall, 2006).

Fears may have declined, too, but they remain inconsistent with the decline in actual recorded crime rates (see Dixon *et al.*, 2006). Research highlights that despite falling crime rates, significant numbers of people still believe crime is rising, and that violent crime is far more prevalent than its actuality. For instance, in 1996 and 1998, nearly four-fifths of British Crime Survey respondents thought that violent crime accounted for more than 30 per cent of all recorded crime, whereas it actually accounted for 12 per cent of all crime (Mattinson and Mirrlees-Black, 2000). More recent sweeps of the BCS reveal that worry about burglary, violent crime and car crime, identified as the three main crime types, have fallen by more than a third between 1998 and 2008 (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008). The BCS breaks down questions about perceptions about rising crime into concerns at local and national level: the former has decreased in recent surveys to 39 per cent in 2008, whilst perceptions of crime at the national level have continued to increase, most recently to 65 per cent (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008). It is possible that this may be explained as a result of actual experience versus mediated representations of crime, which focus disproportionately on specific crimes. This is highlighted in the 2008/09 survey which highlights that perceived increases in crime at the national level were mostly accounted for by perceived rises in knife crime - 93 per cent of respondents thought it had risen, and 86 per cent felt that gun crime had risen nationally (Thorpe and Hall, 2009).

In addition, the 2009 BCS highlights the continuing disparity between the actual risk of victimisation and perception of risk: for instance, the proportion of people who felt they were at risk from burglary was 16 per cent, compared with an actual risk of 2 per cent; 17 per cent perceived themselves to be at risk from violent crime, whilst the actual risk was only 3 per cent (Thorpe and Hall, 2009). Higher levels of worry are related to identity, socio-economic factors and geography. For instance, women express significantly higher worries about violent crime compared to men and young men in particular; and those with minority ethnic backgrounds are much more likely to worry about being burgled than those with ethnic majority backgrounds (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008). In addition, one may talk of average burglary risk at 2 per cent; however, this risk is likely to increase based on residence, identity and socio-economic circumstances (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008).

### **Punitiveness beyond 1997**

---

<sup>3</sup> In a later article, Farrall and Hay (2011) observe that crime as a policy domain received relatively little attention until the early 1990s and that the Tory hard line on crime was largely rhetorical until then.

Although crime rates and fear of crime began to fall from the mid-1990s onwards (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008), criminal justice policy did not respond accordingly. The law and order dialogue continued, and crime as an issue was here to stay, perpetuated by both the media and politicians (Cavender, 2004; Stern, 2000). The tough stance on crime continued with the election of a Labour government in the UK in 1997. Reluctant to appear as the party who were 'soft' on crime, the Labour party set out to 'out-tough' the Tories as part of its electoral strategy (Downes, 2004; Dignan and Cavadino, 2006). The Labour government stressed the need to address the underlying socio-economic causes of offending, alongside the view that offenders take responsibility for actions, hence the memorable slogan identified with the Blair administration: 'tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime'. However, this was not evident in criminal justice policy where causes were arguably overlooked and punishment of offenders was clearly the central focus (Reiner, 2007). This is reflected most starkly in the fact that despite falling crime rates, the prison population rose exponentially from 62,000 in 1997 to 85,000 in 2010 whilst the Labour party were in power (Downes, 2010), with significant rises in the female prison population alongside no real change in offending rates (Hedderman, 2004; Ministry of Justice, 2009; Gelshtorpe, 2007). A raft of new legislation was introduced during this period, which covered new measures such as anti-social behaviours orders, parenting orders, the reformulation of the youth justice system (Goldson, 2000; Antonopoulos and Winterdyk, 2003), as well as the drive towards speedier 'summary justice' and the more efficient and swifter processing of offenders.

Moves towards a progressively more punitive criminal justice system in the UK as well as increasing public intolerance and lack of sympathy for offenders have been observed by a number of authors (e.g. Bottoms, 1995; Garland, 2001; Pratt, 2002; Downes, 2004). Alongside punitiveness, Downes (2004) refers to a 'burgeoning pathology of over-control', with crime and awareness of crime now a definitive and routine feature of lived experience which must be dealt with accordingly via a range of control, surveillance and exclusionary strategies (Garland, 2001). Matthews (2005) however, has disputed the academic consensus regarding criminal justice policy both in the UK and elsewhere as 'the myth of punitiveness', arguing that the contemporary use of extreme forms of punishment and mechanisms of social control are overplayed by academic commentators when in reality contemporary penal developments are shaped by various stakeholders and the opposing rationales of law and order and managerialism. Indeed, managerialism and the need to control, regulate and contain 'risky' populations may not correspond with enhanced populist punitiveness, which Matthews defines in terms of 'expressive and emotive punishments' (Matthews, 2005: 195). The existence of differing agendas of those stakeholders involved in shaping and delivering criminal justice policy has been observed elsewhere (Brownlee, 1998; Garland, 2001). While we agree with Matthews that the theoretical and empirical state of the *concept* of punitiveness may not warrant such extensive use in analyses of contemporary penalty, the ascendancy of law and order discourses in the political arena for more than a quarter century, to which much of the literature refers, is hardly questionable as a fact, and so is the tendency of high level policy makers to seek quick gains by responding to the public opinion's reactivity towards the issue of crime. There is little doubt that the permanence of such characteristics point to real political and ideological changes in contemporary societies.

Various commentators have observed that we now live in a culture of fear, anxiety, insecurity (Furedi, 2007; Walklate and Mythen, 2008), emanating from the insecurities and risks of late/post modernity (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992; Young, 1999). It is thus difficult to pin down

specific objects of fear as fear of crime represents one component of general ontological insecurity (Sparks, 1992; Sparks *et al.*, 2001; Girling *et al.*, 2000; Jackson, 2004). Even more specific discussions focusing on fear of crime often fail to determine specific crimes as the focus of fears (Stern, 2000). Large-scale research such as the BCS presents information on fear of taken-for-granted and quotidian forms of criminal victimisation; however, the extreme fears we are meant to feel with regards terrorism and gang-related crime for example, are led largely by the media and politicians (see Box, 1983; Stern, 2000; Jewkes, 2011). This has led to the erosion of civil liberties, heightened surveillance and control evident in anti-terror legislation, ID cards, DNA databases, tougher immigration policy and the heightened policing of public demonstrations, which suggests links between fear and punitiveness, or more accurately the power of the state to *control* its citizens via a range of regulatory and surveillance measures.

The new coalition government has pledged to reverse the erosion of civil liberties which took place under the previous government in the UK (Cabinet Office, 2010). However, their general approach to dealing with crime appears -on the face of it- to be more of the same in that they have nowhere to go in terms of 'out-toughing' the previous government. As Roberts (2010) asserts, criminal justice policy across the political spectrum has reached consensus in that 'there is no alternative' (p.1) in how we deal with crime. Considering the record of the Tory governments of the 1980s, Farrall and Hay (2011) observed that when the economy is the priority, crime as a policy domain is marginalised. Thus, at a time of national and global economic crisis where austerity measures will result in significant cuts to the criminal justice system in the UK, the increased use of rehabilitation over imprisonment by the present government is driven by economic imperatives.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The data from the UK were collected at Teesside University, an institution located in the town of Middlesbrough in the North East of England. Teesside University which was established as a Polytechnic (technical institute) in 1929 and then formed a university in 1992 has approximately 30,000 students, the majority of which (approximately 18,000) are part-time. Along gender lines, the majority of the students at Teesside University are female (approximately 17,000). Finally, the majority of Teesside University students are based locally or regionally since 65.8% of them are from the North East of England (Teesside University, 2010).

Survey data for the students in the United Kingdom were completed during the first 5 months of 2010. The survey and research proposal were presented to Teesside's University School of Social Sciences and Law Ethics Committee for review. Upon receiving approval and as per the proposal outline, two final undergraduate students from the BSc (Hons) Criminology programme were recruited to administer the survey on campus. In the summer 2010 the data were entered into an SPSS file. Since the initial study for this project was conducted in Canada, we made a few minor changes (e.g., in relation to monetary values) in order for the questionnaire, which was originally designed for the Canadian context, to be more appropriate to the British context as well. No changes were made to the core sections of the questionnaire.

The research assistants were instructed to survey a cross-section of registered students across all the major disciplines of Teesside University. They employed a snowball sampling method to identify prospective instructors and classes and then requested recommendations for subsequent contacts who they might approach to ensure the desired sample size ( $N > 200$ ). All respondents were informed on the purpose of the study and that completion of the survey was

voluntary and confidential as no identifiers were requested other than general descriptive information. The number of participants for the current study was 233, 54.5% of which were females. This slight overrepresentation of women reflects the overrepresentation of women in the university as a whole and in specific schools such as the School of Social Sciences and Law. The majority of respondents were young people. Specifically, 72.8% of the sample were between 17-23 years of age, whereas only 11.7% were older than 30. Ages of respondents ranged from 17 to 50, with a (mean) average of 23. In this case, it is worth reflecting upon the standard deviation of 6.3. Such a deviation from the mean is to be expected in the context of the student age profile at Teesside University, which has significant proportions of ‘non-traditional’ and ‘mature’ students. However, when examining the ages by group, a picture of the typical student emerges. The majority of the students were following a social sciences course at the time of the research, including psychology (43.9%) criminology (20.4%), sociology (12.2%). Again the reason for this overrepresentation of social sciences students is a result of the sample being an opportunity and convenience sample which consisted primarily of students which the authors had readily access to. An additional 9.1% of the participants studied business and the quite significant percentage is a result of the spatial proximity of the School of Social Sciences & Law and the university’s Business School.

Rather predictably, the majority of the participants were British (93.5%). Teesside University, although increasingly and rapidly becoming an international student community, is largely based on native and – as mentioned earlier – local students. Only 13 participants were non-British native, the majority of which (6) were Greek students from the School of Social Sciences and Law and the Business School. This reflects the fact that Greek students are the biggest minority ethnic group (excluding Asian British and Black British, who are native British) in those schools. Other non-British native who participated in the study included one American, two Angolans, two Chinese, one Romanian and one Slovene.

Almost half of the sample (49.8%) did not declare affiliation with a religious faith. Of those that did, Protestants (14.6%) and Catholics (11.2%), whereas a further 16.7% were of Christian denomination (including ‘Christian’, Orthodox Christian, and Church of England). A possible aberration is the extremely low percentage of the Muslim students, considering that Teesside University in general and the schools of social sciences and law and business in particular include a large number of students from the local British Pakistani community. More than half the sample (55.6%) said they were in a relationship, and 84.9% (197 participants) lived with others. The latter category includes students living with parents and those living with housemates Finally, the current source of income for 27.5% of the participants are grants, whereas the rest of the sample were either self-funded (16.6%) or partly self-funded and assisted financially by other sources.

**Profile of Respondents Table (Part A: Questions 1-9)**

<b>PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Age</b>		
15-17	3	1.3
18-20	99	42.5
21-23	67	29
24-26	22	9.5
27-29	13	5.6
30+	27	11.7
<b>Gender</b>		



Female	126	54.5
Male	105	45.5
<b>Area of Study</b>		
Arts	3	1.3
Business	21	9.1
Computing	13	5.7
Criminology	47	20.4
Education	2	.9
Psychology	101	43.9
Law	3	1.3
Science	3	1.3
Sociology	28	12.2
Sports	7	3.0
Other	2	.9
<b>Years of Post-Secondary Education</b>		
0	0	0
1-2	77	33.2
3-4	96	41.4
5+	59	25.4
<b>Nationality</b>		
Native to Britain	218	93.5
Non-Native to Britain	13	5.6
(including) American	1	0.4
Angolan	2	0.9
Chinese	2	0.9
Greek	6	2.6
Romanian	1	0.4
Slovene	1	0.4
<b>Religious Faith<sup>4</sup></b>		
Agnostic	2	.9
Atheist	14	6.0
Catholic	26	11.2
Christian	22	9.4
Christian Orthodox	7	3.0
Church of England	10	4.3
Islam	1	.4
None	116	49.8
Olympian	1	.4
Protestant	34	14.6
<b>Current Intimate Partnership Status</b>		
In a Relationship	103	44.4
Not in a Relationship	129	55.6
<b>Current Living Arrangement</b>		
Lives Alone	35	15.1
Lives with Others <sup>5</sup>	197	84.9
<b>Current Source of Economic Income</b>		
Own Income	38	16.6
Income from Another Source/Person	50	21.8
Combination (Own + Other Source/Person)	78	34.1

<sup>4</sup> Respondents were asked an open question about their faith. Responses were then grouped into post hoc categories. This explains why the categories may not appear 'logical'.

<sup>5</sup> Living with others includes students living with parents and those living with housemates.

Grant(s)	63	27.5
----------	----	------

**3. RESULTS**

**(3a) PERSPECTIVES ON HAPPINESS, LIFE GOALS, and MISCELLANOUS ITEMS**

Overall, the results for all the happiness and life goal items suggests that happiness and the achievement of life goals are either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’ for a majority of the students in this sample. However, students do not universally agree on the level of importance of each item, as is detailed in the following tables. As can be seen from the table below students were asked how true they felt the statement: “every person is responsible for his or her own happiness”. As can be seen most students felt the statement to be true to some extent, with just under half expressing the statement to be with ‘Very True’ or ‘True’. There are, however some gender differences with 19.2% of male student reporting this statement to be ‘Very True’ compared with 9.5% of female students. The percentage of students who feel, to some extent that each person is responsible for his or her own happiness has implications for understanding the reported importance levels of the remainder of the items in this section. As is discussed in this section students rated the importance of a number of life goals, and, as will be seen later in this section students had different views on the degree to which each one of these items were important. Given that most students felt that, to some degree each person is responsible for his or her own happiness it could be inferred that while the students view goals as important they also consider that they themselves are responsible for achieving those goals which are important to themselves.

Interestingly, as is seen in the tables below material outcomes, such as ‘Affording apparel in accordance with current fashions’ are generally viewed as ‘important’ or ‘somewhat important’ by a lower percentage of students than other, more ‘abstract’ life outcomes or goals. While this may suggest that the students in this sample are not particularly materially orientated, further investigation does indicate that students place importance on securing a lifestyle which will bring them a level of material comfort. In particular, 98.7% of students regarding achieving a ‘Having a comfortable standard of living’ as either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’, while this indicates that achieving a material life goal is important to the students in this sample, the item related to “a comfortable standard of living”, and this is open to subjective understanding of what this means. Similarly 96.6% of students felt that achieving a rewarding job was either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’. Again, while achieving a rewarding job may well secure “a comfortable standard of living” as well as other material goals, there is no evidence from this data to suggest that “a rewarding job” relates specifically to a financial reward.

Further, when looking at the achievement of other personal life goals, an overwhelming majority of students placed importance on ‘Enjoying life’ and having a ‘Close network of good friends’ (the percentages are in line with the previous items discussed). This also suggests that students do not specifically place importance on achieving material outcomes in their life. In terms of ‘Enjoying Life’ and having a ‘Close network of good friends’ these may be regarded as more ‘abstract’ life goals which need not rely on achieving financial reward.

Further may be seen with regard to the item ‘high social status’. While this may be considered an ‘abstract’ life goal, it is one which relies on the individual being considered by others and themselves to be important. As the table below indicates, less than half (47.7%)

considered achieving a ‘high social status’ to be either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’, in contrast to the overwhelming majority expressing the importance to them of ‘Enjoying life’. With regard to ‘high social status’, further analysis revealed a statistically significant gender difference. Analysis reveals that achieving ‘high social status’ is more important for the male students than for female students. More than half of the male students (57.7%) felt that high social status was either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’ compared to 39.2% of female students. To assess whether this difference was statistically significant, the four categories of the item were combined into two: ‘Unimportant’ and ‘Important’. A chi square test revealed that the gender difference was significant at the 5% level of significance. However, while this sample does not appear to be overly materialistic, and place importance on ‘abstract’ life goals, they do appear to be individualistic, rather than collective. For example, when it came to involvement in collective organisations or politics, these were deemed much less important. Additionally, most students disagreed that ‘It is important to be actively involved in general political processes’. Indeed, when it came to trusting other people, this sample tends to distrust the moral integrity of other people, and this may be seen to relate to levels of punitivity later in the discussion. The majority of the sample (64.2%) were distrusting of other people’s moral integrity with both male and female students reporting similar results. There was also no significant difference between ages. As an indicator of punitive attitudes most of the sample did not consider that leniency should prevail in circumstances where an individual resorted to stealing in times of economic distress.

Where initial analysis indicated possible difference by demographic characteristics, such as gender and age, further analysis was carried out, where the data allowed. Apart from those items discussed where gender differences were found, there were several where there was no significant difference between the genders. These included: the importance of ‘Enjoying life’, ‘Regular Enjoyment of New Experiences’, ‘Affording Apparel in accordance with current fashions’, and ‘Network of close Friends’. While, the small numbers meant it was not possible to identify differences in other items, it may be of interest to note that only one female student reported that it was ‘unimportant’ to ‘have a rewarding job’, while over 90% of both male and female students reported that it was either ‘somewhat important’ or ‘important’ to have a rewarding job.

**Perspectives on Happiness, Life Goals, and Miscellaneous Items Table  
(Part D: Questions 6, 8, and 9)**

<b>PERSPECTIVES ON HAPPINESS, LIFE GOALS, AND MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Views concerning the following statement: “every person is responsible for his or her own happiness”</b>		
Very true	33	14.2
True	76	32.8
Kind of true	90	38.8
Not quite true	24	10.3
Not true	2	.9
Not true at all	7	3.0
<b>High social status</b>		
Unimportant	39	16.9
Somewhat unimportant	82	35.5

Somewhat important	90	39.0
Important	20	8.7
<b>Enjoying life</b>		
Unimportant	1	.4
Somewhat unimportant	3	1.3
Somewhat important	20	8.7
Important	207	89.6
<b>Regular enjoyment of new experiences</b>		
Unimportant	3	1.3
Somewhat unimportant	11	4.8
Somewhat important	76	32.9
Important	141	61.0
<b>Affording apparel in accordance with current fashions</b>		
Unimportant	53	22.9
Somewhat unimportant	83	35.9
Somewhat important	71	30.7
Important	24	10.4
<b>Close network of good friends</b>		
Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat unimportant	10	4.3
Somewhat important	77	33.3
Important	144	62.3
<b>Having a rewarding job</b>		
Unimportant	1	.4
Somewhat unimportant	7	3.0
Somewhat important	90	39.0
Important	133	57.6
<b>Having a comfortable standard of living</b>		
Unimportant	0	0
Somewhat unimportant	3	1.3
Somewhat important	92	39.8
Important	136	58.9
<b>Involvement in special interest groups (e.g., environmental protection)</b>		
Unimportant	58	25.1
Somewhat unimportant	117	50.6
Somewhat important	40	17.3
Important	16	6.9
<b>Involvement in non-profit organizations</b>		
Unimportant	37	16.0
Somewhat unimportant	101	43.7
Somewhat important	74	32.0
Important	19	8.2
<b>It is difficult to understand what is happening in the world</b>		
Do not agree	53	22.9
Somewhat disagree	78	33.8

Somewhat agree	86	37.2
Agree	14	6.1
<b>Most people care about what is happening in the world today</b>		
Do not agree	44	19.2
Somewhat disagree	65	28.4
Somewhat agree	112	48.9
Agree	8	3.5
<b>Most people lack moral integrity today</b>		
Do not agree	16	7.0
Somewhat disagree	66	28.8
Somewhat agree	115	50.2
Agree	32	14.0
<b>If the economy has brought about social distress, then we should be more lenient towards those who steal as a result of perceived necessity</b>		
Do not agree	76	33.3
Somewhat disagree	69	30.3
Somewhat agree	68	29.8
Agree	15	6.6
<b>Thinking and planning for one's future is a great source of comfort</b>		
Do not agree	5	2.2
Somewhat disagree	27	11.7
Somewhat agree	145	63.0
Agree	53	23.0
<b>People are too busy worrying about today to think about tomorrow</b>		
Do not agree	11	4.8
Somewhat disagree	51	22.1
Somewhat agree	122	52.8
Agree	47	20.3
<b>During times of social unrest, it is not constructive to use political or military force to maintain social order</b>		
Do not agree	33	14.3
Somewhat disagree	88	38.3
Somewhat agree	85	37.0
Agree	24	10.4
<b>It is important to be actively involved in general political processes</b>		
Do not agree	50	21.6
Somewhat disagree	107	46.3
Somewhat agree	52	22.5
Agree	22	9.5

### (3b) CONCERNS ABOUT “RISK”

In terms of risk, the issues that concerned students the most were personal risks to themselves. This corresponds with the individual nature of their life goals discussed in the previous section. However, the level of worry differed according to the type of risk. For example in terms of ‘Becoming a burden to others in old age’ and ‘Being isolated or alone in old age’, the majority of students, in both cases were either ‘not worried’ or ‘a little worried’. However, the lack of worry expressed by the students in this sample may relate to their average age (23) and the perception that such risks are not immediately relevant. It is worth recalling at this point, that a ‘close network of good friends’ *was* deemed to be important by a majority of students, however, students who felt this to be important were no more or less likely to be worried about ‘being isolated or alone in old age’.

Risks to the nation as a whole did not worry many of the students. Notably, a majority of students (60.5%) were not worried at all about the prospect of ‘Too many strangers/immigrants coming into our country’, and of those who were ‘very worried’ all but one were male students.

#### Concerns about “Risk” Table(s) (Part B: Question 1)

CONCERNS ABOUT “RISK”	Number	Percent
<b>Becoming severely ill</b>		
Not worried at all	56	24.0
A little worried	111	47.6
Pretty worried	44	18.9
Very worried	22	9.4
<b>Being involved in a car accident</b>		
Not worried at all	39	16.7
A little worried	123	52.8
Pretty worried	36	15.5
Very worried	35	15.0
<b>Becoming a victim of a violent crime</b>		
Not worried at all	67	28.8
A little worried	93	39.9
Pretty worried	58	24.9
Very worried	15	6.4
<b>Losing my/a job and being unemployed</b>		
Not worried at all	83	35.6
A little worried	74	31.8
Pretty worried	55	23.6
Very worried	21	9.0
<b>Not being able to keep/maintain a good standard of living</b>		
Not worried at all	54	23.6
A little worried	90	39.3
Pretty worried	66	28.8

Very worried	19	8.3
<b>Becoming a burden to others in old age</b>		
Not worried at all	111	48.5
A little worried	66	28.8
Pretty worried	35	15.3
Very worried	17	7.4
<b>Being isolated or alone in old age</b>		
Not worried at all	84	37.0
A little worried	93	41.0
Pretty worried	24	10.6
Very worried	26	11.5
<b>My partnership/relationship breaking apart</b>		
Not worried at all	119	51.1
A little worried	67	28.8
Pretty worried	35	15.0
Very worried	12	5.2
<b>Experiencing a major natural disaster such as a hurricane, earthquake, tsunami, etc.</b>		
Not worried at all	160	68.7
A little worried	62	26.6
Pretty worried	4	1.7
Very worried	7	3.0
<b>Too many strangers/immigrants coming into our country</b>		
Not worried at all	141	60.5
A little worried	61	26.2
Pretty worried	19	8.2
Very worried	12	5.2
<b>Civil unrest in my country</b>		
Not worried at all	138	59.2
A little worried	70	30.0
Pretty worried	16	6.9
Very worried	9	3.9
<b>My retirement not being financially secure</b>		
Not worried at all	84	36.2
A little worried	93	40.1
Pretty worried	48	20.7
Very worried	7	3.0
<b>Our country being threatened by terrorism</b>		
Not worried at all	64	27.5
A little worried	116	49.8
Pretty worried	32	13.7
Very worried	21	9.0

**(Part B: Question 2)**

<b>TOP THREE CONCERNS ABOUT “RISK”</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent<sup>6</sup></b>
Becoming severely ill	100	42.9
Being involved in a car accident	84	36
Becoming a victim of a violent crime	78	33.4

The top three concerns of the students in this sample may be described as personal, or individual risks. However, they are contrasting, relating to health, accident, and crime, indicating that risks can be varied in form, and that students are concerned about risk in its varied forms. ‘Becoming severely ill’ was a risk which concerned both male and female students alike. A slightly higher proportion of female students (39.7%) than male students (31.4%) identified ‘becoming involved in a car accident’ as a top concern. When it came to ‘becoming a victim of violent crime’, 38.9% of female students, compared to 26.7% of male students identified this as a top concern.

Concern, or fear of these three identified risks, does not, of course, equate to actual experience of them. For the two top risks, we do not have data on actual experience of these risks. Given the topic of this research, there is some data regarding experience of violent crime. Notwithstanding the possibility that experience of violent crime may occur in the future, overall 33.4% of respondents reported that ‘becoming a victim of violent crime’ was one of three top concerns, while only 18.9% reported, elsewhere in the survey that they had, in fact been the victim of a violent crime at some point in their lives. As with existing research on the fear of crime, this survey indicates that the fear magnifies the actual experience of crime.

In relation to the perceived risk of ‘becoming a victim of violent crime’ there was a marked difference between the genders. Of the students who reported this as a concern, 63.6% are female, as opposed to 36.4% who were male students. It can be seen then that female students are most likely to be concerned about becoming the victim of a violent crime, while it may be commonly assumed that young males are more at risk from violence in public space (Kershaw *et al.*, 2008). However, in this survey, this pattern is repeated with actual victimisation, with similar proportions of female and male students reported having actually having been the victim of a violent crime than did male students. Violent crime does include a broad range of crimes, including domestic and intimate violence, and it may be that the sample in this study, (just over half were female) are more likely to recognise, report and classify such experiences as violent crime.

**(3c) CONCERNS ABOUT SAFETY****Concerns about Safety Table (Part C: Questions 1-4)**

<sup>6</sup> For this question numbers do not sum to the total number of respondents and the percentages do not sum to 100 due to the fact that each respondent was invited to list 3 concerns. Percentages for each of the concerns should not be summed, but represent the percentage of respondents listing each element as one of their three concerns.



CONCERNS ABOUT SAFETY	Number	Percent
<b>Sense of safety walking alone at night in neighbourhood</b>		
Very safe	45	19.4
Pretty safe	121	52.2
Pretty unsafe	43	18.5
Very unsafe	17	7.3
I don't know	6	2.6
<b>Frequency walking alone at night</b>		
Never	7	3.0
Rarely	89	38.4
Sometimes	68	29.3
Often	68	29.3
<b>Instances of feeling unsafe in past 12 months</b>		
Never	40	17.2
Rarely	111	47.8
Sometimes	63	27.2
Often	18	7.8
<b>Whether or not there are areas/parts of town/city where it feels unsafe to be alone at night</b>		
Yes	47	20.3
No	185	79.7

Overall, a majority of students reported feelings of safety as indicated in the tables. When analysed by gender, some gender differences were indicated, and were found to be statistically significant, in all but the first item (where Pearson's chi square was unreliable due to small numbers). Male students were more likely to report that they frequently walked alone at night, and that they generally felt safer, or did not feel unsafe, While the statistical tests revealed statistically significant differences between the genders, this does not provide the full picture, so while male students are more likely to report feelings of safety, it does not necessarily follow that most female students feel unsafe. The result split by gender shows that most female students reported feeling safe 'outside, alone at night' in their neighbourhood, similarly most female students (58.4%) have either 'never' or 'rarely' felt unsafe in the last 12 months. However, this may be explained by the differing strategies employed to reduce fear and ensure safety in that women may be less likely to go out alone at night (Gilchrist *et al.*, 1998). While there is a statistically significant gender difference when it comes to identifying unsafe areas of a neighbourhood, it remains the case that a majority of both male and female students perceive there to be parts of their town that are unsafe to be when alone at night (see also Wattis *et al.*, forthcoming).

These figures indicate then that while males are more likely to report feelings of safety, or are less likely to report feeling unsafe, that feelings of safety, or a lack of it are a concern for men. For example, just under a quarter of male students rarely or never walked alone, outside at night., just over a quarter had sometimes or often felt unsafe in the last twelve months, and a majority (71.4%) felt that there were areas of their town where they did not feel it was safe to be, alone at night. Aggressive working-class masculinity associated with former industrial locations (Hall, 1999), combined with notions of student visibility may heighten fears for male students in this setting.

**(3d) CONCERNS ABOUT VICTIMIZATION**

In terms of victimisation about specific types of crime the following table indicates that a majority of students did not worry at all about ‘being injured in a street accident’, ‘being sexually harassed in public’, or about, ‘having [ones] primary means of transportation stolen’. Similarly the lowest percentages of students who reported that they were either ‘pretty worried’ or ‘very worried’ were recorded against these three items.

**Concerns about Victimization Table (Part C: Question 5)**

CONCERNS ABOUT VICTIMIZATION	Number	Percent
<b>Being injured in a street accident<sup>7</sup></b>		
Not worried at all	121	52.2
A little worried	95	40.9
Pretty worried	12	5.2
Very worried	4	1.7
<b>Being sexually harassed in public</b>		
Not worried at all	134	57.8
A little worried	73	31.5
Pretty worried	13	5.6
Very worried	11	4.7
<b>Being physically beaten and injured</b>		
Not worried at all	73	31.5
A little worried	102	44.0
Pretty worried	39	16.8
Very worried	18	7.8
<b>Having residence broken into</b>		
Not worried at all	53	22.8
A little worried	129	55.6
Pretty worried	36	15.5
Very worried	14	6.0
<b>Being attacked and robbed</b>		
Not worried at all	72	31.0
A little worried	96	41.4
Pretty worried	56	24.1
Very worried	8	3.4
<b>Being killed</b>		
Not worried at all	108	46.6
A little worried	81	34.9
Pretty worried	27	11.6
Very worried	16	6.9
<b>Having primary means of transportation stolen</b>		
Not worried at all	127	55.5
A little worried	68	29.7

<sup>7</sup> Contributors might consider rephrasing this notion of “street accident” within a local socio-cultural context.

Pretty worried	26	11.4
Very worried	8	3.5
<b>Having something stolen while in public</b>		
Not worried at all	75	32.5
A little worried	108	46.8
Pretty worried	46	19.9
Very worried	2	.9
<b>Being victimized in a traffic accident caused by a reckless driver or someone under the influence of drugs</b>		
Not worried at all	57	24.6
A little worried	106	45.7
Pretty worried	59	25.4
Very worried	10	4.3

**(3e) VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCES/EXPERIENCES WITH CRIME**

A majority of students reported that they had been a victim of crime, however this was more likely for male students, with 60% of males reporting that they had been the victim of a crime. Gender does not appear to be related to the number of victimisation experiences. It is too simplistic to suggest that the rise in the number of victimisation experiences increases as the mean age increases, and this attributing age as the causal factor in victimisation. However, as there are small numbers involved it is not possible to say whether this difference in mean age is statistically significant, nor is it possible to suggest any significant characteristics of those who have experienced several episodes of victimisation.

For half of all students who had reported being the victim of a crime, the most recent experience of victimisation was over two years ago. Of those who reported having been the victim of a crime the majority had experienced a non violent crime. As previously identified, similar numbers of male and female students reported having been the victim of a violent crime. The questionnaire asked students to describe the most recent crime which they had experienced, and these were categorised in the section ‘type of crime experienced’. The most common crime type described was assault, with just over 15% of the sample describing that they had experienced some kind of assault.

Students were asked to provide a description of victimisation and this is detailed in the table below. Further analysis was undertaken to investigate whether the description was related to the type of crime experienced, the length of time since the victimisation occurred, and gender. Slightly higher numbers of students who had experienced a violent crime than those who had experience a ‘non violent’ crime reported that it was a ‘bad’ experience, and that they ‘were still suffering’. However, the small numbers involved make it difficult to reliably state that this difference is significantly different. Similarly, there was no difference discernable when description of victimisation was analysed against the length of time since the crime occurred. Description of victimisation did not differ according to gender.

**Victimization Experiences Table(s) (Part A: Questions 10-11d)**

VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCES	Number	Percent
Has been the victim of crime		

Yes	121	51.9
No	112	48.1
<b>Number of victimization experiences</b>		
0	95	40.8
1-2	103	44.2
3-4	21	9
5+	14	6
<b>Most recent victimization experience</b>		
Less than 1 year ago	28	28.6
Between 1 and 2 years ago	21	21.4
More than 2 years ago	49	50.0
<b>Type of Victimization Experienced</b>		
Violent	44	40.7 <sup>8</sup>
Non-Violent	64	59.3
<b>Type of Crime Experienced</b>		
Assault	36	15.4
Theft	27	11.5
Burglary	19	8.1
Criminal Damage	15	6.4
<b>Description of Victimization</b>		
Bad and still suffering	16	14.3
Bad but no longer suffering	27	24.1
Not so bad, and coping well	44	39.3
No real impact	25	22.3

**(Part D: Question 7)**

VICTIMIZATION EXPERIENCES	Number	Percent
<b>Has knowingly been the victim of crime</b>		
No	116	50.2
Yes, once	62	26.8
Yes, more than once	53	22.9
<b>Type of Crime Experienced</b>		
Theft	73	31.7
Break-in/burglary	37	16.1
Rape/sexual assault	7	3.0
Armed robbery	0	0
Arson	1	0.4
Assault	19	8.1
Treason	0	0
Hostage taking/kidnapping	4	1.8

The next section provides further details regarding victimisation experiences. The numbers and percentages of students reporting that they had been the victim of a crime is slightly different to an earlier, similar question regarding experience of victimisation, notably assault is much lower,

<sup>8</sup> Percentage of those experiencing crime.

possibly because this later question was an open ended question and respondents may not have answered or may not have been willing to describe the type of crime they had experienced. The previous question invited students to tick an appropriate category rather than describe what type of crime they had experienced, this may account for the difference in figures between these two, apparently similar items. The most common type of crime experienced was theft, with male students more likely to report being a victim of this crime. Burglary was a crime which 16.1% of students had reported being a victim of.

**(3f) CONTACT WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

Students were asked about experiences with the criminal justice system and responses to these items are detailed in the following table. Most students did not report any contact with the criminal justice system. Being a victim of crime does not necessarily mean that the individual will go on to have contact with the criminal justice system, the results in this survey therefore mirroring existing knowledge on the under-reporting of victimisation.

**Contact with the Criminal Justice System Table (Part A: Question 12)**

<b>CONTACT WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>As a hearsay witness</b>		
Yes	25	10.7
No	208	89.3
<b>As an eyewitness</b>		
Yes	55	23.6
No	178	76.4
<b>As a person who has committed a minor offence</b>		
Yes	37	15.9
No	196	84.1
<b>As a suspect of a crime</b>		
Yes	6	2.6
No	227	97.4
<b>As someone who has reported a crime</b>		
Yes	79	33.9
No	154	66.1
<b>As a victim of a crime</b>		
Yes	85	36.5
No	147	63.1

Students were most likely to have had contact with the criminal justice system as either victims of crime or as someone who has reported a crime. Students were least likely to report that they had been involved in the criminal justice system as a suspect of crime. Only six students reported that they had been regarded as a suspect of crime, the six included four male students and two female students. Male students were more likely than female students to be involved as eye witnesses.

**(3g) EVALUATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PERSONNEL**

Students who had encountered the criminal justice system, either as victims, witnesses of as suspects were asked to rate perceived professionalism. This question applied to just over half of the respondents (i.e. those who reported having either been a victim, witness or suspect). Twenty percent of those students who had reported some contact with the criminal justice system reported having no direct contact with the criminal justice system. Most reported that the response was professional, however this can be further broken down by a ‘level’ of professionalism, with twenty-four per cent reporting that although they felt the response was professional, the criminal justice system could have handled the situation a little better. Just over eight per cent of those responding to this question felt the response from the criminal justice personnel was unprofessional, while another five per cent felt the response was both unprofessional, and rude.

For those students who reported having been a suspect of crime, their experience of the criminal justice system was mixed. Equal numbers reported that ‘their behaviour/response was generally very professional’, ‘their behaviour/response was mostly professional, but thought they could have handled the matter a little better’, or that ‘their behaviour/response was both unprofessional and rude’, suggesting that the status of being a suspect does not bias individuals in their assessment of the professionalism of the criminal justice system. However, as only six students reported being suspects, it is not possible to generalise the findings from this research.

The criminal justice system was generally found to be professional by victims of crime. Just under half (47.5%) of students who had contact with the criminal justice system as a victim reported that ‘their behaviour/response was generally very professional’, overall satisfaction with the criminal justice system was higher when the percentage of victims who felt that ‘their behaviour/response was mostly professional, but thought they could have handled the matter a little better’ is taken into account (28.8%). It may be the case that the perceived level of professional response may be related to the nature of the student’s encounter with the criminal justice system.

**Evaluation of Criminal Justice System Personnel Table (Part A: Question 13)**

<b>EVALUATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PERSONNEL<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
I did not communicate with anyone personally	26	20.2
Their behaviour/response was generally very professional	55	42.6
Their behaviour/response was mostly professional, but thought they could have handled the matter a little better	31	24.0
Their behaviour/response was generally unprofessional	11	8.5
Their behaviour/response was both unprofessional and rude	6	4.7

**(3h) GENERAL DETERMINATIONS OF FAULT IN CRIMINAL OCCURRENCES**

Most students agreed that the victim is not to blame in criminal occurrences, with only a small number of students who answered ‘mostly yes’. However, when it comes to partially blaming

<sup>9</sup> Final category not included as no responses.

the victim there is a shift in attitudes. As the following table indicates 13.4% of students answered ‘mostly yes’ to this question, with one additional student answering with an outright ‘yes’.

Two thirds of students felt that situational factors lead to criminal acts (answering either ‘mostly yes’, or ‘yes’) suggesting that these students have some understanding of the social context in which some criminal acts take place. This understanding may be related to the type of degree which students are enrolled on, however any distinction according to major area of study is not clear, although there are some interesting patterns indicated. For example, criminology students make up just over 20% of the respondents in this sample. It might be expected that these students might be more ‘sympathetic’ to the context in which criminal acts are committed, yet in fact, they represent over 30% of student who felt that situational acts did not lead to criminal acts (either ‘mostly no’ or ‘no’). Further evidence that criminology students are not particularly sympathetic to situational factors is suggested when the responses of this group of students are isolated. Over half of the criminology students answered either ‘mostly no’ or ‘no’. Students studying other subjects had different responses. For example over 60% of psychology students felt that situational factors led to criminal acts (answering ‘yes’ or ‘mostly yes’). For sociology students the distinction was even more clear-cut where over 85% felt that situational factors led to criminal acts.

It is interesting to contrast the responses for this item with an earlier item: ‘If the economy has brought about social distress, then we should be more lenient towards those who steal as a result of perceived necessity’. The results showed that 36.4% of students either ‘somewhat agreed’ or ‘agreed’ with this statement. So, while most students believe that situational factors lead to criminal acts, they do not believe that leniency should be applied where those situational factors may lead to some stealing.

**General Determinations of Fault in Criminal Occurrences Table  
(Part D: Question 5)**

<b>GENERAL DETERMINATIONS OF FAULT IN CRIMINAL OCCURRENCES</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>The victim is at fault</b>		
No	119	52.4
Mostly no	103	45.4
Mostly yes	5	2.2
Yes	0	0
<b>The victim is at least partially at fault</b>		
No	96	41.4
Mostly no	104	44.8
Mostly yes	31	13.4
Yes	1	.4
<b>Situational factors lead to criminal acts</b>		
No	23	10.1
Mostly no	54	23.8
Mostly yes	107	47.1
Yes	43	18.9

**(3i) PREFERRED RESPONSES TO IMAGINED VICTIMIZATION**

When it comes to the preferred responses to imagined victimisation as displayed in the following tables, a number of responses stand out as being ‘important’ to the vast majority of students in this sample. Over 78% of students felt it was ‘important’ ‘that the offender(s) is/are investigated’ and only male students felt that it was either ‘somewhat unimportant’ or ‘unimportant’ that the offender is investigated. The investigation of the offender is considered important by more students than any other response, and while a majority of students also felt it was important ‘that the offender(s) is/are brought to court and sentenced’ the percentage was less, with 67.7%. This suggests that this sample is not particularly punitive, as sentencing an offender is considered by fewer students than investigation of the offender. The responses to the remaining items would appear to support this, as an even lower percentage, at just over half felt it was ‘important’ ‘that the offender(s) is/are punished severely’.

However, the low percentages of students identifying some of the less punitive responses as ‘important’ would suggest that these students are *more* punitive than not. In particular, only 15% of students, (the smallest proportion for any of the responses in this section) felt it was important ‘that social service also takes care of the offender and his life circumstances’. There appears to be no difference either by gender or by major area of study.

**Preferred Responses to Imagined Victimization Table (Part D: Question 1)**

<b>PREFERRED RESPONSES TO IMAGINED VICTIMIZATION</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>That the offender(s) is/are investigated</b>		
Unimportant	10	4.3
Somewhat unimportant	4	1.7
Somewhat important	36	15.5
Important	183	78.5
<b>That the offender(s) is/are brought to court and sentenced</b>		
Unimportant	9	3.9
Somewhat unimportant	8	3.4
Somewhat important	58	25.0
Important	157	67.7
<b>That the offender(s) is/are punished severely</b>		
Unimportant	11	4.8
Somewhat unimportant	38	16.5
Somewhat important	64	27.8
Important	117	50.9
<b>That the offender(s) apologize(s) to you</b>		
Unimportant	43	18.5
Somewhat unimportant	66	28.3
Somewhat important	72	30.9
Important	52	22.3
<b>That the state takes care of the victim (e.g., recoups material losses if the offender(s) is/are not able to do so)</b>		
Unimportant	27	11.6



Somewhat unimportant	29	12.5
Somewhat important	75	32.3
Important	101	43.5
<b>That you can discuss the consequences of the crime with the offender(s) and to get him/her to compensate the losses</b>		
Unimportant	55	23.6
Somewhat unimportant	60	25.8
Somewhat important	76	32.6
Important	42	18.0
<b>That you are able to provide a victim impact statement to the court</b>		
Unimportant	13	5.6
Somewhat unimportant	37	15.9
Somewhat important	121	51.9
Important	62	26.6
<b>That social service also takes care of the offender and his life circumstances.</b>		
Unimportant	78	33.5
Somewhat unimportant	60	25.8
Somewhat important	60	25.8
Important	35	15.0

Some further analysis was carried out to explore whether there was any relationship between preferred response to imagined victimisation and victimisation experience. This has explored a suggestion that having being a victim of crime, a respondent may be more likely to prefer a particular type of criminal justice response. Using crosstabs for each of the above responses against the respondents' victim status there was found to be no strong relationship<sup>10</sup>.

### **(3j) PREFERRED CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSES TO SELECT EVENTS**

This section details preferred criminal justice responses to a range of events. The responses indicate that punitivity is not simple, as students' levels of punitivity differ according to events. The one crime which nearly all the students felt that a prison sentence was the preferred criminal justice response was rape, where 97.9% of students expressed this as a preferred response. However, the same level of punitivity was not expressed for other sexually offensive behaviours. For example, for the item 'to force one's partner to have sexual intimacy without her/his consent' (an offensive behaviour which in legal terms is still rape) a lower percentage of 83.3% felt that the most appropriate response was a prison sentence. Similarly, when it came to the item: 'to commit a sexual offence (excluding rape)', an even lower proportion 71.6% felt that prison was the most appropriate response. It may be that the term 'rape' is the determining factor in students opting for prison sentence as their preferred response.

Various types of assault were another areas in which nearly all students were united in the appropriateness of a prison sentence. For the item: 'to injure a person with a knife or a deadly

<sup>10</sup> This was explored using the Cramer's V statistic with none indicating a strong relationship (the highest being 0.42) being significant at the 5% level.

weapon’, 97% felt a prison sentence was the most appropriate response, yet when it came to the item: ‘to physically beat an adult person so that he/she requires medical attention’, 81.1% of students felt a prison sentence was the most appropriate sentence, suggesting that the use of a weapon is what prompts a greater proportion to consider a prison sentence. Another interesting comparison is when the victim of a physical beating is a child. In this case the percentage rose to 97.4%, indicating that it is not necessarily the act which warrants such a response, but the age of the victim. Further analysis of the gender differences of these two items reveals little gender difference, and in fact when the victim is identified as a child, the numbers of males and females preferring a prison sentence goes increases in equal proportion.

As with the life goals discussed previously, it may be seen from these tables that students’ preferred criminal justice responses are more punitive in response to crimes against the individual than crimes against society. For example, 10.3% of students felt that prison was the preferred response ‘to avoid paying your taxes’.

**Preferred Criminal Justice Responses to Select Events Table (Part D: Question 2)**

<b>PREFERRED CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSES TO SELECT EVENTS</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>To drive a motor vehicle under the influence of a significant amount of alcohol</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	10	4.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	8	3.4
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	12	5.2
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	29	12.4
Community service	43	18.5
A fine	18	7.7
Probation	113	48.5
A prison sentence	10	4.3
<b>To use a means of public transport without a legal ticket/payment</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	34	14.6
A warning with the threat of punishment	95	40.8
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	22	9.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	10	4.3
Community service	5	2.1
A fine	62	26.6
Probation	5	2.1
A prison sentence	34	14.6
<b>To steal something of important value</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	13	5.6
A warning with the threat of punishment	26	11.2
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	30	12.9
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	14	6.0

Community service	37	15.9
A fine	18	7.8
Probation	94	40.5
A prison sentence	13	5.6
<b>To resist a police officer</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	40	17.2
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	1	.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	12	5.2
Community service	40	17.2
A fine	37	15.9
Probation	43	18.5
A prison sentence	56	24.1
<b>To smoke marijuana</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	81	34.8
A warning with the threat of punishment	59	25.3
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	4	1.7
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	3	1.3
Community service	12	5.2
A fine	38	16.3
Probation	13	5.6
A prison sentence	23	9.9
<b>To break and enter (burglarize) a house/an apartment for the purpose of stealing</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	11	4.7
A warning with the threat of punishment	3	1.3
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	17	7.3
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	19	8.2
Community service	2	.9
A fine	32	13.7
Probation	149	63.9
A prison sentence	11	4.7
<b>To physically beat an adult person so that he/she requires medical attention</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	0	0
A warning with the threat of punishment	0	0
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	9	3.9
Community service	14	6.0
A fine	6	2.6
Probation	15	6.4

A prison sentence	189	81.1
<b>To shoplift something of modest value</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	20	8.6
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	13	5.6
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	13	5.6
Community service	83	35.8
A fine	52	22.4
Probation	27	11.6
A prison sentence	21	9.1
<b>To consume illicit drugs (e.g., heroin, cocaine, ecstasy, etc.)</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	28	12.1
A warning with the threat of punishment	39	16.8
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	1	.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	12	5.2
Community service	16	6.9
A fine	21	9.1
Probation	33	14.2
A prison sentence	82	35.3
<b>To occupy an empty house (nobody is living in the house)</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	30	12.9
A warning with the threat of punishment	92	39.7
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	16	6.9
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	20	8.6
Community service	29	12.5
A fine	19	8.2
Probation	14	6.0
A prison sentence	12	5.2
<b>To commit a sexual offence (excluding rape)</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	2	.9
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	1	.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	3	1.3
Community service	0	0
A fine	4	1.7
Probation	53	22.8
A prison sentence	166	71.6
<b>To take someone's handbag/wallet by force</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	4	1.7

The offender needs to only compensate material damage	4	1.7
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	29	12.5
Community service	21	9.1
A fine	14	6.0
Probation	42	18.1
A prison sentence	115	49.6
<b>To steal a vehicle or other mode of transportation (e.g., motorbike, bicycle, etc.)</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	1	.4
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	3	1.3
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	11	4.7
Community service	21	9.1
A fine	11	4.7
Probation	31	13.4
A prison sentence	151	65.1
<b>To injure a person with a knife or a deadly weapon</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	0	0
A warning with the threat of punishment	1	.4
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	0	0
Community service	0	0
A fine	0	0
Probation	6	2.6
A prison sentence	226	97
<b>To physically beat a child/young person so he/she requires medical attention</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	0	0
A warning with the threat of punishment	0	0
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	0	0
Community service	0	0
A fine	1	.4
Probation	5	2.1
A prison sentence	227	97.4
<b>To break into a house a second time and steal something of value (e.g., television or computer) in the process</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	0	0
A warning with the threat of punishment	1	.4
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	1	.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and	1	.4

arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial		
Community service	4	1.7
A fine	0	0
Probation	43	18.5
A prison sentence	183	78.5
<b>To force one's partner to have sexual intimacy without her/his consent</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	1	.4
A warning with the threat of punishment	2	.9
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	16	6.9
Community service	0	0
A fine	0	0
Probation	20	8.6
A prison sentence	194	83.3
<b>To have an abortion</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	208	90.8
A warning with the threat of punishment	6	2.6
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	2	.9
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	2	.9
Community service	0	0
A fine	6	2.6
Probation	0	0
A prison sentence	5	2.2
<b>To avoid paying your taxes</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	8	3.4
A warning with the threat of punishment	38	16.3
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	22	9.4
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	22	9.4
Community service	11	4.7
A fine	103	44.2
Probation	5	2.1
A prison sentence	24	10.3
<b>To engage in fraudulent financial transactions</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	3	1.3
A warning with the threat of punishment	11	4.7
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	12	5.2
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	8	3.4
Community service	17	7.3
A fine	54	23.2

Probation	17	7.3
A prison sentence	111	47.6
<b>To pour two litres of dirty oil into a nearby river/stream/body of water</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	2	.9
A warning with the threat of punishment	29	12.4
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	2	.9
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	8	3.4
Community service	68	29.2
A fine	83	35.6
Probation	21	9.0
A prison sentence	20	8.6
<b>To commit an act of rape</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	0	0
A warning with the threat of punishment	0	0
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	1	.4
Community service	0	0
A fine	3	1.3
Probation	1	.4
A prison sentence	228	97.9
<b>To inflict bodily harm on someone using a knife or deadly weapon</b>		
The state does not need to react to this	4	1.7
A warning with the threat of punishment	0	0
The offender needs to only compensate material damage	0	0
The offender should discuss the crime with the victim and arrive at a form of restoration such that there would be no trial	0	0
Community service	1	.4
A fine	0	0
Probation	12	5.2
A prison sentence	216	92.7

### (3k) VIEWS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Capital punishment is no longer practiced in the UK, however as can be seen from the following table, the idea of capital punishment remains popular among some people. Most of the students in this sample supported capital punishment for some types of crime. There was no statistically significant difference by gender, while the average age of those who did not support capital punishment, at 25 was higher than for those who did (22).

While over half supported capital punishment for certain crimes, the percentage differed for specific named crimes. More than half of the students (53%) felt murder should be punishable by death. However, when asked to agree or disagree that ‘capital punishment is

justified only for premeditated murder’, only 31.6% agreed, suggesting that those who feel capital punishment is appropriate for murder, also feel that it is appropriate as a punishment for other crimes. Additionally when it came to agreeing or disagreeing with the statement that ‘any person, man or woman, young or old, who commits a murder, should pay with his or her own life’, a majority (62.9%) disagreed, suggesting that while the majority of students support capital punishment for murder, that they are willing to consider that it may not be an appropriate punishment for all who actually commit this crime. In other words, punitivity, in this case, is directed at the crime rather than the perpetrator.

For many of the items in the following table there was no difference in agreement according to demographic characteristics (gender being the most reliable characteristic that could be tested for). However, when it came to the statement ‘Capital punishment is the most hideous practice of our time’, a chi square test revealed a significant gender difference, with female students more likely to agree with this statement (40.8% of females agreed compared to 23.1% of male students) suggesting that different genders do differ in their attitudes towards capital punishment (Chi square of 8.096 with a significance of 0.004).

For all specific crimes listed in the following table there was no difference by gender, with agreement in almost equal proportions between female and male students. The specific list of crimes for which students were asked to consider whether they felt capital punishment was appropriate included an open ended response question. For this the only crime entered, (which couldn’t be categorised within an existing category) was that of child sexual abuse, with 15 students identifying this type of crime as one which should be punishable by death.

Victim status did not lead to a difference when it came to opinions of which crimes should be punishable by death. Cross tabulations were carried out with chi square tests indicating no significant difference between respondents who had been a victim of crime and those who had not. Neither gender no victim status therefore predisposes a respondent to viewing certain crimes as suitable for punishment by death.

**Views on Capital Punishment Table (Part D: Questions 3 and 4)**

<b>VIEWS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Supports capital punishment for certain crimes</b>		
Yes	131	56.2
No	102	43.8
<b>Crimes that Should be Punishable by Death</b>		
Murder	123	53
Rape	76	32.8
Armed robbery	2	.9
Arson	12	5.2
Treason	12	5.2
Hostage taking	6	2.6
Kidnapping children and/or young persons	34	14.7
Human trafficking of children	58	25
Act of terrorism	80	34.5
Selling illegal drugs	5	2.2
Other crimes:		
Child sexual abuse	15	6.4
<b>Capital punishment may be wrong, but it is the best</b>		



<b>deterrent to crime</b>		
Agree	112	48.5
Disagree	119	51.5
<b>Capital punishment is never justified</b>		
Agree	79	34.1
Disagree	153	65.9
<b>Capital punishment is justified, but I wish it were not</b>		
Agree	40	17.6
Disagree	187	82.4
<b>Any person, man or woman, young or old, who commits a murder, should pay with his or her own life</b>		
Agree	86	37.1
Disagree	146	62.9
<b>Capital punishment is wrong, but necessary in our imperfect civilization</b>		
Agree	73	31.6
Disagree	158	68.4
<b>Capital punishment has never been an effective means to deter a crime</b>		
Agree	86	37.2
Disagree	145	62.8
<b>I don't believe in capital punishment, but I am not sure that it isn't necessary</b>		
Agree	77	33.3
Disagree	154	66.7
<b>We need capital punishment for some crimes</b>		
Agree	142	61.5
Disagree	89	38.5
<b>Capital punishment is not necessary in modern civilization</b>		
Agree	85	37
Disagree	145	63
<b>We cannot call ourselves civilized as long as we have capital punishment</b>		
Agree	88	37.9
Disagree	144	62.1
<b>Life imprisonment is more effective than capital punishment</b>		
Agree	90	39.6
Disagree	137	60.4
<b>The execution of criminals is a disgrace for a civilized society</b>		
Agree	82	36
Disagree	146	64
<b>I don't agree with capital punishment, but it is virtually impossible to abolish it</b>		
Agree	36	19.9
Disagree	191	84.1
<b>Capital punishment is the most hideous practice of our time</b>		

Agree	75	67.5
Disagree	156	32.5
<b>Capital punishment gives the criminal what he/she deserves</b>		
Agree	107	46.3
Disagree	124	53.7
<b>The state cannot teach the sacredness of human life by destroying it</b>		
Agree	105	45.7
Disagree	125	54.3
<b>It does not make any difference to me if we have capital punishment or not</b>		
Agree	59	25.7
Disagree	171	74.3
<b>Capital punishment is justified only for premeditated murder</b>		
Agree	73	31.6
Disagree	158	68.4

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Limitations for the ability to generalise from the results of this survey certainly arise from the fact that it was not carried out using a nationally representative sample of students. On the other hand, because Teesside University predominantly recruits a local student body from the region of the North East of England, the results are more likely to be representative of the attitudes and concerns of young people in that region. The particular significance of this circumstance is that, as discussed above, the North East and Middlesbrough in particular, are areas which have been severely affected by the economic crisis and the restructuring of the economy, and are, as a consequence, experiencing high levels of poverty, unemployment, and ill-health. In so far as they are also areas highly affected by social insecurity and the incidence of crime, the views and concerns of respondents may be more likely to convey how punitive attitudes take shape amongst those worst affected by the issues of crime and victimisation.

Further limitations may also arise from the administration of the survey questionnaire among a purposive, albeit large, sample of social science students primarily. Social scientists are normally trained to take into account the ‘wider picture’ when expressing views on social issues, and therefore are more likely to convey more informed, thoughtful or, at least, restrained responses towards crime and punishment, and, therefore, less likely to reflect the ‘emotiveness’ of punitivity deemed by commentators to underpin contemporary developments towards increased punitiveness (see above in Introduction). Our results suggest that while there are differences across different subjects in this respect, there is no evidence in this sample that the acknowledgement of situational factors leading to crime leads to more lenient responses towards crime.

Despite such important limitations, the survey has yielded a series of interesting findings, which are worth commenting in the remainder of this chapter, and which can be summarised as follows. Overall, respondents appeared to place high value to happiness and the achievement of life goals; however, this value orientation appeared to be more focused on abstract rather than overtly materialistic goals such as specific lifestyles or financial rewards. While the majority of

respondents thought that having a 'rewarding' job is important, 'enjoying life' in general or having a 'close network of friends' can be taken as indicators of an orientation towards more abstract life goals rather than specifically material gains. Regardless of how this orientation can be exactly understood, the results leave little doubt that such orientation operates within an individualistic value system, where achievement is viewed as an individual's responsibility rather than a correlate of collective welfare. Supportive of this interpretation are not only the respondent's overall mistrustfulness of other people's moral integrity and, to some lesser extent, care about what is happening in the world, but also their reservations about the importance of being involved in collective activities, including involvement in political, special interest or non-profit organisations and activities. Similarly, a flavour of such individualistic culture can be traced in the importance respondents place on 'thinking and planning for one's future as a source of comfort', particularly when seen in the light of their overall reluctance to acknowledge social distress as a mitigating circumstance for acquisitive crime.

The above image is further reinforced when the respondents' perceptions of risk are taken into consideration. As the results suggest, the issues that concerned students the most were personal risks to themselves, whereas perception of collective risks appears to be much weaker, even though, as noted previously, this sample is more likely to experience more forcefully the impact of economic and social problems locally. Confirming a recurrent finding of other crime surveys, our results have shown quite clearly the discrepancy between 'fear of crime', or the concern about becoming a victim of violent crime, and the actual experience of criminal victimisation at some point in the respondents' lives. In the same vein, marked gender differences in the perception of violent crime victimisation risks surfaced in our results, as female students were more likely to be concerned about becoming a victim of violent crime than male students. This is consistent with other research on victimisation and fear of crime (Hough and Mayhew, 1983; Kershaw *et al.*, 2008) which has often presented women, along with the elderly as irrational given their lesser risk from violence in public space. However, more nuanced analyses from feminist and left realist perspectives highlight how factors previously ignored by administrative criminology such as domestic and sexual violence, sexual harassment, social and physical vulnerability based on gender, and the construction of the gendered victim of sexual violence account for women's higher levels of expressed fear (Hall, 1985; Stanko, 1987; Young and Matthews, 1992; Kelly and Radford, 1996; Koskela, 1999; Jewkes, 2011).

As regards this sample's preferred criminal justice responses to particular offences, the results suggest that while levels of punitivity do differ according to events, the common theme is a preference for more punitive responses towards crimes against the individual. Furthermore, the sample's views are united in their preference for custodial sentences when it comes specifically to rape, assault with a knife or a deadly weapon, or violence against children, while, interestingly, support for custodial sentences is lower for other offences falling under the same categories, that is, sexual offences, offences causing physical injury and assault. This general outlook holds equally for both genders, a characteristic that underscores consensus.

In our view, and within the given limitations of this research, the above characteristics could permit some generalising remarks on the punitive attitudes of our respondents in light of our account of developments in punitiveness in the past quarter century and particularly since the mid-1990s. We may begin by noting how, despite experiencing quite directly the consequences of deteriorating socioeconomic indicators in the region, students of this sample are reluctant to acknowledge the possible mitigating effect of collectively adverse conditions on individual offending behaviour. The emphasis laid by this younger generation on individual responsibility

may be quite clearly indicating the internalisation at the level of individual attitudes, and therefore, the success of what Garland (2001) understands as ‘responsibilisation strategies’ deployed within the neoliberal paradigm for the governance of crime. The success of such strategies does not necessarily entail an increase in punitiveness. If, however, it means that individual perceptions of crime and justice could be increasingly cut off from an awareness of known and well-studied social determinants of crime, it is not difficult to see how public opinion may be increasingly less capable of critically evaluating the ‘interventionist strategies’ pursued by ‘the growing array of agencies and institutions with their different roles, discourses and specialisms [within] an increasingly complex, opaque and expanding network of crime control’ (Matthews, 1997: 196).

In other words, we could be witnessing the formation of a vicious circle, which indeed leads to a selective amplification of punitiveness. In this sense, it may be no coincidence that respondents in this survey expressed an overwhelming support for custodial sentences against the specific types of offences that have monopolised the attention of both media and policy makers in the past decade, namely knife crime (House of Commons, 2009), sex offences and child abuse (Home Office, 2007). What remains unresolved and is clearly worthy of further, more detailed and systematic research are the social correlates of the change in sensibilities at the individual level, that is, the objective social conditions upon which such orientations of individual subjectivity have become possible.

## 5. REFERENCES

- Antonopoulos, G.A. and Winterdyk, J. A. (2003) ‘The British 1998 Crime and Disorder Act: A ‘Restorative’ Response to Youth Offending?’, *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 11(4), 386-397
- Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society*, London: Sage.
- Bottoms, A. (1995) ‘The philosophy and politics of punishment and sentencing’. In C. Clarkson and R. Morgan (eds) *The Politics of Sentencing Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Box, S. (1983) *Power, Crime and Mystification*. London: Tavistock.
- Brownlee, I. (1998) ‘New Labour – new penology? Punitive Rhetoric and the Limits of Managerialism in Criminal Justice Policy’, *Journal of Law and Society*, 25(9): 313-335.
- Cabinet Office (2010) *The Coalition: Our Programme for Government*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Cape, E. (2010) ‘Adversarialism ‘lite’: Developments in procedure and evidence under New Labour’, *Criminal Justice Matters*, 79 (1), 25-27.
- Cavender, G. (2004) ‘Media and Crime Policy: A Reconsideration of David Garland’s *The Culture of Control*’, *Punishment & Society* 6(3), 335-48.

- Chapman, B., Mirrlees-Black, C. and Brawn, C. (2002) *Improving Public Attitudes to the Criminal Justice System: The Impact of Information*. Home Office Research Study 245. London: Home Office
- Cleveland Criminal Justice Board (2007) 'On Target for Progress', *Working Together*, Spring, p.4
- Dignan, J. and Cavadino, M. (2007) *The Penal System: An Introduction*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ditton, J. & Farrall, S. (2000) (eds) *The Fear of Crime*. International Library of Criminology, Criminal Justice and Penology. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Dixon, M., Reed, H., Rogers, B and Stone, L. (2006) *CrimeShare: The Unequal Impact of Crime*. London: IPPR.
- Downes, D. (2004) 'New Labour and the Lost Causes of Crime', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 55, 4-5.
- Downes, D. (2010) 'Counterblast: What went Right? New Labour and crime control', *The Howard Journal*, 49(4), 394-397.
- Downes, D. & Morgan, R. (1997) 'Dumping the 'hostages to fortune'? Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Farrall, S. (2006) 'Rolling back the state': Mrs Thatcher's criminological legacy', *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 34, 256-277.
- Flatley, J., Kershaw, C., Smith, K., Chaplin, R. and Moon, D. (eds) (2010) *Crime in England and Wales, 2009/10*. London: Home Office
- Furedi, F. (2007) 'The only thing we have to fear is the 'culture of fear' itself', *Spiked*, 4<sup>th</sup> April. Available online at: <http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?/site/printable/3053/> accessed 9<sup>th</sup> June 2008.
- Garland, D. (2001) *The Culture of Control*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Gilchrist, E., Bannister, J., Ditton, J. and Farrall, S. (1998) 'Women and the 'fear of crime': Challenging the accepted stereotype', *British Journal of Criminology*, 38, 283-299.
- Gilroy, P. (1987) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson.

- Girling, E., Loader, I. and Sparks, R. (2000) *Crime and Social Change in Middle England: Questions of Order in an English Town*, London: Routledge.
- Goldson, B. (2000) (ed.) *The New Youth Justice*. Dorset: Russell House.
- Gray, E., Robey, R. & Cameron, D. (2007) *Attitudes to the Death Penalty*. London: Ipsos-MORI
- Grimshaw, R., Mills, H., Silvestri, A. and Silberhorn-Armantrading, S. (2010) *Magistrates' Courts and Crown Court Expenditure, 1999-2009*. London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies
- Hall, R. (1985) *Ask Any Woman: A London Inquiry into Rape and Sexual Assault*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B. (1978) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, The State and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan.
- Hall, S. (1999) 'Grasping at Straws: The Idealisation of the Material in Liberal Conceptions of Youth Crime', in South, N. (ed.), *International Library of Criminology, Criminal Justice and Penology, vol 1: Youth Crime, Deviance and Delinquency*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hay, C. and Farrall, S. (2011) 'Establishing the ontological status of Thatcherism by gauging its 'periodisability': Towards a 'cascade theory' of public policy radicalism', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-856X.2010.00443.x.
- Hedderman, C. (2004) 'Why are more women being sentenced to custody?'. In McIvor, G. (Ed) *Women who Offend*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Higgins, N., Robb, P. and Britton, A. (2010) 'Geographic Patterns of Crime. In Flatley, J., Kershaw, C., Smith, K., Chaplin, R. and Moon, D. (eds) *Crime in England and Wales, 2009/10* (pp.165-194) London: Home Office
- Home Office (2007) *Review of the Protection of Children from Sex Offenders*. London: Home Office
- House of Commons (2009) *Knife Crime. Seventh Report of Session 2008-2009*. London: The Stationary Office Ltd.
- Jackson, J. (2004) 'Experience and Expression: Social and Cultural Significance in the Fear of Crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 946-966.
- Jewkes, Y. (2011) *Media and Crime*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. London: Sage.
- Kelly, L. and J. Radford. (1996) 'Nothing Really Happened': The Invalidation of Women's Experiences of Sexual Violence', in M. Hester, L. Kelly and J. Radford (eds), *Women*,

- Violence and Male Power*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kershaw, C., Nicholas, S. and Walker, A. (2008) *Crime in England and Wales 2007/2008*. London: Home Office.
- Koskela, H. (1999) 'Gendered Exclusions': Women's Fear of Violence and Changing Relations to Space', *Geografiska Annaler*, 81, 111-124.
- Matheson, J. (2010) 'The UK Population: How Does it Compare?', *Population Trends*, Nr.142, pp.9-32
- Matthews, R. (2005) 'The myth of punitiveness', *Theoretical Criminology*, 9, 175-198.
- Mattinson, J, and Mirrlees-Black, C. (2000) *Attitudes to Crime and Criminal Justice: Findings from the 1998 British Crime Survey*. A Research, Development and Statistics Directorate Report. London: Home Office.
- Middlesbrough Council (2010) *Middlesbrough Council's Annual Workforce Monitoring Report*. Middlesbrough: Middlesbrough Council
- Mills, H., Sivestri, A. and Grimshaw, P. (2010a) *Police Expenditure, 1999-2009*. London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies
- Mills, H., Silvestri, A. and Grimshaw, R. and Silberhorn-Armantrading, F. (2010b) *Prison and Probation Expenditure, 1999-2009*. London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies
- Office for National Statistics (2004) 'Population Size: 7.9% from a non-White Ethnic Group'. Available online at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=455>
- Office for National Statistics (2011) 'Population Data'. Available online at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk>
- Pratt, J. (2002) *Punishment and Civilisation*. London: Sage.
- Reiner, R. (2007) 'Success or statistics? New Labour and crime control', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 67(1), 4-37.
- Roberts, R. (2010) 'Justice and politics', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 80 (1), 1.
- Smith, D. (2010) *Public confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the British Crime Survey 2002/03 to 2007/08*. London: Ministry of Justice
- Sparks, R. (1992) 'Reason and unreason in 'left realism': some problems in the constitution of the fear of crime'. In Matthews, R. and Young, J. (eds), *Issues in Realist Criminology*, London: Sage.

- Sparks, R., Girling, E. and Loader, I. (2001) 'Fear and everyday urban lives', *Urban Studies*, 38, (5-6), 885-898.
- Stanko, E. (1987) 'Typical Violence, Normal Precaution: Men, Women and Interpersonal Violence in England, Wales, Scotland and the USA'. In J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (eds), *Women, Violence and Social Control*. London: Macmillan.
- Stanko, E. (2000) 'Victims R Us: The life history of 'fear of crime' and the politicisation of violence'. In Hope, T. and Sparks, R. (eds), *Crime, Risk and Insecurity*, London: Routledge.
- Stern, S. (2000) 'Why politicians want to scare us?', in *New Statesman*, 18<sup>th</sup> September.
- Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (2011) 'Various Data'. Available online at: <http://www.teesvalley-jsu.gov.uk/>
- Teesside University (2010) 'University Statistics'. Available online at: <http://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/about/factsandfigures.cfm>
- Thorpe, K. and Hall, P. (2009) 'Public perceptions'. In Walker, A., Flatley, J., Kershaw, C. and Moon, D. (eds) *Crime in England and Wales 2008/2009: Volume One – Findings from The British Crime Survey and Police Recorded Data*. London: Home Office.
- Tudor, A. (2003) 'A (macro) sociology of fear?', *Sociological Review*, 51, 238-256.
- U.S. Department of State (2011) *The CIA World Factbook*. Available online at: <http://worldfacts.us/UK.htm>
- Van de Walle, S. (2009) 'Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Does Experience Count?', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(3), 384-398
- Walklate, S. (2007) *Imagining the Victim of Crime*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Walklate, S. and Mythen, G. (2008) 'How scared are we?', *British Journal of Criminology*, 48, 209-225.
- Wattis, L., Green, E. and Radford, J. (forthcoming) 'Women students' perceptions of crime and safety: Negotiating fear and risk in a post industrial landscape', *Gender, Place and Culture*,
- Wood, D. (1984) *British Crime Survey 1982 – Technical Report*. London: Home Office.
- Young, J. (1992) 'Ten points of realism'. In Young, J. and Matthews, R. (eds), *Rethinking Criminology: The Realist Debate*. London: Sage.
- Young, J. (1999) *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. London: Sage.



## 6. CONTRIBUTOR BIOGRAPHY

**Georgios A. Antonopoulos** is Reader in Criminology at Teesside University, UK.

**Georgios Papanicolaou** is Lecturer in Criminology at Teesside University, UK. He works from a materialist theoretical perspective on the history, organisation and role of the police apparatus, and his current research interests include the politics of transnational policing and the policing of national and transnational illegal markets.

**Claire Tupling** is Senior Lecturer in Education Studies at Canterbury Christ Church University, UK. Previously, she was Senior Lecturer at Teesside University where she was awarded a PhD in Sociology.

**Louise Wattis** is Lecturer in Criminology, Teesside University, UK. She completed a PhD focusing on the student experience of place, crime and fear of crime in a post-industrial location. The work explored how student identity/ies intersect with gender and locality to shape experiences of place, crime, safety and fear of crime. She is currently publishing around the themes of gender, space/place, and fear, and the meaning of fear of crime.