Introduction to Crime and Deviance

Social controland socialisation are the main processes involved in trying to ensure people keep to the norms and values of society and do not engage in deviant behaviour.

Social control is achieved by a range of positive and negative sanctions which are applied by formal agencies of social control, e.g. the police, courts and informally through family, peer group etc.

The main aim is to maintain social order where society is stable and people generally comply with social norms and values.

The Social Construction of Crime and Deviance

**The Social Construction of Crime**

Newburn suggests that crime is basically a label attached to certain behaviours which are prohibited by the state and have some legal penalty against them.

An act only becomes a crime when a particular label of ‘crime’ has been applied to it. This can depend on interpretations of law enforcement agencies and the context in which that act has taken place.

Changing attitudes can mean that acts once regarded as criminal, no longer are seen in this way, e.g. the definition of ‘reasonable force’ a person can use to defend themselves in their home.

Criminal law varies from one country to another.

Also, enforcement agencies may find an act criminal but choose to not record or prosecute.

Therefore there is nothing that is in itself criminal. Crime is socially constructed.

**The Social Construction of Deviance**

Deviance includes criminal and non-criminal acts. What is defined as deviance will depend on the social expectations about what is normal behaviour.

Therefore, whether something is deviant or not depends on how other people react to it.

*Societal and Situational Deviance*

Plummer identifies these two aspects of defining deviance.

**Societal deviance** refers to acts that most members of a society regard as deviant because they share similar ideas about what approved and unapproved behaviour.

**Situational deviance** refers to the way in which an act being seen as deviant or not depends on the context or location in which it takes place.

Whether an act is deviant or not will therefore depend on:

* If the act is carried out by lots of members of society. If so, can it really be regarded as deviant?
* The time
* The society
* The social group
* The place or context

Social Class and Crime

The sociology of crime tends to focus on crimes committed by the working class. This is predominantly due to statistics indicating that working class people are the main offenders.

However, sociologists have sought to show how crime isn’t committed by just the working class. White collar and corporate crime refers to crime committed by the middle and upper classes. However, these tend to be undetected and unreported.

Working Class Crime

Working class crime can be mainly explained using the different theories you have looked at, as indicated below:

1. Strain theory (Merton)
2. Subcultural theories (Cohen; Cloward and Ohlin; Miller)
3. Control theory (Hirschi)
4. Marxist/Neo-Marxist theories (Chambliss; Gordon; Box; Snider; Pearce; Gilroy; Taylor, Watson and Young; Hall)
5. Labelling theory (Becker; Cicourel; Lemert)
6. Left Realism (Lea and Young; Young)
7. Right Realism/rational choice and opportunity/New Right (Murray; Cornish and Clarke)

The two major criticisms of explanations for working class crime are:

* They cannot explain why the majority of working class individuals don’t commit crime.
* Crime by other social classes is undetected or unrecorded.

White Collar and Corporate Crime

Timmer and Eitzen describe these crimes as crimes in the suites, in contrast to everyday crimes in the street.

Sometimes white collar and corporate crime are referred to as **economic crime.**

**White collar crime**

Sometimes this is called **occupational crime.**

It is committed by middle class individuals who abuse their work positions for personal gain.

**Corporate crime**

This is sometimes called **organisational crime.**

It is committed by large companies or individuals acting on behalf of those companies, and directly benefits the company.

The Underrepresentation of White Collar and Corporate Crime

There are several reasons why these crimes are underrepresented in statistics:

1. **Hidden from view and hard to detect:** Croall points out that as many of these are in the workplace, individuals seem to simply be doing their jobs. Companies can also use networks of influence to cover up corporate crime.
2. **No individual victims:** there is less obvious personal harm and victims appear impersonal, e.g. a company, the government. Clarke points out these are often **complaintless crimes** as there is no individual victim to report it.
3. **May benefit both parties concerned:** both parties may therefore try to conceal the offence.
4. **Hard to investigate:** investigation often requires a lot of skill and expert knowledge which many police forces may lack.
5. **Lack of awareness that a crime has been committed:** victims often lack the expertise to know they have been defrauded, for example, e.g. horsemeat scandal in supermarket burgers in 2013.
6. **Not prosecuted as criminal acts:** many corporate crimes lead to fines or enforcement notices rather than police action. White collar crimes are often concealed by **institutional protection** and are rarely reported by the institution to protect its reputation. Suspected individuals may be simply sacked.
7. **Better chance of being found not guilty:** most juries see criminals as working class, whilst defendants are often of the same background as judges and magistrates. They may appear more honest and respectable to juries and more likely to have their crimes seen as temporary lapses in judgement.

However, since the financial crisis of 2008, the activities of a range of different people have made corporate crime more visible, e.g. campaigns by groups such as UK Uncut and investigations by journalists into corporate tax avoidance.

In addition to this, because corporations are now more involved in people’s lives through marketisation and privatisation of public services, they are exposed to more public scrutiny than previously.

**Corporate Crime**

**Examples**

There are 6 main types:

1. **Paperwork and non-compliance:** where correct permits/licences aren’t obtained or companies don’t comply with health and safety regulations, e.g. in 2015 Volkswagen evaded environmental regulations by fitting 11 million cars with a defeat device to cheat emissions tests.
2. **Environmental crimes:** damage to the environment caused deliberately or through negligence.
3. **Manufacturing offences:** examples include the incorrect labelling or misrepresentation of products and false advertising, e.g. inadequate testing of thalidomide in the late 1950s led to birth defects in thousands of babies.
4. **Labour law violations:** neglect of health and safety regulations, failing to pay minimum wage etc.
5. **Unfair trade practices:** includes anti-competitive practices, e.g. price fixing, illegally obtaining information on rival businesses, e.g. in 2011 UK supermarkets and dairy companies were fined for fixing the price or milk and cheese.
6. **Financial offences:** includes offences like tax evasion and concealment of debts, e.g. in 2001 Enron concealed debts of around $50bn eventually causing the company to collapse.

Some corporate crimes have transnational dimensions, e.g. Western companies may try to avoid health and safety regulations by moving production to developing nations where laws aren’t as stringent.

Explanations for Corporate Crime

**Strain theory**

Box argues that if a company cannot achieve its goal of maximising profit by legal means, it may employ illegal ones instead. Therefore, when business conditions become tougher, a company may use this form of innovation to maintain profits.

**Differential association**

Sutherland sees crime as learned from others. The more we associate with people with criminal attitudes, the more likely we are to be criminal.

Therefore if a company’s workplace culture justifies committing crimes to achieve corporate goals, employees will be socialised into this criminality.

The culture of business may also favour competitive, aggressive personality types who are willing to commit crime to achieve success.

**Techniques of neutralisation**

Matza argues individuals will be more likely to commit deviance if they can justify their behaviour. Therefore, corporate crime may occur because individuals may say they were just doing as they were told, that victims should have read the small print, or that everyone is doing it.

Learning these techniques can be an important part of socialisation into a deviant corporate culture and therefore links with differential association.

**Labelling theory**

Croall notes corporate crime is often not intended to cause harm, even if it does, and therefore is seen as less criminal.

Nelken points out that powerful individuals/corporations employ accountants and lawyers to redefine their crimes as non-criminal. This is known as **de-labelling or non-labelling.** This can be done by reducing the seriousness of charges, for example.

By avoiding the attachment of the label criminal, it may encourage further crimes by reducing the risk associated with offending.

In addition, law enforcement is reluctant, or unable (due to lack of resources for example), to investigate these crimes.

**Seduction of crime and edgework**

Nelken looks at the world of high finance which shows a subculture in which thrill seeking, edgework and making hard choices in high risk situations is as important as the money itself.

**Marxism**

Corporate crime is inevitable in a capitalist society as the goal of capitalism is to maximise profits.

Box argues capitalism has created a **mystification**, which is the idea that corporate crime is less widespread or harmful than working class crime.

Capitalism controls the state which means it is able to avoid making or enforcing laws that conflict with its interests, e.g. tax avoidance loopholes.

While some corporate crime is prosecuted, the majority is not. Pearce argues this maintains the illusion that not much corporate crime occurs.

Box argues corporations are criminogenic because if they find legitimate opportunities for profit are blocked, they will resort to illegal techniques.

Corporations comply with the law only if they see it enforced strictly. This means in developing countries there are high amounts of corporate crime, e.g. selling unsafe products.

*Criticisms*

Doesn’t explain crime in non-profit making organisations, e.g. the police.

Law abiding may be more profitable than law breaking, e.g. pharmaceutical companies that complied with regulations were able to access lucrative markets in developing countries.

**White Collar Crime**

**Examples**

* Bribery and corruption in government and business.
* Falsifying expenses.
* Fraud, e.g. in 2012 a rouge financial trader in London was jailed for 7 years for fraud by gambling huge sums of money in unauthorised financial deals which cost the bank UBS over £1.5bn.

Explanations for White Collar Crime

**Strain theory and relative deprivation**

Whilst the middle class are unlikely to see their social goals blocked, they may have a sense of relative deprivation (lacking things others have).

They may also want more than can be achieved by socially approved means.

**Control theory**

Nelken suggests strain and control theories merge in explaining some white collar crime. He suggests some successful people have expensive lifestyles but may have got into financial difficulties maintaining those lifestyles. They are so tied to the expectations of those in their social group that have similar lifestyles that they turn to innovation to maintain their lifestyle.

**Differential association**

This can explain white collar crime too.

Gender and Crime

Official statistics show that males commit far more crime than females. This is sometimes called the **crime-gender gap** or the **crime-sex ratio**.

In England and Wales in 2014 men accounted for ¾ of all convictions, 85% of convictions for serious (indictable) offences and 95% of prisoners. Men are more likely to be repeat offenders, commit more serious offences and more likely to be found guilty.

**Reasons for Lower Female Crime**

**Less detectable offences**

Women tend to commit more offences which are less likely to be detected or reported, e.g. shoplifting. Women tend to steal smaller, less detectable items than men.

**Sex role theory and socialisation**

Parsons argues women adopt expressive roles in the family. These roles involve caring, cleaning and housework. This provides positive, non-criminal role models for girls.

Socialisation also encourages women to adopt feminine characteristics, e.g. less aggressive.

Women’s roles and socialisation combine to make many women avoid the risk taking involved in crime. It also results in less opportunities for crime.

**The gender deal and the class deal**

Carlen suggested women are encouraged to conform by the class deal and the gender deal:

* **The class deal:**women who work can afford material rewards such as consumer goods.
* **The gender deal:** women who conform to the expressive role have material and emotional rewards from family life.

Most women accept and achieve these deals and therefore don’t commit crime. However, these rewards are not available to some women due to different reasons, e.g. poverty. These women may make a rational decision to commit crime as they have little to lose but crime offers rewards they cannot achieve through the legitimate class or gender deals.

Carlen argues women are socialised into a role as **guardians of domestic morality** and they risk social disapproval if they fail to uphold this morality. Women therefore can be condemned for being a criminal and being unfeminine.

**Social control**

Heidensohn argues there are different spheres. Men dominate the public sphere (the streets etc) where most crime is committed, whilst women dominate the private sphere (home). Social control therefore deters women from crime in the following ways:

1. **In the private sphere:** patriarchal control results in women having responsibilities for domestic labour and childcare. This means there is less time and opportunity for women to commit crime. Adolescent females are more closely supervised by parents as well than adolescent males resulting in a private bedroom culture for females where they socialise with friends at home rather than in public.
2. **In the public sphere:** women face patriarchal control in the form of fear of physical or sexual violence if they go out alone at night. This means they are less likely to be able to commit crime in the public sphere.
3. **In the workplace:** women face a glass ceiling at work, as well as sexual harassment and increased supervision at work. This prevents opportunities and job roles where they could commit white collar crime.

**The chivalry thesis**

Pollak suggested the male dominated criminal justice system takes a more protective view of female offending. This means women offenders are seen as vulnerable and in need of protection and as a result are treated more leniently.

Statistics from the Ministry of Justice show:

* Women are more likely to receive suspended or community sentences.
* Women are more likely to receive shorter sentences if they are imprisoned.

Females are also more likely to be cautioned or warned by the police as they are seen as less of a threat than men.

*Evidence against the chivalry thesis*

A lot of male crimes against women, such as domestic assault, are not reported. For example, in 2012, only 8% of females who had been a victim of a serious sexual assault reported it to the police.

Many feminist writers refer to the evil woman theory. This suggests that women who are seen as not confirming to traditional femininity are treated much worse by the CJS than men. This is **double deviance** where women are seen as deviant for committing crime but also for not keeping to feminine norms.

**Police stereotyping**

Labelling theorists suggest police stereotypes mean women who commit crimes are less likely to be watched, caught and labelled as a criminal.

**Reasons for Higher Male Crime**

**Sex role theory and socialisation**

Men’s traditional roles, lack of responsibilities at home and lack of social control all give men more independence than women and therefore more opportunities to commit crime.

While females adopt the expressive role at home, this means boys reject feminine models of behaviour that express tenderness and gentleness and engage in **compensatory compulsory masculinity** through aggression and anti-social behaviour. This is to demonstrate they are not feminine.

**The assertion of masculinity**

Hegemonic masculinity includes features such as independence, toughness, aggression, and risk taking. Messerschmidt argues men have to constantly work at constructing this and presenting it to others. Some men have less resources to do this than others.

Messerschmidt suggests men sometimes turn to crime as a means of asserting their masculinity when legitimate means of doing this are blocked, e.g. success at school, having a well-paid job. When these are missing men seek out alternative ways of asserting their masculinity, e.g. fights, violence against women. These are more likely to be men from deprived backgrounds as they are most likely to be unable to use legitimate means of asserting their masculinity, e.g. employment.

As a result class and ethnic differences lead to different forms of crime and deviance to demonstrate masculinity:

* White middle class male youths:have to be subordinate to teachers in order to achieve, leading to an **accommodating masculinity** in school. Outside of school they adopt **oppositional masculinity**, e.g. drinking, vandalism.
* White working class male youths: have less chance of educational success so adopt opposition masculinity in and out of school. This links with Willis’ working class lads.
* Black lower working class male youths: may have few expectations of a reasonable job and may use gang membership and violence to express their masculinity or turn to property crime to achieve material success.

The assertion of masculinity could also be a reason why men get involved in edgework, as outlined by Lyng. It would also explain why middle class men get involved in white collar and corporate crime through risk taking and thrill seeking in business.

*Criticisms*

Doesn’t explain why all men who don’t have legitimate means of asserting their masculinity don’t turn to crime.

Not all male crime can be interpreted as an expression of masculinity.

**Changes in the economy**

Globalisation has led to a loss of manual, working class, male jobs. This has removed one way in which men were able to express their masculinity.

At the same time, there has been an expansion in the service sector, including the night time leisure economy, e.g. clubs and bars. This has provided some working class men with a combination of legal employment, criminal opportunities and a way of expressing their masculinity.

Winslow studied bouncers in Sunderland and found this type of work provided young men with paid work, an opportunity for illegal business, e.g. drug dealing, as well as the opportunity to express their masculinity through violence.

To maintain their reputation and employability, the men must use their **bodily capital**, e.g. many of the bouncers engaged in body building. This maintains the **sign value** of their bodies, which discourages people from challenging them. As a result the sign of masculinity is important.

**Police stereotyping**

Because of official statistics, the police are more likely to see men as potential offenders and therefore are more likely to stop and search them, arrest them and prosecute them.

**Control theory and rational choice and opportunity**

We can use the argument discussed for the lack of female crime here, but apply it to men.

Men dominate the public sphere where most crime is committed and they face less constraints than women. They also have less to lose in terms of reputation. Indeed, for some men, crime may enhance their reputation, particularly amongst their peer group.

**Functionalism and Subcultural Theories**

The following explanations of crime can also be applied to explain male crime:

* Merton: strain theory.
* Cohen: status frustration.

**Reasons for Growing Female Criminality**

Whilst men still commit more crime than women, this pattern is slowly changing. There was a decrease in the male crime rate between 2002 and 2014 but the female crime rate increased.

**The liberation thesis**

Adler puts forward the liberation thesis which suggests growing female crime may be due to increasing liberation from patriarchy. Women in Britain now have more independence and some of the traditional forms of social control are weakening. This means women adopt traditionally male roles in legitimate activity (work) and illegitimate activity (crime).

For example, women now have greater opportunities in the workplace and this means they can now commit white collar crimes.

**Ladette culture**

Denscombe found there is much more of a ladette culture in which young women adopt behaviour traditionally associated with young men, e.g. binge drinking and risk taking. This is due to changing gender norms in society.

**Net widening**

Sharpe and Gelsthorpe have argued that women aren’t becoming more involved in crime, it is just that the justice system is ‘widening the net’ and arresting and prosecuting females for less serious forms of violence than previously.

There is a growing trend towards prosecuting females for low level physical disagreements.

Worrall argues that in the past, girls’ misbehaviour was likely to be seen as a welfare issue whereas now it has been relabelled as criminality.

**Moral panic**

Sharpe found judges, probation officers and police were influenced by media stereotypes of violent ladettes and many believed that girls’ behaviour was rapidly getting worse.

This means police and courts may take a tougher stance on female crime resulting in more convictions (deviancy amplification).

Ethnicity and Crime

Official statistics suggest what appear to be higher levels of criminality amongst some minority ethnic groups, particularly the African Caribbean population. Black people are:

* Over twice as likely to be cautioned by the police.
* Around three times more likely to be arrested.
* More likely to be charged, remanded and face court than to receive a caution.
* More likely, if found guilty, to receive a custodial sentence and for a longer term.
* Five times more likely to be in prison.

Asians were:

* More likely to be charged and face court proceedings than to receive a caution.
* More likely to receive a custodial sentence if found guilty and for a longer term.

**Why Ethnic Minorities May Commit More Crime**

There are a number of explanations for the links between ethnicity and offending.

Left Realism

**Causes of ethnic minority crime**

Lea and Young accept that black crime, for some offences, is higher than it is for the white population. This is due to:

* **Marginalisation/marginality:** some ethnic groups are marginalised in society by educational underachievement, unemployment etc.
* **Relative deprivation:** at the same time the media and society emphasises consumerism, which makes ethnic minorities feel relatively deprived because they cannot achieve the consumer goals that other members of society can achieve.

As a result, some ethnic minorities, form criminal subcultures. This produces higher levels of utilitarian crime as a way of coping with relative deprivation but also non-utilitarian crime as a way to express their frustration at being marginalised.

**Reasons why this isn’t due to police racism**

Lea and Young argue that whilst the police may act in racist ways, this doesn’t fully explain the statistics for the following reasons:

1. Over 90% of crimes known to the police are reported by members of the public, meaning the statistics cannot be affected by racist stop and searches, for example.
2. Black individuals have higher rates of criminalisation than Asians. The police would therefore have to be very selective in their racism.

*Criticisms*

The police may stereotype black and Asian individuals differently but still treat them both differently to white individuals.

Functionalism and Subcultural Theories

The following explanations of crime can also be applied to explain ethnic minority crime:

* Merton: strain theory.
* Cohen: status frustration.
* Cloward and Ohlin: three different subcultures.

Control Theory

This can also be applied to explain ethnic minority crime.

**Why Ethnic Minorities May Not Commit More Crime**

Neo Marxism

**Black crime as a myth and resistance**

Gilroy argued the idea of black criminality is a myth and that ethnic minorities are no more likely than any other group to commit crime. However, as a result of the criminal justice system and the police holding negative stereotypes about ethnic minorities and crime, ethnic minorities are criminalised and appear more in official statistics.

However, Gilroy argues crime by ethnic minorities can be seen as a form of political resistance against a racist society. This is rooted in the historic resistance of ethnic minorities to British imperialism in their countries of origin. For example, riots and demonstrations were used to resist British imperial rule in former British colonies. These are the same tactics ethnic minorities use today to resist racism.

*Criticisms*

First generation immigrants in the 1960s and 1970s were very law abiding.

Most crime is intra-ethnic (the victim and criminal are of the same ethnicity).

**Black crime and scapegoating**

Hall et al argue that in the 1970s Britain was facing an economic and political crisis characterised by high inflation and unemployment. This threatened the dominance of ruling class ideology **(a crisis of hegemony)** as it indicated there were problems with capitalism.

At the same time a moral panic developed which portrayed black youths as more involved in crimes such as mugging and this was promoted by the media. This moral panic resulted in growing demands by the public that something should be done.

Hall et al argued the moral panic was used to:

* Justify more aggressive policing against the black community, e.g. stop and search.
* Distract the public from the problems with capitalism.
* Divide the working class along ethnic lines by encouraging white working class individuals to see black working class individuals as criminals.
* Win support from the public for more authoritarian forms of rule that could be used to suppress opposition to capitalism.

*Criticisms*

The conflicts between minority ethnic groups and the police still exist, as do negative media stereotypes, but the crisis of hegemony does not.

Lea and Young point out that most crimes are reported by the public, not discovered by the police. Therefore it is hard to say black crime is as a result of police racism.

Police Labelling

Labelling theorists argue statistics are incorrect and instead show selective law enforcement. You can therefore link this with Cicourel, Lemert and Becker’s arguments.

Phillips and Bowling suggest racial discrimination is shown in the following ways:

**Direct racial discrimination**

1. **Stop and search:** in 2013 Asians were twice as likely, whilst African Caribbeans were six times more likely, to be stopped and searched. Minority ethnic groups fit police stereotypes of troublemakers and they are therefore targeted more by the police. This has a bigger impact when the police have discretion about how they use their powers. This is often based on racial stereotypes rather than reasonable suspicion. This also creates resentment towards the police from these communities, which was seen as a reason behind the 2011 riots.
2. **Canteen culture:** it has been argued there is a racist canteen culture among the police which includes suspicion, macho values and racism. This encourages racist stereotypes and mistrust of those from non-white backgrounds.
3. **Institutional racism:** the investigation into the police handling of the murder of Stephen Lawrence led to the Macpherson Report. This accused the Metropolitan Police of institutional racism which led to mistakes in the investigating of the murder.
4. **Arrests, charges and court proceedings***:* police officers appear to arrest and charge some minority suspects without sufficient evidence. The CPS are more likely to drop cases involving minority suspects or fail to get a conviction which indicates a lack of evidence to charge the suspects in the first place.
5. **Discrimination in sentencing:** Hood found that black men face a greater likelihood of a prison sentence and of a longer sentence. One reason for this is pre-sentence reports by probation officers. This are a risk assessment used by magistrates in deciding on an appropriate sentence. Hudson and Bramhall found reports on Asian offenders were less comprehensive and suggested they were less remorseful.
6. **Over-representation in prison:** the effects of social exclusion, direct discrimination and indirect discrimination are shown in the disproportionate imprisonment rates for minority groups. In 2013 26% of prisoners were from minority ethnic groups despite only making up 12% of the population. In prison, minority prisoners face more brutal treatment than white prisoners whilst Asian prisoners face stereotyping as terrorists.

**Indirect racial discrimination**

1. **Mistrust of the police:** this means minority ethnic suspects are less likely to cooperate with police officers or prosecutors, perhaps because of previous negative experiences with the police. Refusing to admit to offences means they are ineligible for a caution or reduced sentence.
2. **Social position:** minority ethnic groups are thought to be more likely to abscond due to poor housing, lack of community etc. Therefore they’re more likely to be remanded in custody. Many of these social conditions can be seen as a result of racism, e.g. in applying for jobs.

Self report studies indicate that ethnic minorities are significantly less likely to offend than white respondents. Despite this, minorities are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted or convicted.

Other Explanations

**Neighbourhood**

Fitzgerald et al found crime rates were highest in very poor areas and areas where very deprived people came into contact with wealthier people. Young blacks were likely to live in these areas and be very poor.

However, whites affected by these factors were also likely to commit street crime. Therefore ethnicity wasn’t a cause of crime.

**Getting caught**

Sharp and Budd found black offenders were more likely to be arrested. Reasons included because they were more likely to commit crimes such as robbery, where they can be identified by victims or they were more likely to associate with known criminals which made them more visible to the police.

Crime Statistics

Official statistics influence what we think about crime. These statistics are usually used to:

* Compare crime rates to previous years.
* To measure police efficiency in reducing crime.
* To show where the police should concentrate their resources.
* To provide the public with information on crime patterns.
* To provide a basis for sociologists to explain crime.
* To reveal police assumptions and stereotyping as the statistics are partly generated by the activities of the police themselves.

Sources of Crime Statistics

Crime statistics are collected from several sources:

1. **Police recorded crime (PRC)**

These are offences detected by or reported to the police and recorded by them.

1. **Victim surveys**

These survey the victims of crime and include unreported and unrecorded crime. This makes them more accurate than police recorded crime and they aren’t affected by recording/counting rules that affect police statistics. An example is the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) which is a face to face survey in which residents in households are asked about their experiences of crime in the previous 12 months.

1. **Self-report studies**

These are anonymous questionnaires in which people are asked to admit to committing crimes. An example includes the Home Office’s ‘Offending, Crime and Justice Survey’ between 2003 and 2006.

1. **Court and prison records, and records on police cautions**

These reveal some of the characteristics of offenders who have been caught.

**Police Recorded Crime and the Crime Survey for England and Wales**

These are the main basis for official crime statistics and together form a more comprehensive picture of crime.

PRC covers a wider range of offences than the CSEW, e.g. crimes against businesses, but does not include crimes that are not reported to, discovered by or recorded by the police. Therefore, it excludes some less serious offences. In 2014/15 the CSEW recorded around 50% more crimes than were recorded by the police.

The Social Construction of Crime Statistics

Many sociologists are cautious about crime statistics. They question the extent to which they are reliable as there may be inconsistencies in the way crimes might be classified, e.g. several offences committed at the same time might be recorded as a single offence.

There are also questions over their validity in providing a true picture of the amount of crime and the characteristics of offenders. This is because many offences are either not discovered, not reported to the police or not recorded by the police. For example, in 2014 it was calculated that almost 1 in 5 of crimes reported to the police were not recorded.

These hidden crimes are often referred to as **the dark figure of crime.**

**Unreported crime**

A large amount of crime is not even reported to the police. The CSEW suggests around 60% of the crimes it covers are never reported to the police.

The CSEW found the main reasons are because:

1. It was too trivial, or the police could not do anything.
2. It was a private matter they dealt with themselves.
3. It was inconvenient to report.

Other reasons can include the fact it was the victim’s own fault, fear of reprisals, fear of or a bad experience with the police and courts.

In some circumstances, such as white collar crime, crime may not be reported due to fear of harming the reputation of a company, e.g. fraud by a bank employee.

**Reported but unrecorded crime**

The police may not record an offence that has been reported to them because:

1. They may regard the matter as too trivial.
2. It has already been resolved.
3. The person complaining may be seen as too unreliable.
4. They may not regard it as an offence.

**Changes in reporting and recording of crime**

Official statistics can also give a distorted picture of crime as they may give the impression of an increase in crime, when the rise is really due to the public reporting more crimes or changes in the way the police record crime. Factors that may influence this include:

1. **The media:** the media may exaggerate certain crimes and make them seem more widespread and serious which leads to more people reporting these crimes.
2. **Changing police attitudes, priorities and policies:** the police may prioritise certain crimes at different times. This can make it seem that these crimes are on the increase.
3. **People reporting less serious incidents which may have not been reported previously:** people may become less tolerant of certain crimes. This could be influenced by the media and also the break-up of close knit communities meaning people report crimes they would have previously dealt with themselves.
4. **Changing norms and attitudes:** this may result in certain behaviours being seen as more criminal/deviant.
5. **Higher policing levels:** more crimes may be detected due to there being more police, increased community policing and Neighbourhood watch schemes.
6. **Changing counting rules:** this can result in higher numbers of certain offences being recorded, e.g. changing the criteria for what is classified as a hate crime.
7. **More sophisticated police training and equipment:** can lead to increased detection.
8. **Changes in the law:** this can lead to more things becoming illegal.
9. **Easier communications:** mobile phones, text, email and police websites may make the reporting of crime easier.
10. **People have more to lose:** people have more consumer goods and insurance for these. Insurance claims for theft or damage need a police crime number.

**Attempts to overcome the limitations of official statistics**

Victim Surveys

These help to overcome the problems of offences not reported to or recorded by the police. There are some problems however:

1. People may exaggerate to impress researchers.
2. People may forget they were victimised or when they were victimised.
3. People may not realise they have been the victim of a crime.
4. They don’t often include all crimes, e.g. the CSEW doesn’t include fraud.
5. The survey may not be representative and generalizable.
6. Victims may be embarrassed to admit to being a victim.
7. Consensual or victimless crimes where both parties commit an offence may be unreported.

Self-Report Studies

These are useful as they provide information on the characteristics of offenders not reported to or caught by the police, as well as crimes not recorded by them. They can also be used to find out about victimless crimes and may help to discover some of the reasons why people commit crimes.

However, self report studies have some problems too:

1. Offenders may exaggerate to impress researchers, especially young male offenders. Also, offenders may not be willing to admit to more serious offences.
2. Some respondents may not see some offences as a crime. For example, in some communities some crimes may be such a common occurrence that offenders may not see them as criminal and therefore don’t report them.
3. Individuals may not remember all the offences that have committed.
4. More persistent and serious offenders may live lifestyles that result in them not participating in such surveys. This may make these surveys unrepresentative.

The Use of Crime Statistics by Sociologists

**Functionalism, New Right and Right Realism**

Broadly accept statistics as accurate and representative and useful for establishing patterns and trends in crime. They are used as a basis for forming hypotheses and theories.

**Interactionism**

Statistics are social constructions and useful only to reveal the stereotypes, labelling and assumptions of the public, as well as the sexism and racism of the criminal justice system. Statistics also fuel these stereotypes.

**Marxism and Neo Marxism**

Statistics provide a biased view of crime as they underrepresent crimes of the powerful.

**Feminism**

Statistics underrepresent the extent of female crime and crimes by men against women.

**Left Realism**

Statistics are broadly correct, though they underrepresent white collar and corporate crime and exaggerate working class crime, particularly by some minority ethnic groups.

The Victims of Crime

Victimology

This is the term used for the study of the impact of crime on victims, victims’ interests and patterns of victimization.

Victims of crime are increasingly viewed as consumers or customers of the CJS, and is success is now judged by the extent to which it meets the needs of victims, not just how effectively it deals with offenders. This can be seen via:

* The introduction of a National Crime Recording Standard for recording crimes was adopted in 2002 which prioritises victims’ account of a crime occurring, rather than to the police view of the evidence.
* Victim Support schemes are now an integral part of the CJS.
* There is a growing emphasis on restorative justice, which enables victims to confront offenders with the consequences of their actions and encourage them to make amends.
* In 2013 the Home Office announced that victims of antisocial behaviour and low level crime will be able to have their say on out of court punishments of offenders.

This greater importance attached to victims is part of a growing recognition that if victims don’t have confidence in the CJS, most crime will go unreported with victims unwilling to provide evidence.

The Social Construction of Victimization

Who counts as a victim is socially constructed. It depends on the attachment of the label ‘victim’. This can be affected by people not reporting they have been a victim of a crime. This may be due to:

* Victims not realising they have even been victimised.
* Refusing to accept they have been victimised or blaming themselves.
* Thinking the label of ‘victim’ makes them weak or foolish.
* Others may regard them as responsible for their own victimisation, e.g. Tombs and Whyte suggest victims of accidents at work as a result of corporate health and safety failings are often blamed for being negligent.

The Effects of Victimisation

Hoyle points to a range of possible effects of victimisation besides physical harm or financial loss. These can include mental health issues such as depression, disrupted sleep, post-traumatic stress disorder and fear of further victimisation. These will depend on the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the victim.

Other consequences may include restrictions over movement, e.g. Feminists draw attention to female victims being afraid to go out at night.

Further victimisation **(secondary victimisation)** can occur as a result of the original or **primary victimisation**. For example, in rape trials there may be secondary victimisation where it is often the female victims rather than the male suspects who seem to be on trial. Secondary victimisation can also be found in cases of honour crime, where women who have been raped can face further victimisation by family members for the dishonour and shame that their victimisation has brought on their family.

Patterns of Victimisation

**Gender**

Young men (16-24) have about twice the risk of being the victim of most violent crime but this declines with age.

Women are far more likely than men to be victims of ‘intimate crimes’. These crimes are also less likely to be reported, recorded, or to result in offenders being convicted.

Domestic violence

1 in 4 women and 1 in 6 men will suffer some form of domestic violence at some point in their relationships.

89% of domestic assaults are committed by men against their female partners.

Each year about 150 people are killed by a current or former partner and 80% are women.

The majority of victims do not report it or seek help as they are either afraid the violence will get worse, are ashamed or see it as a private matter.

Many female victims suffer **repeat victimisation** which means they suffer the same offence many times, yet many don’t leave their partners, often because of lack of resources for be economically independent, they have nowhere else to go, they blame themselves, they are afraid of further violence or are afraid of losing their children.

The police now take domestic violence more seriously, but only about 40% of all incidents are reported to the police and only around 5% of those reported result in a conviction.

Rape

About 90% of rape victims are women and it is estimated about 1 in 10 rape victims report the offence. They may be deterred from doing so partly because in rape trials it often seems to be the female victims rather than the male suspects who are put on trial. Also rapes that are prosecuted tend to have a very low conviction rate.

A common conception is that rapists are strangers unknown to the victims. However, around 84% of female victims knew the perpetrator. The misleading stereotype of the rapist as an abnormal stranger means that when the criminal justice system is faced with a person accused of rape, the fact that he often knows the victim and appears no different from other men, leads to doubts about whether what occurred was actually rape and can lead to the victim being, unfairly, partly blamed.

**Age**

The lifestyles of the young give them greater opportunity to commit crime and also expose them to being victims of crime. The likelihood of being a victim decreases as an individual gets older. In 2013/14 it was found that adults aged 16-24 were around 9 times more likely to be victims of crimes against the individual than those aged 75 and over.

**Ethnicity**

The risk of being a victim of personal crime is higher for minority ethnic groups than for the white group. Apart from racial incidents, this may be part in explained by the fact that minority ethnic groups are more likely to be younger, working class and live in deprived areas.

Between 2007 and 2010 African Caribbean people were four times more at risk of homicide.

Minority ethnic groups are up to 14 times more likely to be victims of racially motivated incidents.

Honour crimes and forced marriages are exclusively linked to ethnic minority groups and women are overwhelmingly the victims.

**Social class**

The poorest sections of the working class are the most likely victims of crime. The highest rates of victimization are found:

1. *Among the ‘hard pressed’:* the unemployed, long term sick, low income families etc.
2. *In areas of high physical disorder:* with widespread vandalism and graffiti etc.
3. *In areas with high levels of deprivation.*

Those in the 20% of poorest areas faced much higher risks of being victims of household crime compared to the 20% most affluent areas.

Explaining Victimization

These patterns of victimization indicate some social groups are more likely to be victims of crime than others. There are two major approaches to explaining this.

**Positivist victimology**

Tierney suggests this involves identifying something in the characteristics of circumstances of victims which makes them different from non victims. These are:

1. **Victim proneness:** the characteristics of individuals or groups that make them more vulnerable to victimization.
2. **Victim precipitation:** victims are actively involved in, or to blame for, their victimization, e.g. victims failing to conceal valuables.

*Criticisms*

It tends to blame the victims rather than the offenders. Feminist writers, for example, have been very critical of suggestions from positivist victimiology that victims of intimate crimes are somehow to blame.

It downplays the role of the law and criminal justice agencies in not tackling crime effectively and therefore contributing to victimization.

It focuses too much on the characteristics of individual victims and does not pay enough attention to wider structural factors, e.g. poverty, that often make some groups and communities more vulnerable to crime than others.

It doesn’t recognise there are situations where people may unwittingly become victims or are not aware of their victimization, e.g. corporate or white collar crimes.

**Radical or critical victimology**

This is associated with conflict theories such as Marxism and Feminism. It focuses on how wider social issues, including the criminal justice system, produce victimization. For example, deprivation means it is the most deprived members of society who are most likely to be victims, whilst Feminists suggest women are victims of intimate crimes due to male power in a patriarchal society. The higher rates of victimization among ethnic minorities have been explained by under protection by a racist police force which regards ethnic minorities as offenders rather than victims.

*Criticisms*

It ignores the issues of victim precipitation and proneness that positivist victimology identities. For example, many people would regard burglars injured by householders trying to protect their property as responsible for their victimization.

Realist Theories of Crime and Deviance

Realist theories differ from other theories of crime as they focus on the reality of crime, such as what’s actually happening, the impact on victims and the development of policies to tackle crime.

There are two versions:

1. Left Realism: takes the approach of ‘tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime’. This is mainly linked to Labour Party policies
2. Right Realism: this emphasises being tougher on criminals than the causes. This is mainly linked to Conservative Party policies and the New Right.

Left Realism

This developed as a response to traditional Marxist and neo Marxist approaches which it accused of:

1. Not taking working class crime seriously and romanticising working class criminals.
2. Failing to take victimisation seriously as well as the fact that most victims were the poor and deprived.
3. Having no practical policies to reduce crime.

Through victim surveys, Left Realists found crime was a serious problem, particularly in inner city deprived areas. Those at the greatest risk of crime are the poor.

Left Realists accept that most people don’t care much about white collar and corporate crime as they don’t regard it as having any impact on their lives.

**Explaining Crime**

Like Marxists, Left Realists accept that social inequality, social conditions and perceptions of injustice are the major causes of crime.

Lea and Young try to explain why people turn to crime using three key concepts:

1. Relative deprivation

This is when people see themselves as deprived relative to other people they compare themselves with. This can generate discontent and resentment and therefore crime.

1. Marginalisation

Some groups experience **marginality** (when they are pushed to the margins of society) and face social exclusion through educational failure, unemployment etc. This, combined with relative deprivation, can lead to anti-social behaviour and crime as there are few other ways of expressing frustration.

1. Subculture

Working class deviant subcultures emerge as group solutions to the problems of relative deprivation and marginalisation. These subcultures can take different forms over time and in different contexts, e.g. street gangs or youth subcultures. These can lead to more crime as these subcultures may see offending as acceptable behaviour.

**Late Modernity and the Bulimic Society**

Young has developed Left Realism and linked the explanations for crime to changes in society happening in late modernity. Young argues societies are media saturated and everyone is included in consumer culture through constant exposure to advertising and media generated lifestyles. These raise everyone’s expectations of what the good life is like.

However, for some people this is combined with social and economic exclusion, which means they cannot afford to participate in consumer society. Young argued this was creating a **bulimic society** where people gorge themselves on media images of consumer lifestyles but are then forced to vomit out their raised expectations as they cannot afford these lifestyles. This intensifies their frustration.

This explanation was a significant factor in the involvement of young people in looting and rioting in English cities in August 2011.

Young argues the sense of relative deprivation is made worse by the following features of late modern societies:

1. Growing individualism: there is an emphasis on looking after yourself and less emphasis on community spirit and the welfare of others.
2. Weakening of informal controls: traditional social structures such as the family are breaking up. This means there is less informal control on people’s behaviour.
3. Growing economic inequality and change: globalisation has meant the gap between the rich and poor has increased massively, e.g. the wages of celebrities and the decline of manufacturing industries.

All these factors outlined by Young combine to create crime amongst young people. These people are more likely to involve themselves in various forms of what Lyng called **edgework**. These are thrill seeking and risk taking behaviours, which aren’t necessarily criminal or deviant, but which may result in the boundaries of criminal and non-criminal behaviour being tested. This may result in crime.

**The Square of Crime**

To understand and tackle crime, Lea and Young suggest it is necessary to examine the ways in which four elements of **the square of crime** influence or interact with one another.

1. Social structural factors and formal social control by the state: these influence how crime is defined, how enforcement is carried out and whether an act is criminal or not.
2. The public and the extent of informal social control: how do people react to crime in their communities? Do the public report offences?
3. The role of victims: why do people become victims and what do they do about it? How do victims view offenders?
4. The offenders: what meaning does the act have to the offender? Why do they choose to offend?

*Criticisms of Left Realism*

It neglects other responses to relative deprivation and marginalisation such as those outlined by Merton.

It neglects gender as a significant issue and particularly crime which females are most likely to be victims of.

It doesn’t pay much attention to white collar and corporate crime even though these often have the most impact on the most deprived communities.

It doesn’t really explain why most deprived working class youth don’t turn to crime.

Right Realism

This is associated with the New Right.

It has the following features:

1. **Value consensus and shared morality underpin society**

This is reflected in the law and criminals are immoral as they breach this consensus. It is important to maintain social order.

1. **Biological differences influence crime**

Wilson and Herrnstein argue biological differences between individuals make some people more likely to commit crime than others.

1. **Socialisation and community control**

Poor socialisation and lack of community controls result in crime and antisocial behaviour. The most effective way to reduce crime is to strengthen community bonds. This links to Hirschi’s control theory.

Stricter socialisation through the family, education etc, as well as re-establishing a sense of individual responsibility will be more effective than police action in reducing crime.

Murray, for example, links crime to an unemployed, workshy underclass who live in broken communities with high levels of crime. Murray argues this underclass is characterised by dependency on welfare payments, lack of individual responsibility, high rates of lone parenthood etc. which results in lack of adequate socialisation.

1. **Rational choice and opportunity**

People weigh up the costs and benefits before choosing what action to take. Cornish and Clarke suggested people choose to commit crime because they decide the benefits to be gained are greater than the potential costs and there are opportunities to commit crime.

The solution, therefore, is to increase the costs, e.g. heavier policing to increase the risks of being caught and reduce the opportunities for crime.

1. **Crime will always exist**

These will always be some people who commit crime and it is therefore a waste of time trying to find out what the social causes of crime are. The most that can be achieved is to reduce the impact of crime on victims. White collar and corporate crimes have relatively little impact on people so they shouldn’t be a major focus for policing.

*Criticisms*

Doesn’t address the wider structural causes of crime.

Doesn’t pay any attention to white collar, corporate crime or hidden crimes.

Suggests offenders act rationally, but some crimes are impulsive or irrational and do not bring any obvious gain.

Realist Policies for Crime Control and Prevention

Realist theories regard themselves as ‘real’ as they primarily concern themselves with practical policies to prevent crime.

Right Realism

Right Realists focus on individuals and the location of crime rather than on social causes of crime. They emphasise reducing opportunities for crime and increasing the chances of being caught to prevent people from choosing crime.

Right Realists therefore argue people choose to commit crime and therefore no one is forced to commit crime. Therefore we want to prevent people seeing crime as an attractive choice. This can be characterised as being tough on the criminals.

**Environmental crime prevention**

Wilson and Kelling developed what has become known as the **broken windows thesis.** This is the idea that if a broken window (a symbol for social disorder and a lack of community concern) is not repaired, then others are likely to be broken and further neglect will follow.

Unless anti-social behaviour of all kinds are kept to the minimum, then there will be a gradual deterioration of neighbourhoods and a sense that no one cares will develop. This will lead to more anti-social behaviour and petty crimes will eventually grow into more serious crimes.

Therefore two things should happen:

1. Any broken window must be repaired immediately, abandoned cars towed away etc.
2. There should be zero tolerance policing on all anti-social behaviour, even if it isn’t strictly illegal.

**Routine activity theory**

Felson and Clarke suggest a crime occurs as party of everyday routines when there are three conditions present:

1. There is a suitable target for the potential offenders, e.g. a person, place or object.
2. There is no **capable guardian**, e.g. neighbour, police, CCTV, to protect the target.
3. There is a potential offender who thinks the first two conditions are met and then makes a rational choice whether or not to commit the crime.

**Situational crime prevention**

This is concerned with preventing crime in particular locations rather than catching offenders. It aims to make crime a less attractive choice and reduce opportunities for crime.

This is achieved by ‘designing out crime’ and **target hardening measures**, e.g. post coding goods, anticlimb paint, CCTV, alcohol free zones.

Other examples include **hostile architecture** such as public benches with graffiti resistant surfaces or spikes outside buildings to deter rough sleepers.

These measures aim to make possible targets more risky for potential offenders. It is argued these could be combined with signs warning people of surveillance in an area which would encourage people to regulate their behaviour or face punishment.

*Criticisms*

Removes the focus from looking at wider economic and social policies which may cause crime, e.g. capitalism.

Situational crime prevention in an unequal society can increase inequality with the affluent living in target hardened areas meaning poorer people who are unable to afford these measures may become even more vulnerable to crime.

**Displacement theory** suggests situational crime prevention doesn’t prevent crime and simply displaces it to other areas where the risks of being caught are lower. However, a review of situational crime prevention found it led to a **diffusion of benefits** with neighbouring areas also seeing reductions in crime. This review found potential offenders instead find legitimate activities more appealing.

**Increased social control**

This is linked to Hirschi’s control theory. The focus is on tighter family and community control to promote conformity and isolate deviant individuals through community pressure.

This approach also suggests it is possible to predict crime, and therefore prevent it, by identifying those from at risk backgrounds.

Policies linked to this include:

* Making parents take more responsibility for the supervision of their children and socialising them into conformist behaviour. Those who don’t may be issued with Parenting Orders which compel a parent to attend parenting classes or counselling etc.
* Schemes like Neighbourhood Watch, which help to build community controls over crime.
* Cracking down on anti-social behaviour through measures like Criminal Behaviour Orders or Dispersal Orders.
* Supervision of offenders, e.g. electronic tagging to restrict and monitor their movements.
* Adopting **zero tolerance policing** which involves taking steps against all crimes. This links to the broken windows thesis.
* Heavier policing and more arrests particularly in high crime areas to deter potential offending.
* Fast track punishment of offenders with more imprisonment and harsher sentences.

*Criticisms*

Zero tolerance policing and a strong police presence in neighbourhoods with high levels of crime and social disorder may involve a waste of resources on trivial offences.

Labelling theorists suggest zero tolerance policing can result in giving people who have only committed minor offences a criminal record, which may have a negative long term impact.

Ignores white collar and corporate crimes.

Doesn’t address the wider social causes of crime.

Left Realism

Left Realists focus on the idea that both offenders and victims of crimes tend to be found in the most disadvantaged communities. They therefore emphasise the need to tackle the material and cultural deprivation that may lead to crime. This can be characterised as being tough on the causes of crime.

The left realists therefore focus on **social and community crime prevention.** These tend to be longer term strategies as they tackle the causes of offending, rather than just removing opportunities for offending.

Kinsey et al suggest police need to improve clear up rates and to spend more time investigating crime to deter offenders and make the public feel confident that reporting crime is worthwhile.

The lack of confidence in the police in disadvantaged communities often means the police have to resort to military style policing, e.g. stop and search, flooding an area with police. This is often counterproductive and results in further resentment. This was found to be a key reason behind the riots in 2011.

Preventing crime involves using policies such as:

* Building community cohesion, enabling them to develop more informal controls over behaviour.
* Multi agency working, e.g. Community Safety Partnerships, where a variety of agencies such as the police, the local council etc, work together with local people to tackle crime rather than just relying on the police.
* Democratic and community control of policing so it is more responsive to local needs. The police need to be more tolerant of those with different lifestyles or those from non-white ethnic groups. By building more public confidence victims and the community will be encouraged to report crime. Examples include Safer Neighbourhood teams, Community Forums and the election of Police and Crime Commissioners.
* Tackling social deprivation and other risk factors by improving community facilities, reducing unemployment and improving housing.
* Intensive parenting support and early intervention strategies, e.g. Sure Start Children’s Centres.

**The Perry pre-school project**

This project was set up for disadvantaged black children in Michigan. A group of 2-4 year olds were offered a two year enrichment programme during which time they also received weekly home visits.

A study followed the children’s progress after this programme and showed by age 40 they had significantly fewer arrests and more had graduated from high school and were in employment than individuals who hadn’t been part of the programme.

*Criticisms*

They are ‘soft’ on crime as they focus on the social causes and downplay the role of the offender in choosing to commit crime.

The majority of these in deprived communities do not turn to crime.

They deflect attention away from more practical crime prevention measures such as those proposed by the Right Realists.

They ignore white collar and corporate crimes.

Neighbourhood policing, where the police try to integrate themselves into the community, might be seen as an extension of surveillance over the whole population.

Functionalist Theories of Crime and Deviance

Functionalist Theories

**Durkheim: The Functions of Crime and Deviance**

Crime is an inevitable feature of social life because not everyone is effectively socialised into society’s values and there is a diversity of values. Therefore not everyone will have the same level of commitment to the shared values of society.

However, deviance and crime can perform positive functions for society:

1. Strengthens collective values: values can waste away unless people are reminded of the boundaries of right and wrong behaviour. Crime, the reporting of it and public reaction to it therefore strengthens collective values.
2. Enables social change: some deviance is necessary to allow new ideas to develop and for society to progress.
3. Acts as a safety valve: deviance can release stress within society. This avoids more serious challenges to social order.
4. Acts as a warning device: warns that society is not working properly. It therefore indicates there are social problems that need solving before there are more serious threats to social order.

*Criticisms*

Crimes are not always functional for everyone, e.g. the victim.

Crime doesn’t always promote solidarity. It may lead to people becoming more isolated.

**Merton: Strain Theory**

Merton suggests social order is based on a consensus around social goals and approved ways of achieving them.

However, in an unequal society not all individuals have the same opportunity for realising these goals. This means they face a sense of strain and **anomie.**

Individuals may respond via the following behaviours:

1. **Conformity:** accept the goals of society and the means of achieving them.
2. **Innovation:** accept the goals of society but cannot achieve them through approved means so turn to crime instead.
3. **Ritualism:** give up on achieving goals but keep to the means of achieving them, e.g. workers who have given up on hopes of promotion.
4. **Retreatism:** reject goals and means of society. They give up completely.
5. **Rebellion:** reject existing goals and means but substitute them for new ones.

*Criticisms*

Assumes there is a consensus on the goals of society. For example, not all people want financial success.

Focuses on individual responses and doesn’t recognise patterns of crime according to class, gender, age and ethnicity.

Doesn’t explain why most people who face strain don’t turn to crime.

Doesn’t recognise there are many apparent conformists who are actually innovators, e.g. white collar criminals.

Subcultural Theories

These build on Merton’s work but focus on the position of groups in society rather than individuals. These mainly focus on young, working class delinquency.

**Cohen: Status Frustration**

Cohen argues working class youth believe in the goals of mainstream culture but they cannot achieve the goals through approved means.

They feel they are denied status in society and therefore suffer from **status frustration.** This is as a result of failure in education, living in deprived areas and low chances of employment.

As a result they form a delinquent subculture which is based on deviant behaviour. This gives them the opportunity to gain status amongst their peers.

This is also a form of revenge where this individuals get back at the society that has denied them status. This can explain why many juvenile offences are not motivated by financial gain.

*Criticisms*

Assumes working class youth accept society’s goals and only reject them when they can’t achieve them. Miller argues they don’t accept them as they have different values.

Matza also shows how most young delinquents are committed to mainstream values but drift in and out of occasional delinquency.

**Cloward and Ohlin: Different Responses**

Argue Cohen’s theory doesn’t explain the diversity of responses among working class youth who find the socially approved means of achieving society’s goals blocked. They suggest there are three types of subculture:

1. **Criminal Subcultures:** characterised by utilitarian (useful) crimes. These develop in working class areas with patterns of adult crime. This provides a career structure for aspiring young criminals and an alternative to a legitimate career ladder **(illegitimate opportunity structure).** Adult criminals prevent non-utilitarian crimes in order to prevent the attention of the police.
2. **Conflict subcultures:** characterised by violence, gang warfare etc. Emerges in areas where there is a high rate of population turnover and therefore a lack of social cohesion. This prevents the formation of a stable adult criminal subculture and therefore illegal means of achieving goals are blocked. Results in street crime and gang culture which means young people can gain status from peers.
3. **Retreatist subcultures:** includes young people who are double failures. They have failed to succeed in mainstream society and in criminal and conflict subcultures. The response is a retreat into drug addiction and alcoholism.

*Criticisms*

Exaggerate differences between the different types of subculture as there is an overlap between them.

**Miller: Focal Concerns**

Argues there is a distinctive working class subculture with key characteristics called focal concerns. These include an emphasis on:

1. Toughness and masculinity
2. Smartness (being quick witted etc)
3. Autonomy and freedom
4. Trouble
5. Excitement

These values result in a risk of law breaking and become exaggerated as young people search for peer group status.

It is therefore conformity to lower working class subculture rather than the rejection of dominant values.

Criticisms

Do not explain middle class and corporate crime.

They rely on the pattern of crime shown in statistics. However a lot of crime is not reported which makes it difficult to know who the real offenders are.

Imply that working class youth are socialised into delinquent values. If this is the case there should be widespread delinquency. However there is not.

**Matza: Techniques of Neutralisation**

Matza argues delinquents are very similar to other people in society. For example, they show feelings of outrage about crime and often express feelings of remorse when caught.

Many delinquents use **techniques of neutralisation** which are based on mainstream values. These are used to try and justify or excuse their actions as temporary lapses in normally conformist behaviour. The following techniques are often used:

1. Denying responsibility
2. Denying there was a victim or any injury to a victim
3. Claiming that those who blame them have no right to do so
4. Claiming the deviance was justified.

Marxist and Neo Marxist Theories of Crime and Deviance

Marxist Theories

Traditional Marxist theories have the following features:

1. **Capitalist society is criminogenic.**

This means crime is a natural development of a capitalist society which emphasises economic self-interest, greed and personal gain.

Relative poverty means some struggle to survive or are excluded from participating in a consumer society. This encourages crimes like theft or violence due to **social exclusion** (where people are excluded from full participation in society).

Gordon argues that what is surprising is not that the working class commit crime, but that they don’t commit more of it.

1. **The law reflects ruling class interests and ideology**

Laws are not an expression of value consensus. Chambliss and other Marxists argue they are instruments of the ruling class and reflect ruling class ideology.

At the heart of the capitalist system is the protection of private property and other ruling class interests. The state defines acts that threaten these interests as criminal.

Box argues that serious crime is **ideologically constructed.** Serious crime is defined as property crime or offences by the working class rather than harm caused by corporations or governments. The agents of social control (police etc.) protect ruling class interests, criminalise those who oppose them and are used to control the workforce.

Laws that appear to benefit everyone, or the occasional prosecution of members of the ruling class provide a smokescreen suggesting the law is impartial, when this is not the case.

1. **Selective law enforcement**

The impression given by statistics that crime is mainly committed by the working class is due to selective enforcement of the law. Chambliss suggests crime control is focused on the working class who are more likely to be prosecuted. Those of higher social classes are less likely to be prosecuted and if they are they are treated more leniently.

Selective law enforcement gives the impression that the majority of criminals are the working class and this distracts the working class’ attention from their own exploitation and the crimes of the capitalist class. This also means individuals are blamed for crime and not capitalism.

Neo Marxist Theories

Neo Marxists argue Marxist explanations are too deterministic in suggesting many people are forced to commit crime. The Neo Marxists argue no one is forced to commit crime and many people in similar circumstances do not commit crime.

The Neo Marxists also see working class crimes as political acts of resistance to ruling class oppression. This was the approach adopted by Gilroy when studying black crime in the 1970s. He argued black crime was a form of resistance to ruling class oppression in the form of police racism and harassment.

**The New Criminology**

Taylor et al, while accepting many of the features of traditional Marxism, suggested that to fully understand crime and deviance, it was necessary to use structural and interactionist approaches. They therefore blended labelling and Marxism into a fully social theory of deviance. This therefore combines the following main features:

* Marxist ideas about the unequal distribution of wealth and who has the power to make and enforce the law.
* Interactionist ideas about the meaning of the deviant act to the criminal, society’s reactions to it and the effects of the deviant label on the individual.

They argue there are a number of aspects that must be looked at:

1. The wider origins of the deviant act: the unequal distribution of wealth and power in a capitalist society.
2. The immediate origins of the deviant act: the specific situation leading criminals to choose to commit a deviant act.
3. The deviant act and what it means to the deviant: why did the individual carry out this act, e.g. was it a form of rebellion against capitalism, is it just an alternative to employment.
4. The immediate origins of social reaction: the reactions of people around the deviant, e.g. police, family, to the deviant act.
5. The wider origins of social reaction: how does society react to the act, e.g. those with the power to define acts as deviant (police, mass media), why are some acts treated more harshly than others?
6. The effects of the social reaction on the deviant’s future action: does labelling stop them re-offending or does it lead to more deviance?

The New Criminology was applied by Hall et al in their study of black crime, particularly mugging, in the 1970s. Hall suggested these crimes were used by the ruling class to reassert their dominant ideas **(hegemony)** at a time when these ideas were under threat due to economic crisis.

This was done by distracting people from the causes of this crisis by focusing on the problem of mugging by scapegoating young black people. The ruling class owned media exaggerated this problem and demanded something be done about it. Hall et al argued this created a **moral panic** (a wave of public concern about an exaggerated threat to society) which helped justify more aggressive policing. This re-established ruling class hegemony throughout society and prevented wider opposition to the ruling class.

*Criticisms of Marxist and Neo Marxist explanations*

They overemphasise property crime and have little to say about non-property offences.

They overemphasise class inequality and ignore other inequalities like ethnicity and gender.

Feminists regard their theories as malestream, which only focus on male criminality.

Traditional Marxist theories are too deterministic.

Not all laws can be seen as reflecting ruling class interests. There are many that are in everyone’s interests, e.g. traffic and consumer protection laws.

They pay little attention to the victims of crime. Neo Marxists tend to romanticise working class crime. Left Realists point out that most victims are working class.

Interactionist Theories of Crime and Deviance

This is often referred to as labelling theory. This argues that many people commit crime and that people labelled as criminals are only labelled in this way because they have been caught by the police etc. The police have caught and prosecuted these people because of stereotypes and explanations of crime that the police rely on.

Labelling theory seeks to explain why only some people and some acts are defined as deviant while others carrying out similar acts are not.

It therefore focuses on:

1. The interaction between deviants and those who define them as deviant.
2. The process where rules are selectively enforced and why they aren’t always enforced in the same way.
3. The consequences of being labelled as deviant.
4. The circumstances in which a person is defined as deviant.
5. Who has the power to attach deviant labels.

Becker suggests an act only becomes deviant when others perceive and define it in this way. Whether a deviant label is applied to an individual will depend on the reaction of society. Becker argues deviants are simply people that have been successfully labelled in this way by society.

Becker calls those who have the power to enforce rules and impose their definitions of deviance, e.g. police, media, **moral entrepreneurs.**

Selective Law Enforcement

Agencies of social control, e.g. police use discretion when deciding how to deal with illegal or deviant behaviour. The police cannot prosecute all crime, so criminal labels are not attached to every breach of the law. It is important to study how, and to whom, deviant labels are applied.

Becker argues the police operate with stereotypical categories of what constitutes ‘trouble’, who is likely to be a criminal, what areas are likely to have higher levels of crime etc. This influences their responses to behaviour. The action taken depends on these stereotypes.

**Cicourel**

Cicourel suggests law enforcers’ stereotypes can affect whether criminal labels are attached and this leads to the social construction of crime statistics.

He studied juvenile delinquency and found juvenile crime rates to be consistently higher in working class areas than in middle class areas. He found this was because the police viewed the behaviour of middle class and working class juveniles differently even when they were engaged in the same behaviour.

Cicourel argued this was because the police had a perception that middle class youth came from good backgrounds and so their behaviour was seen as temporary lapses and they were not charged with these offences. This was the opposite for working class youth.

The Labelling Process

Lemert distinguishes between **primary** and **secondary deviance.**

Primary deviance is deviance that has not been public labelled, e.g. fare dodging.

However if the deviance is detected and the person committing it is publicly labelled as a criminal this can become a **master status** (a status that overrides all other individual characteristics). This can result in the individual accepting this deviant label and may lead to a **self-fulfilling prophecy** where they become the label. This leads to further deviance known as secondary deviance.

Deviant Careers and the Self Fulfilling Prophecy

Becker also argued this can lead to a **deviant career**. This is when those who have been labelled find legitimate opportunities blocked so commit further deviant acts.

This career begins when an individual joins or identifies with a deviant group facing similar problems. This provides support and understanding for the deviant identity which may generate further deviance.

Becker therefore suggests that social reaction and the application of the deviant label may produce more deviance than they prevent. This links to Cohen’s work on deviancy amplification and moral panics.

**Moral panics and deviancy amplification**

The **deviancy amplification spiral** is a term used to describe the process in which the attempt to control deviance leads to an increase in the level of deviance. This leads to greater attempts to control it, and this then leads to even higher levels of deviance. A key example of this was shown by Cohen in his study of mods and rockers in the 1970s.

The media exaggerated the level of violence and this began a **moral panic** where there was increasing public concern and moral entrepreneurs called for a crackdown. The police responded by arresting more youths which then led to more public concern as they thought there was increasing deviance and seemed to confirm the original media reports.

At the same time the mods and rockers were labelled as **folk devils** who were seen as responsible for society’s problems. This led to them being further marginalised in society.

This links with Lemert’s argument about secondary deviance.

*Criticisms*

It tends to remove blame from the deviant and place it onto those who define them as deviant.

It assumes an act isn’t deviant until it is labelled in this way, yet many people know when they are taking part in deviance.

It doesn’t explain the causes of deviant behaviour before labelling takes place.

It doesn’t explain why people commit different crimes.

It is too deterministic: some people choose deviance and labelling doesn’t always result in more deviance.

It doesn’t explain why there are different reactions to deviance or where stereotypes come from.

It ignores the importance of wider structural factors, e.g. poverty.

It has little to say about the victims of crime.

It has no real solutions for crime.

It doesn’t explain why some individuals are labelled rather than others and why some activities are illegal while others aren’t.

Postmodernist Theories of Crime and Deviance

Postmodernists view crime as an outdated metanarrative of the law, which doesn’t reflect the diversity of postmodern society. Crime as it is presently defined is simply an expression of a particular view among those with power of how people should conduct themselves and denies people’s freedom and difference.

As a result, they argue it is necessary to develop a transgressive approach. This doesn’t define crime as simply law breaking and focuses on a definition of crime based on respect for people’s chosen identities and lifestyles.

A Transgressive Approach

Henry and Milovanovic suggest crime should be defined as people using power to show disrespect for, and causing harm to others, whether or not it is illegal. This embraces all threats and risks to people pursuing increasingly diverse lifestyles and identities.

They identify two forms of harm:

1. **Harms of reduction:** power is used to cause a victim to experience some immediate loss or injury.
2. **Harms of repression:** power is used to restrict future human development. This brings a wider range of actions into being classed as criminal, which may not be illegal, or taken very seriously, e.g. sexual harassment and hate crimes.

The Causes of Crime

Postmodern society is characterised by a fragmentation of the social structure of society and a diversity of values. Social class, work and family, which formed people’s identity, gave them roles and values and integrated them into society, have been replaced by uncertainty and choice of identity.

Individuals increasingly focus on themselves, often with little sense of obligation to others, which reduces constraints over committing crime.

The individualism of identity means the social causes of crime are undiscoverable. Each crime becomes a one off event and is motivated by an infinite number of individual causes.

**Edgework and the Seduction of Crime**

Katz explores the seduction of crime for individuals and Lyng argued people participating in crime are engaged in edgework. This involves individuals committing crime for excitement and thrills as they explore boundaries between legal and criminal behaviour.

Crime and antisocial behaviour may just be one more way in which people construct their identities along other high risk activities, e.g. skydiving. The thrill of crime is more likely to appeal to young people, especially young working class men who lack ways of achieving peer group status through non-criminal behaviours.

*Criticisms*

It doesn’t explain why most people don’t use their power to harm others and why particular individuals or groups find it necessary to engage in acts of harm as a means of asserting their identity.

It fails to recognise that consumer society can lead to resentment among those who can’t afford to participate.

Fails to recognise that many people still have strong conceptions of right and wrong.

Feminist and Postmodernist Policies for Crime Control and Prevention

Feminism

Feminist approaches mainly focus on the issues that directly impact on women. These largely relate to the fear of crime among women and particularly their fear of going out at certain times or being forced to avoid certain areas for fear of patriarchy based violence.

They regard patriarchy as they key factor contributing to crimes against women and women themselves turning to crime.

Newburn suggests feminist solutions to crime involve:

* Making previously ignored forms of victimization visible., e.g. domestic violence,
* Exposing the extent to which violence against women is primarily an issue of men’s violence against women, rather than violence perpetrated by strangers.
* Recognising that sexual violence is primarily an issue of male power and in some cases **misogyny** (hatred or dislike of females), not of sex.
* Showing how a patriarchal criminal justice system holds stereotyped views of women and fails to respond appropriately to crimes against them.
* Identifying the features of the criminal justice system that lead to further victimization of women, e.g. the questioning of female victims in rape trials.
* Liberal feminists emphasise improving the circumstances that might encourage women to report crimes against them, e.g. more specialist training of police officers to deal with intimate crimes.

**Crimes committed by women**

Crimes committed by women are mainly related to poverty, debt and drug abuse, there need to be more supportive welfare policies and better paid jobs. These policies would involve similar approaches to the Left Realists but with more focus on the circumstances of women.

Marxist Feminists focus on how inequality in a capitalist society has its hardest impact on women, particularly working class women, which drives them to commit ‘female’ crimes, e.g. prostitution and shoplifting, through economic necessity, as well as making them the main victims of crime. Tackling female crime therefore involves tackling social inequality

Radical Feminists emphasise the way women sometimes turn to crime as a result of the responsibilities placed on them by a patriarchal society, e.g. housework and childcare. Radical Feminists emphasise policies such as opening more rape crisis centres, highlighting the abuse of women through things like ‘slut walks’ and ‘reclaim the night’ marches. Men need to undergo re-socialisation so they no longer treat women as sexual objects.

Postmodernism

Postmodernists regard the law as an outdated metanarrative that is simply the expression of a particular view among those in power, of how people should conduct themselves. It does not reflect the growing diversity and choice of identities in contemporary societies.

Lea suggests the postmodernist approach to crime reduction involves a need for the criminal justice system to recognise the diversity of social groups and to respect their particular identities and lifestyle choices.

The emphasis on the fragmentation of society and diversity of identities leads to an emphasis on more informal local arrangements for preventing crime. This involves replacing the centrally managed formal criminal justice system processes with more localised and informal arrangements, e.g. community policing, private security firms, controls through the family and school.

The increasing use of private control agencies and the use of surveillance technology enable crime control to be customised to the demands and needs to particular communities and groups. This is accompanied by growing control of entry to certain areas, e.g. shopping centres and gated communities, for which control is only allowed for some social groups, e.g. shoppers and residents rather than skateboarders or the homeless.

Postmodernists emphasise that crime is caused by complex individual motives and therefore justice needs to be more individualised to reduce crime. It needs to reflect the particular needs of the offender and the wider public interest. This involves looking at whether alternatives to prosecution are necessary. Sentencing should be customised to each individual and recognise the particular circumstances that make them likely to commit crime.

*Criticisms*

Doesn’t recognise the importance of social inequality. Poorer social groups face increasing exclusion from places like shopping centres and more surveillance though more repressive policing.

Doesn’t recognise that more informal arrangement for crime control, e.g. private security firms and localised policing, are likely to benefit the most articulate and affluent middle class groups who have the power and resources to get their needs attended to.

Control Theory

Hirschi agrees with Durkheim that social order is based on shared values and socialisation. However, instead of trying to explain why people commit crime, he looks at why people don’t commit crime.

Control theorists argue all human beings can commit crime but there are social bonds with other people that encourage them not to. However, if these social bonds are weakened or broken they will turn to crime.

Four Social Bonds

There are four social bonds which pull people away from crime:

1. People share moral beliefs, e.g. respect for rights of others.
2. People are committed to conventional activities, e.g. working, and have no wish to risk this through crime.
3. People are involved and kept busy with different groups and activities. They have no opportunity or time for crime.
4. People are attached to those around them and sensitive to their needs and wishes.

Hirschi adds that there must also be opportunities for offending as well as weakened or removed social bonds in order for crime to occur. This links to Right Realism.

*Criticisms*

Assumes crime is committed by people who have broken away from the values of society, but Merton and Matza suggest people who commit crime remain committed to these values.

Doesn’t explain why some have weaker bonds than others.

Doesn’t explain why not all individuals with weaker bonds turn to crime.

Doesn’t explain the variety of forms of deviance and crime.

Doesn’t recognise it is possible to be deviant and have tight social bonds, e.g. white collar criminals.

Suggests everyone is a potential criminal and therefore our behaviour should be closely controlled and monitored. This may undermine respect for the law.

The Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system (CJS) refers to all the different agencies and organisations that are involved in law, order, crime and punishment, and how they work together. It consists of the police, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), courts, prisons and probation service. They are overseen by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice. The Youth Justice Board oversees youth justice, and advises the Ministry of Justice on youth offending.

The CJS is dominated by older, middle class people and in crown courts, senior judges are predominantly white and male and drawn from very privileged social backgrounds.

The Role of the CJS in Crime Control and Prevention

The CJS is concerned with four inter-related aims:

1. *Deterrence*: deterring people from committing crime is a key aim of the CJS
2. *Public protection*: primary role of the police is to maintain public order, prevent crime and catch offenders. Courts will use appropriate sanctions to stop further harm.
3. *Retribution*: **retributive justice** is concerned with punishing criminals for wrongdoing.
4. *Rehabilitation*: **rehabilitative justice** is the idea that, often alongside or instead of being punished, criminals should be rehabilitated. This means turning them into reformed characters, so they do not offend again.

Changing Approaches to Criminal Justice

Garland suggests in most of the twentieth century the focus of the CJS was on the rehabilitation (reform) of offenders. However since the 1970s there has been a growing emphasis on retributive justice with harsher penalties, giving criminals what Newburn called their just deserts. This was shown by a significant increase in imprisonmentwith the number of prisoners doubling in the UK between 1970 and 2014. This is also accompanied by politicians talking about cracking down on crime by controlling and supervising offenders.

However, there has been growing uncertainty about whether deterrents such as imprisonment are working. Crawford and Evans note that since the 1980s the emphasis of crime reduction has been focused on preventing crime in the future. There has been a growing recognition that the CJS should also be concerned with protecting the rights and needs of victims as well as punishing the criminals.

**The culture of control: from Left Realism to Right Realism**

These changes have been reflected in sociological theory where there was a shift from Left Realist approaches to more Right Realist approaches. Left Realist approaches focus on the causes of crime such as social injustice and inequality, whereas Right Realist approaches focus more on the consequences of crime and the need for more social control, stricter socialisation, harsher punishment, measures to reduce the opportunities for criminal acts to be committed, and reducing the harm and fears that crime produces in the public.

Garland argues there is now a **culture of control**, concerned with controlling, preventing and reducing the risks of people becoming victims rather than with rehabilitating criminals. This is accompanied by the growing use of private security alongside official criminal justice agencies.

**Restorative justice**

Due to the rise of uncertainty about the impact of imprisonment on reducing crime, there are more attempts being made to divert people involved in low-level minor offending away from formal sanctions. This aims to reduce the criminalization of those who commit minor offences and to avoid them entering **universities of crime** (prisons and youth justice institutions).

There is more use of **restorative justice** processes and of community sentences for less serious offences. Restorative justice is when victims and offenders are brought together to help repair the harm done by the offender and make them take responsibility for their actions. Braithwaite claims restorative justice is more effective when it involves **reintegrative shaming**. This involves not only coming face to face with victims, but also being publicly named and shamed, which will encourage offenders to conform in future.

Postmodernists note the movement of the CJS from centralised control to more informal localised arrangements, as it takes into account peoples different lifestyles and needs. For example policing policies becoming more localised and community based, reflecting diverse and localised identities such as ethnic and gender identities. This could also include the use of private security firms by people and businesses who seek to customise crime control to their own needs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Imprisonment is effective** | **Imprisonment is not effective** |
| Functionalism: prison is a form of retributive justice. Helps reinforce the value consensus/collective conscience; builds social solidarity and maintains social orderControl theory: by sending someone to prison it makes it clear they have done something wrong and therefore helps establish shared moral beliefs and encourages them to care about others around them.Right Realism: increases the costs of crime therefore making crime a less attractive rational choice (Cornish and Clarke)Weber: imprisonment is a form of punishment decided upon by bureaucracies who are controlled by elected governments. Therefore it is fair. | Marxism: is part of repressive state apparatus used by ruling class to maintain their power and dominance. Form of social control used to prevent ruling class from being challenged. Used more for working class crime than for crimes of the powerful. Downes: mass incarceration locks up the unemployed which makes capitalism look successful (maintains false class consciousness).Left Realism: doesn’t tackle the causes of crime: marginalisation (unemployment; educational failure) or deprivation. Interactionism: results in a label becoming a master status which results in secondary deviance and deviant career. Prisons are universities of crime which cause more crime.Foucault: surveillance is more effective as it encourages self surveillance, reducing the need for prison. Postmodernism: individualised, localised arrangements are needed because the causes of crime are individual, therefore individualised solutions are needed.Feminism: women who don’t conform to expected gender norms more likely to be arrested and imprisoned.  |

Surveillance and Crime Control and Prevention

Foucault suggested surveillance was a key means of monitoring, controlling and changing the behaviour of criminals. It is a form of disciplinary power as the uncertainty of people about whether they are being watched leads to **self surveillance** and control over their behaviour.

Foucault sees surveillance as entering more into every sphere of life, including our private lives. He argues society has been transformed into a surveillance or disciplinary society in the **age of panopticism** in which everyone is subject to the disciplinary gaze of the panopticon.

Surveillance technology (which Foucault calls **technologies of power** and **disciplinary technologies**) have enabled the state to exercise disciplinary power over the whole population. Lyon argues that surveillance in modern societies has been enhanced by information and communication technologies (ICTs). In addition to those who may be suspects, ordinary people’s personal data is of interest to others. He also argues everyday life has become less private. Surveillance is now such a key part of everyday life that it makes sense to talk of surveillance societies where ICTs enable total social control.

Round the clock surveillance technologies like CCTV, face recognition software and automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) systems now monitor the movements of all people, and such technology has become a key means of controlling crime and disorder, by avoiding the risk of them occurring in the first place, and of tracking potential offenders.

Foucault used the concept **carceral archipelago** (a prison consisting of a series of islands) to describe contemporary societies, with every public location like a small panopticon in which everyone is subject to surveillance, e.g. schools Government agencies gather huge amounts of data on every individual, surveillance is now used not just to track criminals but also to prevent potential crime and non-conformist behaviour.

According to the British Security Industry Association an estimated 5 million CCTV cameras are installed across the UK. This makes Britain one of the most heavily surveilled countries in Europe, with the police routinely using video footage to identify criminals.

This surveillance also takes the form of consumer tracking, in which a large amount of data is collected on individuals. For example Tesco Clubcard collects information about every product a customer purchases, providing a profile of the lifestyle of that person.

Internet Service Providers (ISP) are now legally required to hang on to their users’ communications and often an individual’s digital footprint provides more information than direct, physical observation. Everything is visible to the state or large corporations such as Apple, Google and Amazon.

Foucault suggests we are now living in a **carceral** (prison-like) culture, in which the panoptic model of surveillance has been spread throughout society. Society itself has become a gigantic panopticon, where everyone is being watched by those with power (who Foucault calls **the judges of normality**) in order to impose conformist behaviour through self-discipline.

Evaluation of Foucault

A strength of Foucault’s analysis is that he shows how the power of surveillance can increase the power of the state. He regards this as an oppressive form of social control, encouraging conformity and limiting opposition to an unequal society

However, such surveillance is now sowidespread that people are no longer aware of it. Even when they are, they can take steps to avoid it. This means self surveillance is less likely to occur.

Some surveillance can be useful, e.g. monitoring hospital patients. Evidence suggests those living in the most deprived communities with the most crime welcome surveillance.

**Synoptic surveillance**

Mathiesen argues that in contemporary society it is not just the few who monitor the many. The media enables the many to monitor the few, for example, by media stories on corrupt or immoral behaviour by politicians. This means we live in a **synopticon.**

Another example of this is where the public monitor each other, for example via dash-cams or helmet-cams.

The widespread ownership of cameras and camera phones means people can monitor the monitors, for example, by filming illegal behaviour by the police.

**Surveillant assemblages**

Foucault’s argument about the panopticon is based on the idea that surveillance involves the monitoring of physical bodies in specific places, e.g. prison.

However, Haggerty and Ericson point out that surveillance technologies now ‘talk’ to one another, e.g. number plate recognition software and CCTV footage. This means data doubles of individuals can be created and monitored, e.g. through mobile phone communication, rather than monitoring the physical individual.

**Risk management**

Feely and Simon identify three ways in which surveillance is different now to Foucault’s argument:

1. It focuses on groups rather than individuals.
2. It is not interested in rehabilitation but is interested in preventing offending.
3. It uses calculations of risk.

An example of this is airport screening checks. These are based on known risk factors.

One effect of this is to place entire social groups under suspicion. For example, in 2010 West Midlands police sought to introduce a counter-terrorism scheme to surround two mainly Muslim suburbs of Birmingham with automatic number plate recognition cameras, thereby placing whole communities under suspicion.

The problem with risk management is the danger of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

**Labelling**

Research shows that CCTV operators make discriminatory judgments about who they should focus on. For example Norris and Armstrong found there is targeting of young black males.
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