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Abstract

Although statistics imply that youth crime is falling, fear of crime amongst young people is prevalent. Young people living in high crime neighbourhoods are more likely to become involved with crime - as victim or offender - and to experience increased psychological stressors such as fear. Even though schools have almost universal access to young people, in the UK their role in crime prevention is in its infancy. In contrast, the positive impact of crime prevention interventions in countries including America and Australia are well documented.

By analysing the perspectives of a range of young people and adult stakeholders in an inner-city community, this study contributes to knowledge about how to strengthen the role of the school in youth crime prevention.

A qualitative mixed-methods design was used to allow full exploration of the topic. Young people in Years 5-9 took part in mixed gender, school-based, focus groups. Adult stakeholders, including primary and secondary school staff, the police and youth workers, shared their views in semi-structured interviews or focus groups. Each participant lived or worked in the research ward.

Each interview and focus group was transcribed and analysed along three thematic analyses; ‘context of crime for young people’, ‘context of youth crime for adult community stakeholders’ and possible future ‘ways of working’. Various themes and subthemes allowed for further exploration of the topic.

The findings highlight how regularly young people in high crime inner-city communities are exposed to crime, and how aware they are of it. Participants report that young people are not getting enough crime prevention support in school, and that schools could and should be doing more. The limited support available to young people is piecemeal, and tends to be reactive not preventative. This study highlights the need for increased joined-up working between youth services and education. There is also a need for a wider range of provision and better use of existing resources in such communities to better meet the holistic needs of young people and protect them from crime. Although
there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution to improving crime prevention support in schools, the findings can be applied to other contexts. The study outlines the implications for professionals in these communities, including the possible role for educational psychologists.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

This thesis will explore the role of the school in supporting and protecting young people from crime. It will incorporate the perspectives of a range of stakeholders in an inner-city community, to contribute to knowledge about how to strengthen the role of youth crime prevention in UK schools.

This chapter briefly introduces the topic and presents a rationale for the current study. It summarises the national, local and personal contexts that have influenced this research.

England and Wales have particularly high rates of youth crime, with more young people in custody than any other European country, besides Turkey (Natale, 2010). Young offenders are some of the most vulnerable and excluded groups in society and are more likely to have been victims of crime (Youth Justice Board, 2006). Existing literature outlines the long-term detrimental impacts of offending (SEU 2001; Keung, 2010), including the psychological well-being of those who are involved in, or exposed to crime (Gabriel & Greve, 2003; Stafford, Chandola, & Marmot, 2007; Jackson, 2009).

Research suggests that young people in marginalised communities are more at risk of becoming involved in crime, either as offender or victim; the relationship between crime and social deprivation is well-documented (Ralphs, Medina & Aldridge, 2009). Socio-economic deprivation also increases the risk and incidences of mental health difficulties in children (Wilkinson, 1997; Logan & Spencer, 2000), highlighting the need for increased levels of support for young people in deprived areas.

The huge costs of crime to the UK economy and society, heavily outweighs the relatively small sums spent on prevention (Hosking & Walsh, 2005; Solomon & Garside, 2008). There is however, a growing consensus that young people need to be protected from becoming involved in crime (HM Government, 2011; International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC), 2010a). The current political agenda focuses on community cohesion, prevention, early intervention
and improving services for vulnerable children and families (Allen, 2011; HM Government, 2011; Department for Education (DfE), 2013).

The government’s ‘new approach to fighting crime’ involves a shift in power from Whitehall to local communities (Home Office, 2013), presenting an opportunity to tailor social crime prevention to specific local issues. A community approach, with support from frontline services working collaboratively with the systems around young people, is recognised as being most accessible and an effective solution (Attride-Strirling Davis et al., 2001). This is however in stark contrast to the huge cutbacks to youth and community services and initiatives to protect young people, introduced by the latest government. This will increase the vulnerability of young people in hard-to-reach communities.

Schools are at the heart of communities and there is a growing awareness, both in the literature and government policy, of the need for schools to tackle issues which lie ‘beyond the school gates’ (British Educational Research Association (BERA), 2010a). Sir Michael Wilshaw (Head of Ofsted) identified the need for schools to act as ‘surrogate parents’ (Wilshaw, 2011). This includes promoting the psychological and emotional well-being of pupils (Urbis, 2011). Youth is the most criminogenic age and schools are the one place where children and young people spend a significant amount of time (Rutter, et al., 1979; Hayden, Williamson & Webber, 2007), illustrating the possible role schools could play in deterring young people from crime.

The role of schools in crime prevention is rarely mentioned in UK educational research (Hayden et al., 2007). It is not covered in criminological data, and does not feature on the National Curriculum. The reduction in the Physical Social Health and Emotion (PSHE) curriculum and the heavy academic demands on schools will mean that crime prevention is not likely to be top of the agenda. Even though the government have signalled the role in which they think schools could play (HM Government, 2011), there is little support and practical guidance to help schools to do this.
Internationally the role of the school in crime prevention is more widely recognised. The US, Europe and Australia all have well-documented school-based interventions targeting youth crime, all finding them to be effective in reducing violent and disruptive behaviour (Vazsonyi, Belliston & Flannery, 2004; Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). Intervention also educates young people about the consequences of becoming involved in crime, successfully deterring them from doing so.

Evidence suggests that involving communities in developing and implementing successful youth crime prevention strategies is paramount (11 Million, 2009), and because any strategy to prevent youth crime will involve young people, they must also be given a voice. Listening to young people’s opinions should provide valuable insight and knowledge that should inform future support.

This study aims to explore how community stakeholders, including young people, in a socially deprived neighbourhood, view the role of the school in providing crime prevention support to young people.

There are contextual factors that are relevant to the present research and will be discussed in more detail below.

1.1 Local Context
London has been identified as a hotspot for youth crime (Communities that Care, 2005; Hallsworth & Duffy, 2010). Hallsworth and Duffy (2010, p. 38) recently reviewed the research on gangs in London and pointed out that, “The majority of interventions being offered to young people in London however are targeted at those who have been identified as ‘at risk’ of offending or are already engaged in offending”. Their conclusion highlights a need to educate young people about the consequences of crime, with a focus on prevention.

In my current role as Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP), I work with young people living in a high crime neighbourhood in London who regularly express their awareness of crime in their local area. This includes voicing their fears and
worries about their own risk and vulnerability to crime, and the stresses and pressures this inevitably involves.

The teaching / support staff in the schools also regularly outline their fears for young people as a result of their increased exposure to crime. They worry for their pupils’ safety, and the impact on their psychological wellbeing in terms of fear, anxiety and social pressures to conform. They are also concerned about the effect of crime on their pupils’ overall engagement in school and on their learning. Young people who are experiencing psychosocial stressors such as fear and anxiety, or have low self-efficacy, are unlikely to achieve their best in school.

1.2 Personal Context

“A direct consequence of self-reflexivity is the use of the first person to discuss the author’s “embedded” role in the case study, not as an “objective” outsider but as a practitioner affecting, and being affected by, the system.” (Pellegrini, 2009 p. 272)

In my current role as a practitioner for three schools in a socially deprived, high-crime area, I have witnessed first-hand the long-term detrimental impact of young people becoming involved in crime, on both themselves and their families. My previous work with young offenders and their families living in urban communities, gangs, children looked after, and those excluded from school, highlighted the wider impact of youth crime. In my MSc in Applied Forensic Psychology, I was able to engage and reflect on the psychology of offending behaviour and victimology, which increased my awareness of the importance of early intervention and prevention.

My current work as a TEP has shown me that the emphasis should be on providing opportunities for social inclusion; if we find ways to support, engage and inspire young people then I believe they will be less likely to drift into antisocial and criminal activities. Educational Psychologists (EPs) are effective in supporting schools to meet the cognitive, social and emotional developmental needs of young people. Farrell, et al. (2006) suggests that ‘Educational Psychology services are likely to become more community focused within the
new Children’s Services, with a reduced emphasis on school based work’. My focus and object is to highlight the need for prevention and early intervention to support and protect young people, and my interest in the unique position the school has in having virtually universal access to all children, underpins this research.

Of particular interest is Bronfenbrenner’s Eco-Systemic Model (ESM) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), which emphasises the continuous interaction of an individual within their environment (see Appendix A). It recognises the child as developing and existing within dynamic and interdependent systems. This model shows the influence of environmental systems such as the family, school, peers and local community as well as cultural norms, values, policies and economic conditions in our society. The ESM underpins the systemic role of EP practice and promotes EPs to work more diversely and creatively with young people and all of the systems that they function in.

When considering the lives of young people at risk of crime, a systemic model has particular value. If the role of the school is to become more integral in crime prevention, it is important that we explore the perspectives of young people and other community stakeholders, in order to identify areas of need and possible future ways of working.

1.3 Aim of Research
The aim of this research is to contribute to knowledge about how to strengthen the role of youth crime prevention in UK schools, through the analysis of the perspectives of a range of stakeholders in an inner-city community.

1.4 Research Questions
RQ1) What are children and young people’s views about their vulnerability to youth crime, and the role of youth crime prevention in schools? How are their perspectives influenced by gender and age?

RQ2) How do a range of professionals in the youth and community sector, and the education sector view youth crime prevention and its role in schools? What
can we learn from community stakeholders to inform school-based interventions?

RQ3) What approaches to tackling youth crime prevention are likely to be most effective in UK schools?
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

This literature review will address Research Question 3 by providing an overview of the relevant literature, including the international literature in regard to crime prevention in schools. The scope of literature reviewed will include both academic literature as well as government policy documentation. This chapter will start off by reviewing the literature on youth crime and the impact of crime; it will then address government policy and current concerns in regard to youth crime. The fear of crime will then be discussed, followed by a review of the risk/protective factors, with a particular focus on the neighbourhood and the school. The existing role of the school in crime prevention will be reviewed and lastly the international literature regarding what factors contribute to effective school-based prevention programmes will be considered. In recognition of the growing consensus that young people need to be protected from crime (HM Government, 2011) and that the school may have a role to play in this, as well as the fact that there is limited information available about how to achieve this, the focus of the literature reviewed throughout this chapter, is that of crime prevention. It is important to note that whilst the UK literature on crime prevention education is sparse (Hayden et al., 2007), there is literature, including reviews and analyses, in regard to sex and drugs educations in UK schools which is informative (Stone & Ingham 1998; Stead & Angus, 2007; Department for Children, Schools and Families 2008a; Department for Children, Schools and Families 2008b; Bardisa-Ezcurra, Kwan & Pledge 2009; Jones, Bates & Downing 2009; NICE 2010; DfE, 2013). However, it is not within the scope of this review to elaborate on the literature in regard to the particulars of individual crimes, such as drug misuse or sex crimes. The focus of this study is exploring the schools role in preventing and protecting children and young people from crime in its entirety, with the recognition that it is multifaceted and involves various acts that are forbidden and punishable by law.

2.3 What is Youth Crime?

Before looking at the research, it is worthwhile to address exactly what is meant by the term ‘youth crime’. The Youth Justice System (YJS) deals with young people aged 10-17 years old. Children under age 10 are considered to not be criminally responsible by the Criminal Justice System (CJS) and young people
aged 18 or over are deemed adults. For the purpose of this research youth crime is defined as crime committed by those between the ages of 10-17. In this research the term youth crime includes youth violence.

2.3.1 Youth Crime in the UK
There is no way of accurately assessing youth crime, however we can estimate it by looking at police crime statistics, crime surveys and self-report surveys. Statistics convey that crime has been falling since the mid-1990s and the number of young people in the YJS has continued to decrease in 2010/11; in terms of those entering the system for the first time, those receiving custodial sentences and those re-offending (Ministry of Justice, 2012). However, 31 years of national crime surveys routinely demonstrate high levels of crime absent from statistics, the ‘dark figure of crime’ (Hough & Mayhew, 1983), and so should be interpreted with caution (MVA, 2002; Simmons & Dodd 2003). Self-report studies reveal that around a half of young males and a third of young females admit to some involvement in offending (Hines & Williams, 2007).

Despite an apparent reduction in youth crime, Natale’s (2010) recent review for the Institute for the Study of Civil Society (CIVITAS), reports that offending is most likely to occur between the ages of 14 and 18. Findings from the longitudinal Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions report that overall offending, both volume and prevalence of crime, appears to peak at age fourteen (McVie, 2005). Other research reports that young people are likely to commit their first offence between the ages of 11 and 12 (YJB, 2006); all of which suggest that late childhood/early adolescence is a risky age for involvement in crime. The number of 15-17 year olds in Young Offender Institutes (YOI) has more than doubled over the past ten years and every year an estimated 70,000 school-age children enter the YJS. The total cost of dealing with young offenders is reported at £4 billion a year (Natale, 2010). Clearly youth crime remains problematic. In stark contrast to the image portrayed in the media, both crime surveys and statistics figures show that youth crime makes up only a small proportion of overall crime.
It is well established that young people who become involved with the YJS are more likely to experience disadvantages and more difficult transitions into adult life (Home Office, 2002; Furlong & Cartmel 2007; Hine & Williams, 2007). There are genuine concerns about young peoples’ involvement with serious offending such as use of weapons, gang membership and drug dealing in major cities (Natale, 2010) and the impact of such crimes on their psychological well-being (Jackson, 2009).

The primary purpose of the Children Act (2004) was to offer a set of goals (the five aspects of the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda to ensure the best outcomes for all children and young people (HM Government, 2004). However in recent years the UK was placed bottom of a league table of child well-being in the European Union (Bradshaw, Hoelscher & Richardson, 2007) and ranked bottom of the world’s developed nations on child well-being (UNICEF, 2007). This suggests that society is failing to promote and support positive well-being for some young people. Rees, et al. (2010) describe well-being as an overarching concept regarding the quality of people’s lives, as a dynamic process emerging from the way in which people interact with the world around them. This highlights the need to work systemically, engaging with the various systems around the young person, when addressing their well-being.

It is impossible to eradicate all risk, but it is society’s responsibility to ensure that the most disadvantaged vulnerable young people are protected as much as possible and are equipped to cope with the risks to crime. As well as the need to educate and protect young people there are huge costs of crime, both in terms of the financial realm and costs to the victim, perpetrator and wider society. The focus of the current economic climate is that of ‘value for money’ and ‘cost effectiveness’, with this in mind the costs of youth crime will be reported below to reinforce the need for a crime prevention strategy.

The cost of youth crime to UK society is high and the large majority of this money is spent on punishment and youth justice rather than prevention (Solomon & Garside 2008). There are increasing numbers of young people in custody and each place costs between £50,000 per annum for a Youth Offender Institute
(YOI) and £206,000 for a secure children’s home placement (Natale, 2010). Costs of formal punishment are extortionate, the results ineffective, and the numerous harmful effects of prison are well-known (Time for a Fresh Start, 2010). De Zulueta (2009) estimates that the ratio of current cost of preventing crime in the UK compared to cost of its consequences are 1:3000. The figures alone provide a purely financial incentive for prevention strategies, without the obvious motivation of the need to ensure young people are safe and supported in order to achieve their full potential. There are numerous intangible costs of crime which are difficult to measure, such as losses arising from the emotional and physical effects of crime (Dolan, et al., 2005) and also the social and economic costs associated with the fear of crime (Dolan & Peasgood, 2007).

Gender difference is prevalent in the youth crime literature, and features in Research Question 1 of this study; this is discussed in more detail below.

2.4 Gender and Crime
The long history of crime data and research demonstrates that the prevalence of offending amongst boys is significantly higher than amongst girls and the most recent Youth Justice Board (YJB) review reflects this and reports that young males accounted for 12.6 per cent of total arrests and young females 2.8 per cent in 2011/12 (YJB, 2013). Whilst it is important to read crime statistics with caution, these figures clearly indicate that males continue to be over represented in the YJS. Historically this has inevitably resulted in a focus on young male offending in both media and government policy. However both boys and girls are affected by crime and the invisibility of girls in policy and literature has been critiqued (Belknap, 2001).

In the literature, the diversity in risk-taking behaviour of males and females is often associated with different life experiences and the gendered presumptions attached to masculinity and femininity within western society (Green, Mitchell & Bunton, 2000). Over a decade ago Davies (1999) points out that girls and boys ‘do’ masculinity and femininity and so gender can now be viewed as a situated accomplishment. Recent policy recognises the ‘increasing’ role of girls and crime, particularly their involvement in gang-related activity and concerns
regarding the hidden impact of serious youth violence on girls (HM Government, 2013). This suggests a shift in policy, which is also echoed in the media, regarding the focus of youth crime from typically being that of boys and gangs, to the recognition of the involvement of girls in gangs. Recent research has exposed the significant harm posed to girls as a result of relationships with gang-associated boys and family members (Race on the Agenda, 2011) this contributes to the growing concern regarding the often covert exploitation of females.

Currently there is a specific concern and political focus on the sexual exploitation of females, particularly in relation to gangs. The government paper ‘Ending Youth and Gang Violence’ (HM Government, 2011) stated that by April 2013, specialist services will be in place for females suffering gang-related sexual exploitation and abuse. The development of recent policy demonstrates the sustained attention on the need to end violence against women and girls in the UK, recognising the vulnerability of some young girls in being groomed, exploited and abused (HM Government, 2013). An increase in recognition across policy is mirrored by the increasing media coverage regarding the role of girls in crime. Although this is clearly an area of concern, the recent crime statistics report that since 2008/09 the number of young females entering the YJS has fallen by 64%, compared to 50% for young males (YJB, 2013), suggesting that the number of females entering the YJS is declining. The statistics suggest that discourses on female crime are exaggerated. At the same time there is evidence of girls’ sexual exploitation reflected in current rape statistics. There are concerns about the ‘hidden’ exploitation of girls and the covert role of girls in gangs, and if this is the reality then it is unlikely to be reflected in crime statistics. This illustrates the need for more qualitative explorative research in this area in the hope of exposing the reality of this concern. It also suggests an increasing need for young people to be educated about the impact of sexual exploitation and for this issue to be brought to the attention of young people in a supportive, appropriate way.

Youth crime has often become a political battleground in the UK with different parties presenting various strategies to reduce crime. The role of politics and
various government agendas in relation to crime prevention, youth policies and legislation will be discussed in more detail below. It is important to address government policy as this is likely to influence and underpin discourse on youth crime prevention; before doing this it is important to be clear about what is meant by crime prevention.

2.5 Crime Prevention Definition

For the purpose of this research crime prevention refers to both an act intended to prevent any crime before it actually happens and an act aimed to support and protect people from crime. In effect, crime prevention is about stopping crime from happening rather than waiting to respond once offences have been committed. Crime prevention is a multi-disciplinary approach (ICPC, 2010a) and young people should be the primary and essential focus for prevention as many of the factors that lead to crime are ones that require early intervention. The focus of this research is the prevention of youth crime with an emphasis on the role of the school; the term crime prevention refers to preventing youth offending amongst young people under the age of 18 years.

2.6 Government Policy

Although crime costs the UK approximately £20 billion a year, the UK does not have a single government body that focuses on the role of crime prevention. Other countries do; Sweden and Canada have both national and local crime prevention councils that initiate and develop strategies as well as carrying out rigorous evaluations of preventative strategies/approaches (Anderson, 2005; Welsh & Farrington, 2010).

Early intervention and prevention was a defining feature of New Labour’s approach to tackling poverty and disadvantage, with a focus on reducing youth crime by providing targeted support for young people, underpinned by early intervention and prevention. This focus lead to the development of government policies such as the Youth Crime Action Plan (YCAP), the Family Intervention Project (FIP) and the development of Sure Start; all with a focus on improving the outcomes for children and young people. Now in 2013 the current government has abolished many of the previous administrations, policies and initiatives. However, the YJB for England and Wales, a Labour initiative, still
exists; their strategy on youth crime prevention prioritises early identification of risk factors, offering intervention at the pre-delinquency stage (preventative) supplemented by targeted services particularly for high/medium risk groups (YJB, 2005; Haines & Case, 2008). Despite this, in 2010 the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) reported a ‘large-scale failure on the part of national governments to successfully prevent crime’. They blame a universally-applied ‘one size fits all’ national approach to crime prevention rather than interventions that focused on local circumstances and need (ICPC, 2010b), reinforcing the need for UK government to focus on locally designed interventions that target a particular population in a given context.

2.6.1 Current Political Agenda – Tackling Crime
There has clearly been varied political discourse around tackling youth crime, however the current government communicate that they have this firmly positioned in their agenda. A review of this is discussed in more detail below.

In 2011 the Coalition conveyed plans to focus on the reduction of youth violence, including a focus on gangs. Following this an ‘Ending Gang and Youth Violence Team’ was established to support and advise local areas with a serious gang and youth violence problem. The Government report ‘Ending Gang and Youth Violence’ (HM Government 2011) was written following the August 2011 London riots and was compiled using various methods of data collection. This included hearing ‘what works’ in the US, visiting various UK projects, engaging in consultation with senior police officers and local authority officials, as well as talking to young people. Whilst the data collection engages various community stakeholders, the report does not indicate how the data was collected or by whom. Although this report concluded that most young people are not involved in gangs and violence, it noted that the small number who are, seem to have a huge impact on their communities. Whilst the government clearly wanted to focus on reducing youth crime, the political discourse around this appears to focus on the solutions to ‘youth violence’ as being the need to suppress gangs; this has been criticised as masking other more complex systemic factors when addressing youth violence (Hallsworth & Brotherton, 2011). This paper does, however, highlight the need to prevent young people becoming involved in
violence in the first place and suggests this will be achieved with a new emphasis on early intervention and prevention. It sets out the Government’s plans to prioritise £10 million of Home Office investment in early intervention work in 2012-13 to support up to 30 areas 'most affected by gangs and youth violence’. Two aims identified are the need to prevent young people from becoming involved in violence in the first place and the need for partnership working to join-up the way local areas respond to gang and youth violence (HM Government, 2011). Part of their plan is to assess existing materials being used in schools and ensure schools know how to access the most effective interventions. The paper recognises that “primary schools provide a vital but under-used opportunity to educate all children about the risks they will encounter outside the school gate” (HM Government, 2011 p.24), recognising that primary prevention (before the child or young person is involved in crime), empathy and communication are all crucial to violence prevention. This report recognises the need for early intervention and prevention, but only 30 areas most in need will be targeted; this is a concern as there are many areas ‘at-risk’ of crime and such targeted support does not address the wider population. Contrary to the aims of this paper, are the well-publicised government cuts which have inevitably led to reductions in front line youth services and threats to local government programmes and interventions, all of which are likely to be detrimental for young people and increase their risks of becoming involved in crime. Also, they focus on gangs and knives in regard to future interventions in schools, however they report that only a small minority of children are in gangs and carry weapons, therefore such interventions would only be targeting a marginal group of young people. Whilst this report is insightful and clearly recognises the role of the school in crime prevention, it does not address what this will look like or how schools will be expected to implement such programmes alongside their existing demands. It is important to explore with schools and young people, how they feel about this and what they think is needed to ensure school-based crime prevention is effective.

The government’s ‘Schools White Paper’ set out its aim that schools and teachers will take greater control over, and accountability for, what and how things are taught, and will be given more autonomy (DfE, 2010a). The White
Paper’s letter to Head Teachers suggests schools will have more time on their hands, will face less pressure and have more money to meet the needs of disadvantaged children (Gove, 2010). The Youth Taskforce are to provide additional support to schools and local authorities and have designated over £200 million, of the £1 billion funding, to improve the lives of youths and to help schools provide and commission a range of activities for children and young people who are disadvantaged by economic circumstances (YCAP, 2010). Government policy clearly supports school interventions to target anti-social behaviour in young people and social inclusion. However, whilst there is research in other countries acknowledging the views of community stakeholders regarding the role of the school in crime prevention, as well as vigorous evaluation of prevention programmes, the issues for schools are rarely mentioned in UK educational research.

In 2008 the government embarked upon a 3 year programme, Tackling Knives and Serious Youth Violence Action Programme (TKAP) which set out to explore what works when tackling youth violence (Home Office, 2008). One of the areas of focus in this report was ‘Education and Prevention’, which focused on the implementation of various crime prevention programmes/strategies in schools. However the researchers had difficulty in getting schools to commit to carrying out a crime prevention programme in their school; 352 schools were approached but only 7% responded. The programmes that were carried out in schools gained excessive positive feedback from staff and pupils and were reported to have led to enhanced relationships with community stakeholders. Unfortunately TKAP ended in March 2011 with the change of government. Whilst the TKAP research suggests there is a place for crime prevention programmes in schools, with clear benefits to those who participate, it did not give reasons why only a small percentage of schools chose to engage with the research. This is concerning and suggests possible barriers to the implementation of future crime prevention support in schools, and highlights the need for exploration of the reasons why schools might be resistant to facilitating such programmes. Whilst there is currently no research exploring the reasons behind resistance from schools, it is possible that so few schools took up the crime prevention opportunity because statistics state that youth crime is low incidence and that
schools don’t want to increase fear and glamorise crime. Concerns about stigma being attached to schools that engage with such programmes, may hold them back (Kinsella, 2011). Therefore such interventions might need to be targeted and intensive in some schools, where there is increased need, with a lighter touch at a universal level.

There is recognition in policy of the role of the school in crime prevention, and a promise to free schools from unnecessary bureaucracy. However, there is a need to explore this idea with the recipients of such initiatives. Even if robust evidenced-based crime prevention initiatives are designed in the UK, if schools are unable to facilitate the delivery, then their development is futile. Schools need to be engaged and given a voice in order for them to access the most helpful and effective strategies based on the context in which they exist. Having addressed the recent government agenda and future policy development, it is important to consider the UK youth crime context.

2.7 Gangs, Knives and Guns

When discussing youth crime in the UK it is difficult to avoid discourse around ‘guns, gangs and knives’. Around the UK there are various specific multi-agency units set up in response to violence with the focus predominately being on tackling gang problems (HM Government, 2011). Alongside policy, there has been an influx of media interest over the past 10 years regarding gun and knife crime, with a particular rhetoric emerging around young people being out of control, violent hoody-wearing monsters and an emphasis on the risk of UK ‘street gangs’ to society. Such media interest and government policy can result in unhelpfully typifying young people, fuelling the construction of negative narratives, as well as evoking and installing fear amongst youths and the wider society. With this in mind, it is important to note that the vast majority of young people are not in gangs and do not participate in violence or weapon use, and it is only a small number of youths who fall within this demographic (Communities that Care, 2005; HM Government, 2011); this suggests that the current focus on the gang should not be the sole consideration of policy. Hallsworth and Young (2008) describe how ‘gang talk’ and ‘gang talkers’ are unhelpfully mystifying the true picture of urban violence and that by making the gang the key focus of research attention has unhelpfully led to the mistaken conclusion that the
solution to urban violence lies in suppressing gangs. The roots to youth crime are multiple and diverse within the ecology of any given context, therefore the need to go beyond the gang in order to determine causes of crime and when thinking about prevention support, is imperative. Prevention programmes that solely target guns and gangs will fail to address concerns relating to a wider group of young people (Arredondo, 2003). It seems there is a need to look beyond ‘gangs and guns’ when thinking about the role of the school in crime prevention.

A comprehensive study, involving multiple methods of data collection, explored how gun and knife crime is affecting children and young people in England and engaged with a total of 1,800 children, aged 8-17 years from communities particularly affected by guns and knives (11 Million, 2009). They conclude that the number of children and young people using guns and knives is small, however the primary concern for young people is their own safety and safety of peers; suggesting young people are fearful of crime. The research reports that most young people who have carried a knife or gun say that they have done so for protection or out of fear. Research about the prevalence and impact of fear of crime amongst young people will be discussed below.

2.8 Fear of Crime

It is important to note that fear of crime is not a clearly defined concept (Gabriel & Greve 2003) and it is difficult to measure (Hale, 1996); data is typically collected by self-report methods. Despite this, typically data suggests whilst the number of young people involved in crime is reducing and only a small percentage are recognised as being in gangs, fear of crime amongst young people is prevalent (Communities that Care, 2004; 11 Million, 2009; Swift, 2011). Fear of crime can have serious implications in terms of quality of life; it can create and reinforce exclusion from particular urban spaces and general social life (Muncie, 1999; Pain, 2000; Pain 2003; San-Juan, Vozmediano & Vergara, 2012) and ironically encourage gang participation, as well as impact directly on psychological well-being, through experiences of increased anxiety and worry (Gabriel & Greve, 2003; Dolan & Peasgood, 2007; Stafford et al. 2007) and perceived vulnerability to victimisation (Jackson, 2009).
In 2008 a UK charity engaged 800 young people (under 25 years old) in an online consultation to explore their thoughts and feelings about knife and gun crime (Action for Children, 2008). One of their conclusions was that becoming either a victim or perpetrator of crime is a real fear for children and young people growing up in the UK and that young peoples’ lives are being restricted by how unsafe they feel. They also fear the long term consequences of becoming involved in crime. 63% of respondents stated a main reason they felt young people get involved in gun and knife crime is to protect themselves and 36% were worried about gangs in their area. These findings deduce that the choice to self-protect with weapons derives from fear; this has been echoed in numerous other studies (11 Million Children 2009; Kinsella, 2011; Swift, 2011). Fear is resulting in some young people adopting weapon carrying as a self-protection measure, suggesting they feel they have no other option, and are experiencing increased fear of crime. This portrays either the failure of society to educate and support young people in managing their fear and perception of risk of crime appropriately, or indicates a failure to understand and acknowledge their reality.

A youth survey conducted by the YJB (Anderson, et al., 2009) explored the experience of crime, both as offenders and victims, among 11-16 year olds. The survey was conducted among 4,855 pupils from mainstream school and 1,230 11-16 year olds from Pupil Referral Units (PRU)1. They found that younger children aged 11-14 years are more likely to worry about being a victim of crime compared to 15-16 year olds. It is important to note that as the method of data collection was self-completion questionnaires, older children (15-16 year olds) may have chosen to report a minimised fear of crime in order to present themselves in a socially desirable way (Sutton & Farral, 2005). Whilst quantitative data is helpful in that it captures a vast picture of the extent of fear of crime for young people, it does not provide rich data regarding the roots of fear and what young people feel can help them to feel more protected. Age and fear of crime is not the only factor that emerges in the data; gender differences also features heavily in the fear of crime literature and is discussed below.

---

1 PRU’s provide education for those pupils who have been excluded from mainstream settings or provide short-term placements for those pupils who are at risk of exclusion.
2.8.1 Fear of Crime and Gender

A plethora of studies and surveys report that women are more fearful of crime than men (Hale, 1996; Goodey 1997; Pain, 1997; Pain, 2001; Sutton & Farrall, 2005; Cops & Pleysier, 2011), and previous research has concluded that the fear of sexual violence and harassment underpins women’s fears (Gordon & Riger, 1989; Valentine, 1989; 1992). The role of the female as the victim has dominated the criminology literature for decades and has also been echoed in the media. However, the discourse around women as victims has also reinforced unhelpful constructs around women as being inherently weak and passive (Gelsthorpe & Morris, 1994) and men as being feared rather than fearful (Goodey, 1997). It is likely that the relationship between gender and fear of crime is not straightforward and that there are many variations within gender groups (Gilchrist, et al., 1998).

As fear is often measured by self-report it is unsurprising that male fear of crime is underrepresented in the criminological literature as heterosexual masculinity makes fear a less acceptable response for men (Goodey 1997). For example, young boys are more likely to admit to concern about crime (Anderson, et al., 2009) but as they grow up the likelihood of them conveying their fear is progressively minimised as stereotypical adult identities are adopted (Goodey, 1997).

Normative masculine and social identities are likely to have impacted on men presenting as ‘fearful’ in such surveys. However, there has been a shift in the gendering of crime with an increased recognition of the victim-offender relationship, that acknowledges offenders are also likely to be victims (Pain et al, 2002; BERA, 2010a), implying the vulnerability of males not just females in regard to victimisation, and a recognition that males are fearful of crime (Stanko & Hobdell 1993; Mirrlees-Black & Aye Maung, 1994; Goodey, 1997; Sutton & Farral, 2005). The acknowledgment of young males increasingly being at risk of victimisation and fearful of crime helpfully challenges previous discourse in mainstream criminological data of the male delinquent being feared rather than fearful (Gilchrist et al, 1998), this also highlights the vulnerabilities of young men particularly those living in ‘high risk’ urban neighbourhoods, both in terms of increased exposure to crime and victimisation and the negative impact this,
alongside increased fear, has on their psychological well-being. It is not realistic or helpful to ignore men’s vulnerabilities and solely focus on men ‘being feared’, nor is it helpful to only focus on women as ‘being fearful’ and passive, ignoring their ability to rationalise their involvement in crime (Davies, 1999). Quantitative methodologies do not always appear to successfully capture men’s fear and there is a need for increased use of qualitative methods of data collection to explore and expose this in the UK literature.

As young people are not currently receiving any consistent specific crime prevention intervention in school, it is likely they are being ‘educated’ by the media which typically includes overhyped discourse about guns knives and gangs, possibly fuelling fear amongst youth; the relationship between the media fuelling fear of crime is ambiguous (Ditton, et al. 2004). There is a clear need for increased youth crime prevention initiatives and policies, rather than society relying on the formal process of the CJS when attempting to reduce youth crime. In order to think about reducing youth crime and preventing unnecessary fear of crime, we need to ask young people what they would find helpful and to take account of the ways dominant gender discourses influence their responses in our interpretation.

2.9 Risk Factors to Youth Crime

Children and young people develop within the context of complex social systems. Bronfenbrenner’s ESM (1979) demonstrates how the interplay between the various systems, such as school, the family, the community are all instruments in the socialisation of the young person. When addressing risks to youth crime, this model underpins our understanding regarding the complexity of the relationships between various risk factors in the young person’s environment and offending behaviour. There is no single risk factor or environmental opportunity that leads directly to criminal activity but complex interactions of a range of factors. Regularly cited in the literature are, 1) the family 2) peer group 3) school 4) individual characteristics and personal experiences 5) the neighbourhood/community (Loeber & Farrington, 1998; Thornberry, Krohn, et al., 2003; Communities that Care, 2005; Smith, 2006). For the purpose of this research, the role of the neighbourhood and the school as a risk / protective factor to youth crime will be discussed in more detail below.
2.9.1 The Neighbourhood

The term neighbourhood refers to an area that people generally tend to recognise as an entity, such as an estate or block of flats. It can also be called an environment or community, when referring to where people live. Although UK research is still limited in addressing the relationship between youth crime and neighbourhood risk (11 Million, 2009), the locality in which young people live seems to affect whether they get involved with crime. The extensive review of young people, gun and knife crime (11 Million, 2009) reported that threatening neighbourhoods can result in; an increase in weapon carrying to make young people feel safer, exposure to high levels of crime and violence, poverty, fear and stress, poor mental health, higher risk of offending behaviour, limited social mobility and social exclusion. It is important to note that not all residents of economically deprived neighbourhoods are engaged in all or any of the above issues and a problem with the emphasis on risk factors is the way that often urban young men unhelpfully become labelled and consequently targets for intervention (Pain & Gill, 2001).

In the UK, Turner, et al (2006) conducted a large study exploring how children living in poor neighbourhoods view and cope with risks to safety and welfare. They concluded that levels of exposure to violence does lead to some individuals becoming desensitised and ultimately relatively accepting of such matters. A number of extensive studies in the US mirror UK findings that conclude young people living in economically deprived neighbourhoods are at increased risk of committing violence as a result of exposure in the neighbourhood (Wikstrom & Loeber, 1997). In summary, young people living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods have complex lives and the way they tend to manage such challenging environments often brings them into conflict with the law (Ungar, 2004; 2005).

Risks discussed by youth are specific to their communities (Turner et al, 2006). This highlights the need to reduce the risks in communities and engage community stakeholders when thinking about crime prevention and whilst the government appears to recognise this (HM Government, 2011), there is minimal literature to suggest how to do this or what communities want or need in order for youth crime prevention to be a success.
The relationship between neighbourhood and youth crime is not straightforward as each neighbourhood context is different. It is impossible to isolate neighbourhood context as the sole risk factor, however it is clearly one risk/protective factor in youth crime.

2.9.2 The School

Factors such as low academic achievement, disaffection from school and poor classroom behaviour, poor school attendance and exclusion frequent the literature on risk of youth crime (BERA, 2010a; DfE, 2010b). This section will review the literature to explore the role of the school in crime prevention, and what schools are already doing.

Exclusion from school is well documented in the UK literature as a risk factor to youth crime, and recent reports show that boys are four times more likely than girls to be permanently excluded, as are those young people growing up in deprived areas (BERA, 2010a). A high proportion of the UK prison population have been excluded from school (Vulliamy & Webb, 2000), and Pitts (2006) found that almost two-thirds of ‘gang members’ in his study had been permanently excluded from school. The youth survey conducted by Anderson et al (2009) provided an insight into the differences of quality of life for those children who attend mainstream education and those who are educated in PRU’s. Those who attend the PRU are more likely to be excluded, self-report offending, and have been involved with threatening or frightening people, offended, and carried a knife or gun. In mainstream schools, 30% of young people aged 15-16 years self-reported offending compared with 15% of those aged 11-14 years. In PRUs, 68% of young people aged 15-16 years self-reported offending compared with 61% of those aged 11-14 (Anderson et al., 2009). This research, carried out across England and Wales, highlights how children and young peoples’ successful engagement with school serves as a protective factor to youth crime. These figures are very significant and possibly suggest that the best way to prevent youth crime is to channel resources into avoiding school exclusion. This also indicates the relevance of targeting younger children, at the primary/early secondary school age, as the chances of them offending doubles when they turn aged 15 or 16 years old.
Haines and Case’s (2004) research supports the relationship between school disaffection and youth crime involvement. ‘Offenders’ were significantly more likely to believe they were underachieving, admit disaffection and lack commitment to school, have poor relationships with teachers, bully, and report higher levels of suspension and exclusion. All of the above helps to provide information for schools regarding targeting risk factors and preventative interventions and indicates the fundamental need for schools to engage children at risk of exclusion and support them in school to reduce risk of involvement in crime.

Haines and Case also found that children with offending parents are three times more at risk of offending behaviour, compared with their peers (Haines and Case, 2004). The home and family are well evidenced in the literature as a factor in the likelihood of youth crime engagement (YJB, 2005; Hoeve, et al., 2009). It is impossible for professionals to engage with every home of ‘families in need’ and work intensively with the family, systemically, to bring about change. Research illustrates the school as being better equipped than the family to prevent youth crime and it is seen as an important socialising institution in the prevention of offending (Herrenkohl, et al., 2001). Both the neighbourhood and school have been introduced as risk/protective factors for youth crime; further exploration of why schools appear to be well placed to engage with crime prevention support will be discussed in more detail below.

2.10 Why Schools?
Rutter et al’s (1979) study indicated that children spend an average of 15,000 hours in secondary school and if during this time good relationships are formed where pupils feel understood and listened to, the more educational success they are likely to have. Schools offer a realistic opportunity for delivering interventions to reduce youth crime as it is the primary institution, aside from the family, which has access over extended periods of time with young people and teachers are probably the first, outside of the family to identify children’s difficulties.

“A school’s atmosphere, its organisation and the quality of relationships between its teachers and pupils are vital ingredients in preventing – or encouraging – violence” (BERA, 2010a p.9)
School is recognised as a protective factor in deterrence from crime and an effective mechanism for providing pupils with information and guidance on areas such as delinquency, criminal justice and criminality prevention (Wasserman & Seracini, 2001). However, research exploring how UK schools do this and what this should look like is limited.

Early intervention has continued to be a political agenda, with recognition that prevention is better than the cure (Allen, 2011; HM Government, 2011). Intervention at secondary school might be too late in terms of prevention, because research shows that a significant number (57%) of young offenders become involved with crime at or before age 12 (11 Million, 2009).

Primary schools are a viable place to provide preventative support, especially as the age of criminal responsibility is age 10 years. Younger children are more vulnerable as they are likely to lack understanding and awareness about crime involvement and its consequences. They may also be driven by financial gain or the need to feel safe and protected in a disadvantaged neighbourhood where crime is rife and fear is prevalent.

Crime prevention should therefore be a priority, particularly in primary schools in socially deprived neighbourhoods, with an aim to engage and educate children before behaviours become too entrenched.

The British Educational Research Association (BERA) report concludes that although the focus of policy is traditionally that of educational attainment, over the past 15 years there has been an influx of policies that imply a central role for schools in tackling social inequality and there is strong evidence that schools have made some difference (BERA, 2010a). Despite this, they conclude that there is room for schools to be more effective if supported appropriately by national resources, policy and momentum. Whilst schools alone cannot possibly wholly offset the impact of social disadvantage, with the appropriate support, they can have an impact on inequality both social and academic, and address issues ‘beyond the school’ (BERA 2010a). However, the review ‘Violence in UK Schools’ (BERA, 2010b) reports that the evidence base regarding effective ways of tackling violence and bullying in schools is weak, indicating a gap in the existing literature.
The government’s aim to reduce current bureaucratic burden on schools, conveys that schools will have more freedom to address localised priorities and decide on policies and interventions to meet the needs of their pupil population and shape and frame the school ethos (DfE, 2010a). The literature and policy reviewed so far highlights the need and encouragement for some schools to think about their role in crime prevention and what this might look like in relation to the context of the school and the community.

2.11 What Evidence is there for Schools and Crime Prevention?

Although there is much research to suggest that schools have a unique opportunity to address youth crime prevention, before assuming schools have the capacity and resources (financial and human) to engage with this, it is important to look at what schools are already doing to protect young people from crime.

As part of the Children’s Act 2004, schools are required to promote children and young peoples’ well-being and are encouraged to adopt the Healthy Schools approach developed by the Department for Education (DfEE, 1999). There have been various other government initiatives and policies that address children and young peoples’ non-educational needs and aim to meet the social and emotional needs of children and young people in school, these are as follows; Social Emotional Aspects of Learning curriculum (SEAL); Personal, Social, Health and Economic (PSHE) curriculum; Safer School Partnership (SSP); Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) and the development of various school-based parenting programmes (BERA, 2010a).

Although these initiatives are available to schools, many have to prioritise the demands of academic achievement and examination results. It is not surprising that an extensive review of SEAL concluded it is not always happening and where it is happening there appears to be a lack of impact (Humphrey, Lendum & Wiggleworth, 2010). Similar to SEAL, PSHE is not part of the national curriculum and is therefore not statutory and so may not be taught. Ball et al’s (2011a; 2011b) research concluded that the way policies are implemented differs from one school to the next. Interventions in schools are likely to be successful if schools are allowed to manage interventions and are given the appropriate
resources to invest time in interventions that are not focused with exams (BERA, 2010a); if schools are not meeting the social and emotional needs of young people it is unlikely that they will be able to achieve their best in terms of learning and achievement.

Safer School Partnership (SSP), developed in 2002, has more of a focus on crime prevention and was initiated to develop a localised multi-agency partnership to address significant behavioural and crime related issues in and around school; crime by or against children and young people. An extensive review of the SSP (YJB, 2004) found that in SSP schools the quality of the school environment improved and there was an improved perception of safety in and beyond the school gates to the wider community. However, it is difficult to attribute the positive effects solely to the SSP programme as some of the non-intervention schools also saw a reduction in exclusion. This highlights the complexity of evaluating school and community based interventions.

A national evaluation of the TaMHS project (DfE, 2011) concluded a statistically significant decrease in problems in primary school children with behavioural difficulties, but no effect for similar children in secondary school. Overall, the review concluded no significant effect on emotional behaviour for both primary and secondary children. However, primary school pupils reported high levels of contact with sources of mental health support in schools and children with the greatest difficulties reported the greatest contact. This suggests that children in need do access support in schools, however whilst this particular intervention is possibly supporting them with their behaviour, it is not always supporting their emotional needs.

The Place2Be therapeutic play-based intervention model has been found to have a positive influence on children’s social and emotional wellbeing; both teachers and parents reported significant reductions in the extent of children’s social and emotional difficulties following the intervention (Lee, Tiley & White, 2009).

Both of the above, highlight the need and scope for children to be able to access services in school in order to support their social and emotional needs and indicates that schools who are engaging with interventions and services supporting the holistic needs of young people, have been found to have some
positive effects. The literature reviewed indicates that both young offenders and those living in high-crime deprived neighbourhoods are more likely to have mental health needs and complex lives. Therefore targeted support in schools aimed at meeting the social and emotional needs of vulnerable populations of young people, is critical in fostering positive well-being and resilience, and to support their successful transition into adult life, which for some will involve protecting them from crime.

In 2000, the DfEE reported that the core role of an EP should be “to promote child development and learning through the application of psychology by working with individuals and groups of children, teachers and other adults in schools, families, other LEA officers, health and social services and other agencies” (DfEE, 2000, p. 5). EP’s work in schools and communities engaging young people and their families in order to support positive development and well-being, and to raise awareness of and support others to meet the holistic needs of young people. The TAMHS review (DfE, 2011) recognises that, ‘Educational Psychologists appear to be a key group to work with in relation to mental health provision in schools and their potential role in aiding links between schools and specialist CAMHS’. EPs working in socially deprived communities are well placed to work systemically to support schools, families and communities to engage with targeted interventions to support the psychosocial needs of vulnerable populations of young people and to protect them from crime.

An extensive review of UK parenting programmes concluded that school-based provision resulted in improved relationship between home and school and improved behaviour and attendance (Hallam, et al., 2007). However, if ‘hard to reach’ parents choose not to engage in such programmes then prevention work will not happen. Whilst parenting programmes focus on collaboration between schools and families and aim to empower parents to help keep their children safe, none of the parenting programmes that currently exist in the UK solely focus on crime prevention. When targeting children and young people, access is much easier through schools as society cannot engage every parent.

In summary, there are various interventions available to schools that aim to meet the social and emotional needs of young people; however research illustrates a
vagueness surrounding both the effect and consistency of such interventions and an overall lack of focus on youth crime prevention (Kinsella, 2011). The review ‘Ending Gang and Youth Violence’ refers to the preventative ‘Growing against Gangs and Violence’ programme for 13-15 year olds and focuses on ‘girls, gangs and consequences’. The literature reviewed clearly highlights the need for crime prevention in primary school and so targeting 13-15 year olds is not likely to be as effective. The research reviewed also highlights the need for prevention support to be contextualised; suggesting a ‘one programme fits all’ approach is unsuitable. There are only a small percentage of young people in gangs however literature suggests an increased fear amongst young people about gangs. Therefore a programme with a focus on gangs is likely to target only a small minority of the population, as well as fuelling existing anxiety about the prevalence of gangs and weapon carrying in an already fearful population of young people (Hallsworth & Young, 2008). These are important issues to address when planning and designing youth crime prevention strategies for a school population.

If schools are having difficulty finding time to implement policies such as SEAL and PSHE, then it may be pointless to provide schools with further programmes. It is therefore important to explore how schools view their role in crime prevention and what they feel would be needed for the successful facilitation of school-based prevention interventions. As previously mentioned, there is limited UK research and literature in this area, however other countries are much more developed with this and have significant forms of preventative work as part of an internal school welfare and support system. Prevention programmes are adopted at the whole-school level (incorporated into the curriculum), classroom and individual level, to ensure coherence and fluidity of the focus on prevention (Blythe & Solomon, 2009).

2.12 International Studies on Effective School-Based Crime Prevention

Whilst it is important to note that other countries may have different cultural, social and political contexts, in light of the lack of UK literature it is helpful to review the international literature regarding school-based crime prevention in order to explore their relevance and applicability to the UK context.
Much of the international research refers to the term ‘crime prevention programmes’ when reviewing its role in schools. Crime prevention programmes aimed to engage young people in thinking about the issue of youth crime, how it affects them and what they would do to tackle it (Catalano, et al., 2004). The US appears to be leading the way on research (Junger, et al. 2007) and experimental studies mostly show that risk factors can be tackled successfully using effective prevention programmes. A review of 177 primary prevention programmes for children and adolescents found that 129 (72.9%) were based in schools (Durlak & Wells, 1997). Such programmes sought to strengthen social, emotional, cognitive and/or behavioural competencies, self-efficacy, and family and community standards for healthy social and personal behaviour.

Literature that specifies the success of effective school-based prevention programmes will be discussed in more detail below.

A comprehensive meta-analysis of 249 studies of school-based programmes in the US, targeting pre-school to 14 year olds concluded that on the whole, schools seeking prevention programmes may choose from a range of effective programs with some confidence that whatever they choose will be effective (Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). Universal programmes delivered to all students in a school or class, from economically disadvantaged neighbourhoods (low socio-economic, high-crime area-targeted populations) were found to be the most effective. This suggests that larger treatment effects were achieved with higher risk students. Whilst the effect of crime prevention programmes was overall significant, it appears little evidence exists of the effectiveness of routine everyday practices in school. Wilson and Lipsey (2007) report that the universal programmes included in the analysis, that were found to be most effective, mainly used ‘cognitive orientated approaches’. However it is unclear what this term means and they do not describe or elaborate on this, which is a weakness to their analysis.

School-based interventions that involved a sole focus on anti-weapons or a brief intervention of shocking images or wounds was not found to change long-term behaviour (Arredondo, 2003). However, high-quality prevention programmes that
have a common set of goals, are well resourced, structured and managed as a whole-school approach, are likely to be more successful (Durlak, et al., 2011).

My analysis of research from the USA signals a number of promising school-based prevention programmes/interventions, key features and approaches of support identified in the literature are outlined below.

2.12.1 Whole-School Approach
A number of studies conclude that a whole school approach is central to crime prevention support. If prevention interventions can reach the entire population of children they can begin to change the school climate and effectively facilitate change to experience successful outcomes (BVP, 2006; Fagan, et al., 2008). Alongside a focus on the role of teaching staff in programme facilitation, research found that teachers need to be given detailed lesson plans and student guides to help with the facilitation of such programmes to ensure success (Botvin, Griffin & Nichols, 2006; DfE, 2011). This is mirrored somewhat in the UK as the review of the PSHE curriculum (YJB, 2004) concludes that in order for success a whole-school approach is needed, as well as time spent setting it up, dedicated facilitators and good multi-agency relationships.

2.12.2 High-Risk Population
School-based programmes will only make a difference if the population need it (Vazsonyi, et al., 2004; Fagan, et al., 2008). The need for support and intervention to be targeted to high-risk populations, rather than holistically driven has been echoed throughout the literature review.

Whilst the three factors discussed above frequent the international literature, other successful themes identified in Catalano et al’s (2004) review include; methods to strengthen emotional and moral competencies; build self-efficacy; shape messages from family and community about clear standards for youth behaviour; increase healthy relationships with adults, peers, and younger children; expand opportunities and recognition for youth; provide structure and consistency in programme delivery; and intervene with youth for at least nine months or longer.
It appears that the UK model of crime prevention tends to follow US models (HM Government, 2011) and the US research clearly highlights the need for interventions to be grafted into existing local practices and experience, and to be holistically effective in the family, the school and the community (Catalano et al., 2004). There are cultural, social and legal differences between the US and the UK, which will have an impact on the transference of programmes internationally. This, together with the current government agenda, illustrates further the need for research on how UK schools can provide support to protect young people from crime, and particularly an exploration of community stakeholders’ perceptions.

It is important to remain mindful that teachers cannot be expected to do everything in terms of educating our children and fixing social issues. However, schools are required to be self-sufficient and meet the needs of children both academically as well as meeting their social and emotional needs (BERA, 2010a). The literature reviewed suggests that whilst there appears to be a focus in the role of the school in crime prevention in current policy, in reality it is relatively unknown as to how and what UK schools can be doing to address this, and there is a lack of qualitative data exploring the perspectives of community stakeholders regarding this issue. This study attempts to fill that gap. If schools are expected to deal with issues ‘beyond the school gates’ then exploration of possible ways of working in order to support schools and communities in doing this, with those who would be expected to endorse policies (community stakeholders) and the recipients (young people) of such support, is likely to contribute to the success of future initiatives.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

This chapter will begin by exploring epistemological and methodological considerations, before acknowledging the ethical considerations, the research design and rationale for the methods chosen, and a description of the research context. The procedure will be defined in detail, followed by the approach used for data analysis and reflections.

3.1 Epistemological and Ontological Considerations

Several key assumptions need to be outlined within the context of this piece of research. When considering the methodological and epistemological issues I adopted a pragmatic perspective (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) which enabled me to use the method best suited to the research aim. The exploratory nature of the research questions required me to adopt a qualitative design (Willig, 2003). When addressing the epistemological stance, it is worthwhile bearing in mind Hood's (2006) comment, 'most researchers will not fit neatly into the categories of any given typology'. With this in mind, the particular approach of this research is more constructionist in orientation, than it is of the mainstream qualitative approach of social constructionism. Social constructionist approaches take the context and social processes into account and believe that all knowledge is situated within its unique context and is partial (Thompson & Gunter, 2007), which is antithetical to the view that there is an ‘absolute truth’ and reality and meaning is fixed. Robson's (2011) description of constructionism, recognises the above but also highlights the importance of acknowledging how individuals interpret the social world in which they exist. The focus of this study is exploring the thoughts, feelings and interpretations of individuals, community stakeholders and young people, who exist in a particular social context.

An ontological assumption refers to the way in which reality is understood. A constructionist standpoint is situated at the relativist end of the epistemology continuum, viewing knowledge and truth as something that is fluid, rather than at the realist end of the continuum. Constructionism rejects the idea that there is one objective reality, but rather many realities influenced by numerous external factors in any given context (Burr, 2003). Its intention is to explore how individuals’ understand and construct knowledge and truth, depending on their
reality underpinned by their interpretations, and thus create meaning (Burr, 2003).

More recently, Robson (2011) makes reference to the feasibility of a rapprochement between moderate social constructionism and more sophisticated versions of realism. He refers to Nightingale and Cromby’s (2002) strong case for ‘critical realist’ constructionism which challenges the constructionists’ claim, advocated by Gergen (1994), that knowledge may always be reduced to social convention, and which fails to take account of external reality. Nightingale and Cromby state that “the imperfect fit between language and materiality, world and word, creates uncertainty, flexibility and indeterminacy, which, in the course of its deployment and situated use, means that language actually coconstitutes reality” (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, p.706). Whilst this perspective remains committed to a constructionist approach, it implies greater utility, and is closer to a ‘truth’ than the purist relativist social constructionist view. It suggests the possible way in which constructionism might further develop so as to avoid the various snags of linguistic relativism and naïve realism and objectivity.

The findings of this research are not intended to be representative of all community stakeholders in urban neighbourhoods, but should be viewed as a contribution to our understanding of community stakeholders’ existing in a particular social context, and their perceptions regarding the role of the school in preventing youth crime.

Research suggests that eliciting the perspectives of those who are in the least powerful positions in society is the most valid way of creating a standpoint (Fattore, Mason & Watson, 2007). The voices of individuals living in social and economically deprived neighbourhoods are often hard-to-reach communities and it was therefore important that I engaged these groups in my research. Exploring the young person’s voice was key to this research as they are recipients of school curricular and the aim of this research was to explore the most appropriate ways of supporting young people, who are at increased risk of crime. There are ethical implications of pupil voice research, which are discussed below and throughout this chapter.
3.2 Ethical Considerations

My research design and methodology adhered to the British Psychological Society (BPS) Code of Ethics and Conduct (BPS, 2009) and approval was gained from the Departmental Ethics Committee at the Institute of Education, University of London. Please see Appendix B for my ethics form.

The BPS guidelines (BPS, 2009) state that participants under the age of 16 need consent from their parents, however it is also important to gain consent from the young person and ensure that they fully understand their participation and their rights to withdraw (Coad & Lewis, 2004). An accessible information sheet (see Appendix C) about the research was given to all young people and their verbal consent was gained before the focus group. Written consent was obtained from both adult participants and parents of young people, as they were all under the age of 16. Other ethical considerations such as confidentiality and rights to withdraw are addressed throughout the remainder of this chapter.

3.3 Research Design and Paradigm

Given the aim of this study was to explore community stakeholders’ perceptions I was interested in their thoughts and feelings about the topic, as well as the various meanings attributed to their opinions, rather than a concern with cause and effect. Cresswell (2007 p.16) defines qualitative research as “embracing the idea of multiple realities” in order to make sense of how people understand the world in which they exist. Therefore, a qualitative mixed-method design was adopted to explore the key themes within the perspectives of the community stakeholders, as opposed to a quantitative design which is generally associated with a positivist paradigm. This design gave the various stakeholders space and flexibility to describe and elaborate their thoughts and feelings about this topic. Multiple data collection techniques were employed, that included focus groups and semi-structured interviews.

3.4 Methods

Focus groups and semi-structured interviews were the chosen methods of data collection; both of which are discussed in more detail below.
3.4.1 Focus Groups

Focus groups are guided open-ended group discussions that generate a rich understanding of participants’ experiences and beliefs (Robson, 2002). They provide a space whereby perceptions, feelings and attitudes can emerge through interactions from the participants, in a non-threatening environment that allows for the exploration of a phenomenon (Morgan, 1998). According to Morgan (1998), group dynamics stimulate reflection and therefore lead to perceptive insights; they identified three main strengths to focus groups:

1) Exploration and discovery

2) Context and depth

3) Interpretation

As I wanted to explore the thoughts and feelings of various groups, focus groups were an appropriate tool. Each focus group was homogeneous because all of the participants had a common background; either living or working in Ward Unite; were the same age; attended the same school; or had the same occupation. This has been found to facilitate communication and promote an exchange of ideas and experiences in the group situation (Brown, 1999) and it allowed for more time to discuss issues rather than time spent getting to know each other (Morgan, 1998).

There have been various studies published over the past 10 years that recognise focus groups as a viable method when exploring young peoples’ perspectives (Mauthner, 1997; Morgan, et al., 2002; Porcellato, Dughill & Springett, 2002). It is a technique that is useful in finding out how children perceive and interpret issues (Mauthner, 1997). For successful focus groups with children and young people, the groups need to be small in number, homogeneous and interactive to maintain a high level of interest (Porcellato, et al., 2002).

As the focus groups involved both youth and adult participants it was important for me to reflect on the methods I chose for the facilitation of the groups to ensure the consideration of participants' age, cognitive level, interests and context were taken into account (Kirby, 2001). When engaging in pupil voice research it is important to consider the cognitive, emotional and social
developmental competencies of young people to ensure credibility and reliability (Lewis, 2010). I did this in numerous ways; in order to address power differentials between myself and the young people I ensured I adopted the role of naïve curiosity, remaining open honest and understanding when listening to what the young people were saying (Butler & Williamson, 1994), as well as maintaining an appropriate balance of power in terms of directing and controlling the group, and creating a space in which young people felt free to discuss (Morgan et al., 2002). An initial brainstorming activity asking the participants to share what crime means to them and what they know about crime, helped orientate the group to the topic at hand and demonstrated the extent to which the concept of crime was understood, as well as putting the participants at ease as they could participate with such a general inquiry (UNICEF, 2005). It was also a tool used to represent the group’s ideas during the focus group and I was able to refer to the young peoples’ context of crime during the discussion by making reference to their initial brainstorm; this helped to facilitate dialogue and ensured it was their thoughts and perspectives that guided the discussion. Card visualisations are also recognised as being helpful in supporting young people’s engagement in discussion (UNICEF, 2005). Visual data was used to support the discussions as this has been found to aid young people in discussing experiences (Crivello Camfield & Woodhead, 2009). I used pictures of the local area, including significant buildings such as schools, the youth centre and the local shops, this helped to contextualise and generate discussion amongst the young people. The plan and structure used for the focus group sessions is in Appendix D.

Focus groups are an efficient way to get much range and depth of information in a short time, however the restraints to focus groups were taken in to account (McNamara, 1998) and for the purpose of this study the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. Firstly the timescales for data collection were limited and as I was exploring the perspectives of numerous stakeholders it would not have been feasible to interview each person separately; the data set would have been vast and unmanageable for a study of this size. Secondly as the purpose of the study is explorative, in that I was not looking at individual’s experiences in regard to
crime, then group discussion rather than individual interview was useful for highlighting any universal perspectives and shared ideas.

The role of the moderator is key to success of the focus group, particularly when working with young people (Morgan et al, 2002). Research suggests children who are in the company of an adult that they know of or recognise is likely to reduce any anxiety and help to relax them and subsequently gather the relevant information (Porcellato, et al. 2002). I am experienced at working with young people and eliciting children’s thoughts and feelings and I work as a TEP in the schools where I collected data. This helped because I was familiar to the children but without being linked directly to school staff; I believe that this put me in a strong position as a good facilitator. As a facilitator I was aware of the need to ensure that every voice is heard and that no individual dominates discussion. Having previously conducted group work with young people of all ages I am experienced in managing group dynamics and ensured that every young person got a chance to speak at times during the discussion. Open–ended questions were used to encourage participants to respond freely and talk about what is important to them, rather than being constrained by any preoccupations that I, as researcher, might have had. The focus group schedule is in Appendix E.

3.4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

The qualitative interview is a powerful and sensitive tool for gaining the meaning and experience of a particular phenomenon (Kvale, 1996). Generally with this method of data collection hypotheses are not formulated in advance allowing for an openness to what is being studied.

Semi-structured interviews were employed with various adult participants and pre-determined open–ended questions were asked. A schedule of the questions used in both the adult focus groups and interviews can be found in Appendix F (school staff) and Appendix G (youth services). This enabled a non-directive approach, to elicit rich contextual data that was analysed to understand participants’ thoughts and feelings regarding this topic (Smith, 2003). The flexibility of a semi-structured interview meant the order of the questions could be modified, the wording of the questions changed and explanations given based upon my perception of what seemed appropriate at the time.
The interview was organised around several questions focused around three areas driven by the research questions. I ensured that the language used for the questions was comprehensible and any jargon that could confuse the participants avoided; the pilot interview helped to identify this. This approach endorses flexibility and when a participant said something of interest I was able to explore this by asking further questions, as well as by seek elaboration and or clarification of a particular issue of interest.

3.5 Research Context

3.5.1 Sampling
The research was carried out in a particular context, Ward Unite, and so the intention of the study was to employ a ‘purposeful sampling’ strategy, where participants are selected due to particular characteristics, and collected in a deliberate non-random way in order to achieve a certain goal (Robson, 2002). The sample had to be practical and although was not representative of the wider population, it was representative of community stakeholders in the ward.

The adult participant groups were selected due to their involvement and engagement with young people who live or attend school in Ward Unite. All participants are addressed throughout the study with a pseudonym to ensure anonymity. In terms of enhancing validity, enriching data through triangulation was achieved by gathering data from the different groups (Yardley, 2003), the community stakeholders, described later in this chapter.

3.5.2 Ward Unite
For the purpose of anonymity I have changed the name of the local community/context where the research will be carried out too Ward Unite, an area in which I work as a TEP. It is a residential suburb situated in a central (Zone 2) London Borough and has the borough’s highest number of youth (10-24 year olds) residents, the most youth violence and the highest number of offences occurring. One in four of the borough’s incidents of most serious violence over the past 12 months involved suspects aged 19 or under.

The geographical location of Ward Unite is isolated, with limited public transport access and is geographically remote. Due to the large amount of social housing
it has a transient population. It is home to one of the largest council housing estates in the UK and over 60% of the housing is purpose built flats, with over 40% being council housing (Census, 2001).

3.6 Participants
Written consent was obtained from all adult participants (see Appendix H) and verbal consent obtained from the young people. Young people were provided with details of the study on an information sheet they read both previous to their participation in the group and again at the start of the group. I ensured they understood their participation and reminded them of their right to withdraw. Every parent/carer of every young person in Years 5-9 was informed of the study via a letter sent home (see Appendix I) and offered the option of refusing for their child to take part; one refused. Pseudonyms were given to all participants and schools. All of the above adheres to the ethics guidelines provided by the BPS (2009).

The information given in brackets in bold, following the name of each participant group below is the code used to identify participants when reporting quotes in the analysis (Chapter 4). The young person data is reported by their school year and school name, for example (Y6R).

All young people took part in a focus group and adults either completed an interview or a focus group. The table below provides information regarding participants and the method of data collection.

Table 1. Participants, Demographic of Group and Method of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants – Community Stakeholders</th>
<th>Demographic of Group</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 5 – Richton Primary School (Y5R)</td>
<td>Aged 9-10 years</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 – Richton Primary</td>
<td>Aged 10-11 years</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| School (Y6R) | 3 boys  
| 3 girls |  |
| Year 5 – Cliffe Primary School (Y5C) | Aged 9-10 years  
| 3 boys  
| 3 girls | Focus Group |
| Year 6 - Cliffe Primary School (Y6C) | Aged 10-11 years  
| 3 boys  
| 3 girls | Focus Group |
| Year 7 – Nixon Secondary School (Y7N) | Aged 11-12 years  
| 3 boys  
| 3 girls | Focus Group |
| Year 8 – Nixon Secondary School (Y8N) | Aged 12-13 years  
| 4 boys  
| 2 girls | Focus Group |
| Year 9 – Nixon Secondary School (Y9N) | Aged 13-14 years  
| 3 boys  
| 3 girls | Focus Group |
| Youth Workers (YW) | 1 Senior Youth Worker  
| 6 youth workers | Focus Group |
| Catch 22 (C22) | 5 Mentors | Focus Group |
| Staff at Richton Primary School (SR) | 3 Teachers  
| 2 Learning Support Assistants | Focus Group |
| Staff at Nixon Secondary School (SN) | 5 Teachers/Head of Houses | Focus Group |
Safety Neighbourhood Team (SNT)  
1 Sergeant  
2 Police Community Support Officer  
1 Police Constable  
Focus Group

Learning Mentor- Cliffe Primary School (LMC)  
Interview

Learning Mentor – Richton Primary School (LMR)  
Interview

Learning Mentor – Nixon Secondary School (LMN)  
Interview

Head Teacher - Richton Primary School (HTR)  
Interview

Head of Youth Services - Peter Harper (PH)  
Interview

Youth Crime Prevention Manager from the Early Intervention Team - Mark Brackenridge (MB)  
Interview

Gang and Serious Youth Violence Coordinator – John Gardiner (JG)  
Interview

In summary of the data collection 12 focus groups and 7 semi-structured interviews were conducted.

**Young People**

The young people in the study had to live and attend a mainstream school in the ward. As I was interested in exploring how the perspectives of young people were influenced by age and gender, a sample of both male and female participants from Years 5-9 were invited to participate. This allowed for exploration of global themes across developmental trajectories and differences between the conceptualisation of crime over development and across genders.
The Year 5-9 age groups were chosen because of the age of criminal responsibility in the UK and age 14 is when young people are most at risk of becoming involved in crime (McVie, 2003). The focus of the study is crime prevention, therefore I decided to explore the perspectives of young people between the ages of 10-14 years old.

**Schools – (R), (C), (N)**
The three schools pseudonyms are: Richton Primary School (R), Cliffe Primary School (C) and Nixon Secondary School (N). Demographic details about each school can be found in Appendix J.

**Catch 22 – (C22)**
Catch 22 run projects and services across England and Wales for young people and families that experience adversity in their everyday lives, and others in vulnerable situations. They have a team of people working in both Richton and Cliffe primary schools and in other areas of the community.

**Police - Safety Neighbourhood Team - (SNT)**
The SNT consists of One Sergeant, two Police Constables (PCs) and three police community support officers (PCSOs).

**Youth Workers – (YW)**
The youth club provides a space for young people aged 11-19. There is a Senior Youth Worker and 7 other youth workers at the club.

**Head of Youth Services – (PH)**
Peter Harper is the Head of Youth Services for the borough in which Ward Unite exists.

**Serious Gang and Youth Violence Co-ordinator – (JG)**
John Gardiner is the borough’s Serious Gang and Youth Violence Co-ordinator and previous to this he worked with youth offenders in the borough.

**Early Intervention Team Manager – (MB)**
The borough’s early intervention team is responsible for youth crime prevention and Mark Brackenridge (MB) is the Crime Prevention Manager for the area.

Further details about each participant group can be found in Appendix J.
It is important to note that there are other community stakeholders that were not involved in this research. I have chosen the above groups as they all have communication with schools and young people in Ward Unite. I acknowledge that parents are important stakeholders in a community and whilst I am aware that gaining the perspectives of parents would have improved the findings, previous research has found that parents are a difficult group to engage and often involves high rates of attrition in data collection (Peters, Calam & Harrington, 2005; Morawska & Sanders, 2006; Jensen & Grimes, 2010). Parents who have lower socioeconomic status are often hard-to-reach and have less involvement in schools (Hill & Taylor, 2004). With this in mind and the limited timescales of this research the need to be efficient with data collection was important and so I decided to omit this group from my research.

3.7 Pilot Study
I piloted my focus group with two members of teaching staff who were not part of my sample, to ensure all questions were clear and appropriate. Subsequently minor adjustments were made to the schedule, removing some questions and changing their order.

Unfortunately it was not possible to carry out a pilot focus group with young people, as I could not access an additional sample. Whilst this was not ideal, having the experience of working with young people across all ages and facilitating group work, as well as an understanding of the local context and socio-demographic of the cohort of young people, meant I was able to take this into consideration when preparing and developing the focus group schedule.

I piloted the child-friendly ‘Information Sheet’ with 6 young people of different ages that are part of my caseload as a TEP. The purpose of this was to ensure that the information provided to them was clear and they understood what their involvement entailed as well as their rights to withdraw. No amendments were needed to this document.

3.8 Procedure
The various community stakeholders were approached; participation in either the interviews or focus groups was voluntary and consent was obtained from both adults and pupils. Written consent was obtained from all adult participants.
All data was collected in the participants’ settings; the youth club, SNT office, Catch 22 office and schools. The procedure began by establishing rapport, giving a brief overview of the session, gaining consent and reminding participants of their right to withdraw from the study. All participants were assured that information shared would be confidential with anonymity granted and that any electronic data was accessible only through a password system on my computer; in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998).

At the beginning of the interviews and focus groups, with both adults and young people, the following steps were taken; a brief description of the research was given; the rationale for their involvement was explained, followed by the ground rules and the procedure of the session. Participants were reminded of their right to withdraw. The questions on the focus group schedules helped to structure the session to ensure the reliability of data collection between groups, however flexibility was endorsed to stimulate the freedom to talk openly allowing for exploration.

Both interviews and focus group discussions were recorded on a digital voice recorder, which were later transcribed verbatim.

### 3.8.1 Focus Groups

*Pupils - Year 5 to Year 9*

The focus groups took place in school during the school day. Young people were selected at random from the class register. The number of participants and maximum time for each focus group suggested in the ‘how to’ guide to focus groups with children provided by Vaughn et al (1996) was taken into account. Generally there was an even mix of boy and girl participants in each group; this enabled me to explore the thoughts and feelings about this topic with both genders. Researchers on risk/violence have often opted to work with single sex groups because of the personal and sensitive nature of the topic (e.g. Parkes, 2005). However, as the aim of this research was not focused on individuals’ personal experiences of crime, it was felt that mixed gender groups were acceptable.
Consent was obtained from all three schools and a letter sent to every parent in Years 5-9, offering the opportunity for their child to opt-out of the research. Care was taken to ensure that questions, materials and structure of the focus group were developmentally appropriate. The focus groups lasted between 40-50 minutes.

I was somewhat familiar to the young people involved in this research and this helped rapport. I felt that they were comfortable with my role as facilitator and consequently this encouraged them to talk openly and engage with the discussion. The young people in Year 7-9 were less aware of me and this may have impacted on their engagement in the discussions. Before the data collection started, I attended whole year assemblies in the secondary school to introduce myself and talk about my research so that both I and the research were familiar to them.

*Adult Participants*

Group dynamics evidently play a role in focus groups, however participants interacted well and as they are familiar and work together as part of a team, they respected each other’s contribution and were sensitive and responsive to group dynamics.

Focus groups are flexible by design and therefore accommodated a larger number and more diverse range of stakeholders to participate, and so a greater quantity of data was obtained in a short amount of time. All focus groups were taped.

*3.8.2 Interviews*

Interviews were held in a private room to honour confidentiality. Rapport was developed with all participants prior to the interview due to my role as a TEP in the ward. Careful consideration was given to ensure the interviewees felt comfortable and informed about the process and the rationale for their involvement; this was essential to form some element of trust and respect before commencement of the interview (Silverman, 2006). If a participant did not appear to understand a question, I rephrased the question and clarified their understanding before continuing with the interview.
Interviews lasted between 30–60 minutes. All interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder and later transcribed verbatim.

3.9 Data Analysis

Data collected was transcribed verbatim by the researcher and the transcripts were re-read whilst listening to the recordings to ensure accuracy. The data corpus was initially grouped into three data sets; young people, adults in education and adults in youth services. The methods used in this study are drawn from a constructionist paradigm and an approach to analysis that is aligned with this would seem to be most appropriate. Thematic analysis was carried out on all data sets in order to gain an in-depth description of the stakeholders’ perceptions, thoughts and feelings. This method of data collection was deemed most appropriate as it allows for flexibility in order to meet the research specific epistemological position and theoretical framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

It is important to note that thematic analysis can be used as a realist method, which reports experiences, meanings and the reality of participants, or as a constructionist method, which examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings and experiences are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society (Robson, 2011). Thematic analysis provided me with a loose framework in which to carry out the analysis but also allowed flexibility in order for me to take the specific context of this research into account. It allowed me to be aware of, and explore the possible realities for participants, whilst taking in to consideration the likelihood that such realities are influenced by their interpretations of the social world. The constructionist ‘interpretivist’ epistemological stance this study adopted, influenced the data analysis and meant that the participants’ comments were analysed with regard to opinion (relativism) Vs. fact (realism). This acknowledges Nightingale and Cromby’s (2002) ‘critical realist’ constructionism perspective; taking account of external reality. This method of data analysis meant that a collection of themes could be put forward as a representation of the community stakeholders’ voice, in this particular context.
An inductive approach to analysis was adopted as this allowed for the emergence of new understandings and meant that themes identified were strongly linked to the data (Patton, 1990) and were not driven by my theoretical interest in the topic:

“Inductive analysis is therefore a process of coding the data without trying to fit it into a pre-existing coding frame, or the researcher’s analytic preconceptions...this form of thematic analysis is data-driven” (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 12).

The thematic analysis was conducted based on the six phases recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006), outlined in the table below.

**Table 2: Phases of Thematic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarising myself with the Data:</td>
<td>I transcribed all the data verbatim and spent time reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas. I made notes about possible themes and ideas at the end of each focus group and it was helpful to read these alongside the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating Initial Codes:</td>
<td>The coding stage was done by hand and included initially making notes in the margin of the transcripts and then making notes on a separate piece of paper attached to the transcript, about possible codes from each transcript. Once this was completed I looked for interesting features of the data across the entire data set and then began collating data relevant to each code;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
codes represented 'units of meaningful text' (Braun & Clake, 2006) and some codes were grouped together or omitted during this process. The codes identified were driven by the data. Open, axial and selective coding (Neuman, 2006; Cresswell, 2007) was conducted to ensure credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Robson, 2002). A paper trail was kept, including memos, to ensure issues of reflexivity were taken into account during the analysis.

3. Searching for Themes:

This stage of the analysis required arranging codes into potential themes and subthemes. At this point I separated the data sets in two; young people and adult data. The next stage involved cutting out quotes so that they could be physically moved around and grouped in potential codes and then themes; this helped focus on the content of the data and meaning derived from the data and how this related to possible themes. This process enabled me to collate themes, and possible overarching themes. The support from professional supervisors was helpful at this stage and all potential codes and themes were discussed.

4. Reviewing Themes:

This stage required finalising the three thematic analyses and their themes and
This was done in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2) and appropriate data extracts were identified. I re-read transcripts at this stage to avoid meaningful units of data being missed. Again professional supervision was sought at this level to ensure that the themes developed were meaningful and also to enhance the validity of the analysis through triangulation.

5. Defining and naming themes: At this stage analysis continued to ensure the specifics of each theme were coherent and representative of the data. Revisiting the data extracts in each theme to ensure that the name of theme represented the meaning of the text and that there was transparency. Potential themes were reviewed, amended and discussed with professional supervisors to ensure that the themes fairly and effectively represented the data set. The names of the themes were refined and finalised at this stage. Three overall thematic analyses were identified.

6. Producing the report: The next chapter of the research outlines the findings of the study. The themes are presented and supported with quotes from the data. The themes represent the perspectives of community stakeholders regarding the
An example of my data analysis can be found in Appendix K. My reflections on the data collection and analysis process can be found in Appendix L.
Chapter 4 – Findings & Discussion

This chapter presents both the data analysis and discussion in relation to the research findings due to the vast amount of data collected. The summarising and interpreting of the data, through the presentation of themes and supporting quotes, is interlaced with discussion and acknowledgement of previous literature.

The data will be reported across three distinct thematic analyses, which relate to the following;

- **Thematic Analysis 1 (TA1)** - ‘Context of Crime for Young People’
- **Thematic Analysis 2 (TA2)** – ‘Context of Youth Crime for Adult Community Stakeholders’
- **Thematic Analysis 3 (TA3)** – ‘Ways of Working’

Each analysis section will address each research question. Thematic Analysis 1 (TA1) analyses young person’s data, related to RQ1. ‘B’ or ‘G’ will feature at the beginning of each quote indicating whether it is a boy or girl. The year and school will be shown in brackets at the end of the quote (see Appendix K).

TA2 analyses the adult data related to RQ2. TA3 combines both adult and young person data. Themes and subthemes identify possible future ‘ways of working’ answering the second part of RQ2, and RQ3.

A summary table of the three thematic analyses is presented at the beginning of each section. The way the young people talked about all areas was influenced by age and gender, and this is explored across each analysis.

Chapter 5 summarises the key findings and suggests future directions, implications and concluding comments.

### 4.1 Preface to Findings

The thematic analyses show that many of the themes and subthemes across the data for young people and adults are interrelated. The implication of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, is that we need to take into consideration young people’s own perspectives, as well as the perspectives of relevant adult community stakeholders. This is complex as these understandings are shaped by/refracted
through the social world of media, policy, family, school and is unsurprising that some of the interrelated perspectives across the data sets echo the media and current social context. However, all participants either lived or worked in Ward Unite and so a certain level of consensus across the data was to be expected. This highlights the reliability of the themes; the more people in the community are talking about an issue or concern, the more prominent it will be, and therefore the more reliable and valid the themes identified in the analysis are.

The analysis provides new insight into the thoughts of community stakeholders about the role of schools in crime prevention, into current issues for young people, and possible future ways of working for schools in communities like Ward Unite, to prevent youth crime.

The focus group and interview context appeared to encourage reflective thinking amongst adult participants, and their participation in discussions about this topic seemed to evoke feelings of disquiet as they reflected on the impact of their role in supporting young people. Adult participants conveyed feeling they are consistently unable to meet the social and emotional needs of young people due to external pressures, including from academia. School staff, in particular were worried that they could be doing more and what shape that would take within the capacity of their roles.
4.2 Thematic Analysis 1 (TA1) - Context of Crime for Young People

This theme explores how young people conceptualise crime and their vulnerability to it. The views of young people in this study generally echo existing concerns in regard to youth crime, for example the prevalence of gangs, teenagers vulnerability to crime, fear of crime and the influence of ‘bad’ parenting/ home life and high-crime neighbourhoods on involvement in crime. However there are some points that are much less attended to in the literature, including the role of boredom. Young people acknowledged the increased role of girls in crime, particularly in regard to sexual exploitation and gangs, suggesting a shift in perceptions of the gender equality of crime.

In conjunction with Anderson et al’s (2009) survey, the older children were less inclined to talk about their personal experiences of crime or fear of crime. Primary school participants were willing to share their personal fears and experiences of crime. This may have been because I was familiar to the younger children. Both researcher effects and group effects are likely to impact on the openness of the older children; because of a lack of familiarity and trust, and the effect of self-presentation biases and social desirability (Sutton & Farrall, 2005). They may also be aware of the potential implications on them or talking about crime.

This thematic analysis will attempt to answer the following research question:

RQ1) What are children and young people’s views about their vulnerability to youth crime and youth crime prevention in schools? How are their perspectives influenced by gender and age?
Table 3. Thematic Analysis 1 – Themes and Subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. Education &amp; Future Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST3. Boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST4. Transition/Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2. The Gendering of Crime</td>
<td>ST1. Gender Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. Bravado</td>
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4.2.1 T1. Risk / Protective Factors of Crime

Young people in all age groups said that people get involved in crime because of parenting and home life, education and future career aspirations and the impact of the area they live in. These reasons appear regularly in criminological literature and the media. The impact of the environment and context on young peoples’ engagement in crime is addressed in T3.
Across all ages, the role of parenting and home life was the most frequently cited risk or protective factor for becoming involved in crime; this echoes the current literature (YJB, 2005; Hoeve et al., 2009).

Factors discussed within the remit of parenting/home life included; parents educating young people on how to keep safe, the development of morals to help their decision making, levels of parental supervision and guidance, the influence of siblings, the consequences of the emotional impact of letting parents down and the importance of the family unit providing love and a sense of belonging. Younger children expressed more concern about the deterrent of letting parents down, whereas the older children referenced the impact on their future lives due to criminal records, suggesting they fear the consequences of crime (Action for Children, 2008).

When understanding the roots of crime the Year 5-6 children tended to focus on parenting as the key factor, whereas the older children (Y7-Y9) recognised wider contextual factors, such as sibling behaviour, the impact of the ‘estate’ you live on and peer influences. This is possibly related to the inevitable change in exposure to and engagement with additional micro and meso systems within their ecology (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) as they enter adolescence and experience increased autonomy and mobility. Perhaps the older children have a more sophisticated awareness of structural forces.

When the groups were asked about why they think some young people commit crime, a common theme developed amongst the younger females (Y5-6) who demonstrated empathy and considered why people commit crime at a much more emotional and psychological level than the boys.

G:Can I just say something, like for homeless people it’s alright for them to steal, it’s alright because they don’t have any money so it’s kind of alright even though stealing is bad (Y5C)

G:Sometimes people do this because they’re annoyed with something, like care kids sometimes do things like this because they’re so annoyed…so they can get attention (Y5R)

The boys appeared to engage with reasons for crime at a more practical and non-emotional level, for example saying people do it for money, material goods,
boredom or for fun. Both genders tended to present in a gendered stereotypical way, however this was more diverse amongst the younger groups (Y5-7) than it was amongst the older groups and is discussed in more detail in T2.

**ST2. Education & Future Aspirations**

All groups of young people referenced the importance of education in terms of the role of the school and future career prospects as protective factors; echoing the existing literature (Haines & Case, 2004; Pitts, 2006; Anderson et al 2009; BERA, 2010a)

The younger children (Y5-6) made the link between attending a ‘good school’ and getting a ‘good education’ to get a ‘good job’. In addition, the older children (Y7-9) developed this further and considered the consequences of crime, such as the impact of a criminal record, on future job prospects and the need for education to assist your future career.

*B:If you wanna grow up to be let’s say footballer, you’re gonna have to be good at Maths and English because Maths you’re gonna be having to say how far you’re gonna have to pass the ball and English because you’re gonna be signing a lot of documents. (Y8N)*

The young person below talked about the positive role school can play for young people living in a ‘bad’ area, illustrating their recognition that the school provides opportunities for all young people, even living in high crime areas.

*G:Even some people who live in like a bad place they don’t want to get involved cos they know what can happen. They turn to school and they do well and then they get a job. (Y8N)*

This supports the literature around the positive impact school can have in preventing youth crime, both in terms of career prospects and a distraction from crime. The young people recognise the importance of education and school engagement, highlighting their ability to think about the impact education has on their desired future lifestyle. In this study, age was a factor in different attitudes; the older children were more likely to reflect on punishment and the effect this has on an individual’s future, and this appeared to be an effective deterrent.

All young people who talked about the school’s role in crime prevention, focused solely on the academic work aspect, and did not address the possible impact the
school has on developing the social and emotional well-being of young people to support and prevent involvement in crime. Young people do not acknowledge this, or perhaps are not explicitly aware of schools supporting their social and emotional needs. This could indicate a lack of support in schools, or a lack of awareness, amongst young people, either of which is a concern.

**ST3. Boredom**

An unexpected finding in this study, rarely referred to in the literature is the concept of 'boredom' as reason for involvement in crime.

The young people indirectly acknowledged the effects of the recent spending cuts. It was predominately those in Years 7-9 who said closures of youth clubs and other resources in their neighbourhood meant that there was nothing for them to do and so people get involved with crime. Young people expressed their concern and frustrations about this regularly. The younger children (Y5-6) did not acknowledge this issue, which could be because most of them do not attend youth clubs.

*B: When you’re older you have a career, like a job, but when you’re young you don’t have much going, bored (Y9N)*

*B: Youth clubs are good for people like who are in bad situations and now they’ve closed some of them down, people just like think we ain’t got nothing to do and no one to go see or talk to*

*B: Yeah so they end up getting bored and involved in things (Y8N)*

This highlights the importance young people place on having constructive, appropriate activities/resources available to them, particularly upon transition to secondary school, and the preventative role that this can play.

This echoes Dalle Pezze & Salzani (2009) findings that boredom lies at the centre of contemporary society and should therefore be of vital importance for theorists concerned with society. A large youth survey reported that boredom was the most frequently cited reason by youth, for committing crime (YJB, 2006). Despite this, little research exists exploring the relationship between boredom and crime. These findings demonstrate the need for further research particularly in the current social and economic climate.
This data highlights the complex ways in which the feelings and experiences of young people are possibly underpinned by the social and cultural construction of boredom, and how the conceptualisation is possibly symptomatic of a larger set of contemporary problems regarding economic restraints and subsequent lack of resources. The causal relationship between boredom and youth crime needs further exploration as it is clearly a growing concern in today’s society.

**ST4. Transition / Adolescence**

All groups of young people said the transition from primary to secondary school was a risky time for involvement in crime. The Year 5 and 6 groups expressed their apprehension and fear through negative descriptions about secondary school, teenagers and their fear of transition and adolescence. They identified ‘teenagers’ as most likely to commit crime and held negative perceptions about them and the secondary school, but failed to make reference to their imminent role as a teenager. This is likely to have been informed both by messages filtered from the media and previous policy that demonise teenagers, and their own experiences of living in a ward with a large population of highly visible young people who often move around in groups, and because they live in a ward with a high incidence of youth crime.

The Year 9 group reported that older teenagers (16 and 17 plus) are most likely to commit crime. The stereotyping of teenagers and the tendency for the young people to distance themselves from these ‘other’ teenagers who get involved could be a result of researcher effects (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007). They will also understandably avoid self-disclosure in a group setting with an unfamiliar adult. The young people appeared to position themselves as far removed from youth engaged in crime, often repeating stereotypical viewpoints such as boys being aggressive.

*B:* I think secondary school because then they begin with the crime and they are going to do gangs and stuff like that....

*G:*...and mostly when you start secondary school onwards and when you’re a teenager and that you start to do it (crime) more (Y6C)

There was acknowledgement across all groups that transition to secondary school and adolescence coincides with an increase in independence, mobility
and the possession of material goods such as mobile phones and less parental supervision. These were all identified as factors in a young person’s vulnerability to crime. Some young people also implied the vulnerability of teenagers, for example the risks to “fighting and stalking” as a result of having possessions;

G: Yeah it mostly happens when you’re in the teenage parts. I think it’s because you get more responsibility and then people around you start, you get more responsibility, you get a phone you get things and people can just send you stuff that you don’t like and then you’ll end up fighting and stalking you or something like that (Y5R)

The girl depicts the teenager as prey, rather than the predator that they are often unhelpfully portrayed. This challenges more familiar perceptions of teenagers, described by young people in this study and in previous literature.

4.2.2 T2. The Gendering of Crime

Mixed gender groups allowed for exploration of the topic between genders and for analysis of gender dimensions. It allowed me to ask the young people specifically about gender and crime and allowed me to explore similarities or differences between responses of boys and girls and how they chose to present in the group discussion.

In accordance with recent research and policy this study highlights the emerging conceptualisation of greater gender equality in crime. The young people acknowledged that boys and girls are involved in crime, but that boys commit more crime. Both genders are possible victims of crime. It is important to note that girl violence has received high media exposure, which is likely to have influenced such discourse.

ST1. Gender Stereotypes

We know that crime is gendered and the young people in this study engaged with this by stating what’s known about crime, for example that boys commit more crime than girls, and typically their crime is more aggressive and violent. Although recent literature and policy suggest a shift in the gendering of crime, stereotypes persist. The Year 5 girl below attributes unhelpful constructs, underpinned by historic gendered stereotypes, regarding girls being inherently ‘weak’ and ‘passive’ in crime. The girl did acknowledge her awareness of gender stereotyping as she apologised before stating that girls are weaker than boys.
This suggests that despite a shift in discourse in regard to equality, restrictive stereotypes remain firmly within the perceptions and narratives of some young people.

**Q:** Why do you think boys are more likely to do those things?

*G:* I don’t want to insult any of the people here but because boys are just a bit stronger than girls, I don’t want to be rude

**Q:** What do you mean by that?

*G:* Girls are like weak…

*G:* Not weak but girls they don’t do bad stuff (Y5R)

Interestingly two Year 6 girls (see quote below) partly challenged the gendered stereotypes; whilst they describe girls as appearing sweet and innocent, they then suggest that girls might actively use their appearance to deceive others in terms of their involvement in crime. Suggesting a more active role for girls in crime.

**Q:** What else would girls do?

*G:* Pick pocketing because little girls they could be 17 but look like they’re 10 years old and then they can slip through the crowd

*G:* Well maybe guns because girls they look sweet and innocent but some are not…. (Y6R)

These differing perspectives suggest a lack of clarity and an insecurity amongst participants’ as to the understanding of the role of girls in crime, which could be challenging existing constructs about girls. Participants however spoke at ease about boys’ involvement in crime, suggesting a more secure understanding and embedded construct in regard of this relationship.

A shift in the perspectives of the older children was apparent when exploring why boys are more likely to commit crime. For example, below two Year 8 boys acknowledge that boys would be more likely to become involved in crime because of being stressed or pushed away by their family.
Q: Why do you think boys get involved more in those things?

G: They’re more like aggressive. Yeah you can get like the occasional girl who’s like in a gang, but I think it’s more boys.

B: They’re getting pushed away by their family

G: They’re depressed or something

B: Stressed.....

G: I think it’s maybe more of like, boys if they’re like depressed and that; they mostly turn to violence, whereas girls they don’t. They (girls) are most likely to turn to alcohol and drugs and not really violence (Y8N)

In contrast, the younger boys (Y5–7) tended to relive gender norms, stating that boys are more violent and aggressive and therefore commit more crime. They also engaged in more bravado behaviour (see ST2) than the older boys when discussing violent crime. The older boys however challenged this by cutting across the gender boundaries, pushing away from previous gender stereotypes, stating that boys might have family difficulties and/or other mental health reasons, such as stress that result in their involvement in crime. This suggests the possibility of an intersection factor with age and gender, which was evident across this study; as individuals get older, particularly upon the transition to adolescence and secondary school, less disparity exists across gender groups regarding perceptions and attitudes, underpinning their understanding of roots to crime and offending behaviour.

Amongst younger children (Y5–Y6) there was more difference between gender groups regarding the attitudes and perceptions of roots to crime. For example, girls demonstrated more emotional literacy when thinking about reasons behind offending behaviour. These findings suggest that the gender gap in understanding crime appears to close as the children get older.

All groups talked about boys and girls being vulnerable to different crimes. The generalisation was that boys are more likely to commit violent crimes such as gangs, murder, weapon use, and fighting/robbery. The Year 7-9’s referenced boys committing sexual crimes such as rape, prostitution and sexual exploitation; they also identified girls as more vulnerable to being on the peripheral of gangs. This is recognised in current policy. All groups identified girls as being involved in
holding and transporting drugs and weapons and involvement in gangs, which are concerns mirrored in current media and policy.

**ST2. Bravado**

This subtheme was developed because of a marked difference between the way the younger boys (Y5-7) chose to present and engage with discussion about crime. Generally, girls presented as more serious and less playful across the age groups. There was more disparity between the presentation of the boys and girls in the younger groups, than in the older groups (Y8-9). The disparity in behaviour presentation of both genders reduced as the children got older. Young people in Year 8 and 9 had very similar verbal and non-verbal behaviour; reinforcing an intersection between age and gender in terms of level of maturity and presentation in the focus group setting.

Generally, younger boys engaged with masculine bravado during the discussions; expressing themselves by acting out, particularly when talking about weapons and gangs. The bravado was very gender typical and consisted of street talk, such as ‘gangsters’ ‘drive-by’s’ and ‘gear’ and boys tended to use more aggressive street language when describing reasons behind involvement in crime. Girls did not use this language but at least one boy in each group (Y5-6), when talking about violent crime and/or use of weapons, acted out what they were saying, for example pretending to shoot a gun or fight. Goodey’s (1997) research suggests that boys’ emotional illiteracy triggers a form of masculine bravado or fearlessness. Some of the boys showed signs of immaturity; at times they were silly, laughing or saying inappropriate things, for example, when talking about sexual crimes.

**B: shooting**

*B:well that’s what you do in war basically, kill each other....*

*(boy does machine gun actions and noises)*

*B: fight, yeah, starting a fight (acts out punching ducking and diving) ‘what you sayin blud?’ (Y6C)*

Gender is constructed within institutional and cultural contexts, producing multiple forms of masculinity (Connell, 1996). The dialogue and presentation of some of the boys in this study is harmonious with numerous others in relation to
hegemonic masculinity and crime (Goodey, 1997), reinforcing the fact that boys possibly adopt tough masculinities when positioning their identities (Kenway & Fitzclarence, 1997). The effect of mixed gender groups, alongside my role as a female researcher, may have contributed to increased bravado amongst the boys as they attempted to position themselves within the constructed masculine identities (Connell, 1995). This illustrates the social and psychic complexity and fragility of masculinity acknowledged across existing literature on boys and crime.

**ST3. Boys, Peer Pressure, Status & Reputation**

All ages and genders highlighted peer pressure as a key factor in crime, especially influencing boys. Boys made more reference to peer pressure and both genders highlighted the focus on the importance, particularly for boys, of having a reputation and gaining status amongst peers.

**Q:** Why do you think some children and young people choose to commit these crimes?

**B:** To look bad

**Q:** To look bad ok, bad meaning?

**B:** Like cool

**B:** I think it all links up to peer pressure, just to act big in front of all the people (Y9N)

There are many complex and subtle differences in discourses around crime, however in this study the word ‘bad’ was used numerous times across focus groups with young people, typically by boys. Some girls also used the word when describing why boys engage with crime. When I explored the meaning of the word, I was given the following answers; ‘cool’, ‘hard’, ‘respected’, ‘bad as in good’. Gunter’s (2010) ethnographic study in East London explores the notion of ‘badness’ within youth subculture. Gunter concludes that ‘badness’ is a lifestyle choice adopted by a small minority of male youths. With this in mind it is important to note that the word ‘bad’ is used throughout the media and across current youth culture. It is clearly a popular term amongst young people and appears to have been constructed within the current social and cultural context in relation to status and reputation.
A focus on boys committing crime to obtain material goods, such as games consoles, mobile phones and clothing which in turn can gain them status. Such crimes are a common occurrence in Ward Unite. The participants in the quote below show the pressures that exist on young people to be respected, through ratings or status gained from peers, and the relationship with this and involvement in crime;

**Q:** *So why do you think some children and young people do all these things we’ve discussed?*

**B:** *Cos they want money and want to get ratings so like... say if they go to school and somebody try bully them and they’re in a gang yeah...set them up or something... they want to be popular* (Y7N)

**B:** *The trend, they might think it’s cool, it’s the trend...* (Y6R)

The older the children, the more reference were made to the influence of peers and reputation. Numerous boys talked about the possible risks of being forced or coerced by others to become involved in crime, suggesting feelings of constraint and a lack of free will. This indicates that boys tend to adopt a perspective underpinned by an external locus of control (Rotter, 1975) in relation to involvement in crime. A fear of bullying and losing friends was expressed during the discussions as reasons for engaging in certain behaviours. This again reinforces the importance of peer approval and social relationships amongst young people, and highlights some of the pressures young people are under in terms of ‘fitting in’ amongst peers. Whilst the younger children tended not to label it as ‘peer pressure’, they still made reference to it during the discussions. There was a real fear of being isolated or bullied by peers if young people don’t engage with crime.

Reputation and status were mentioned by all focus groups as reasons for young people, especially boys, to be involved in crime. Status, reputation, the influence of peers and engagement in crime is consistently mentioned in the criminological literature. These findings highlight the continuous social pressure young people face and how this might lead to their involvement in crime. There is a clear need for more support and guidance to help young people to develop good self-esteem and self-efficacy, so they can manage these pressures.
ST4. Sex & Crime

The younger children (Y5-6) made reference to sex and crime mentioning both ‘rape’ and ‘prostitution’. These terms are regularly in the media and it is likely that they have knowledge of these terms but are unsure what they actually mean; they tended to use them loosely and often out of context. Some young people did however talk about being aware of rape happening on their estate. The vulnerability of females in sexual crimes, such as rape or exploitation, was mentioned by the older groups (Y7-9). The oppressive terminology used by boys in the quote below, such as ‘woman slut’, and ‘the sket’ and their knowledge of this demonstrates their awareness of exploitation and role of girls.

Q: Why do you think women are more likely to be involved in prostitution?

B: To get money

G: Because like, in gangs they normally have like the one girl like to get money and she’s being pressured into being a prostitute.

B: In gangs there’s a boss, there’s a younger, there’s a newer and there’s a sket

B: The sket’s basically a woman

B: The sket is basically just like the lower one and the boss owns the sket so if the younger does something good

Q: What’s a sket?

B: if the younger does something good, then the boss would give the younger the sket for the day or so and then you pass her on (Y8N).

It is concerning that boys were very matter of fact, as if stating ‘this is just how it is’. Girls either chose not to protest, or agreed. This raises concerns about the exposure and acceptance of sexual exploitation amongst young people, and questions what, how and where they are being educated, if at all, about the impact of such crimes. There is a need for policy to address the existence and prevalence of sexual exploitation of young girls and the need to raise awareness of its damaging impact.

4.2.3. T3. Exposure to, & Lived Experience of Crime

This analysis showed that crime in all its forms is very much a part of young people’s lives in Ward Unite. The aim of the focus groups was not to ask about
personal experiences and this was avoided as much as possible, however the Year 5 and 6 groups continually made reference to their own experience of crime.

The narratives adopted by all ages, when talking about their local neighbourhood, were mostly negative and underpinned by restrictive and oppressive attributions. They talked about various aspects of local crime, including violent crime, as well as vandalism and graffiti, especially around the blocks of flats where they live and their school.

Also evident was the fear of crime amongst young people, particularly expressed by younger groups. Given the researcher effects previously mentioned and in line with previous studies it is unsurprising that the older children were more closed with me and did not share their personal experiences.

**ST1. Knowledge of ‘Gangs’**

Every group spoke about ‘gangs’ and the term was commonly used when young people were trying to either understand why people commit crime or when they were talking about crime in their environment, suggesting a prevalence of ‘gang talk’ amongst young people. Some of the younger children used the term ‘gangs’ more loosely, for example, making inferences about a group of people in the park, however all young people made reference to gangs in their environment. Generally boys gave more information about and mentioned gangs more than girls. This could mean they are more knowledgeable about gangs, that they chose to share their knowledge more than girls, or that they wanted to present as knowledgeable possibly to align with a masculine identity (Goodey, 1997; Sutton & Farrall, 2005).

**G:** there’s a gang issue here and it’s going around everywhere and it’s getting more dangerous now

**B:** Some people join the X (local gang), you get paid for the X as well, the leader pays them, I know this because my friend told me because my friend knows someone who in it and if they’re going to murder someone some of the people in the X leave it and then they go back to it after the persons got murdered (Y6C)

The girl’s quote above demonstrates her fear of gangs and the anxiety about the danger as a result of gang activity. The boy engages with ‘gang talk’ in another way, demonstrating facts about gangs, including the recognition of their
monetary value and the complexities of gang life. It is likely that these young people know about gangs because of the reality of gangs in Ward Unite, and because of ‘gang talk’ both in their immediate environment, and their wider social world, including the media.

Generally, the younger children attributed negative constructs such as ‘bad’ or ‘scary’ to gangs, however older children (Y7-9) also expressed insight and understanding of why young people might join gangs, i.e. for enjoyment and protection;

**Q: You mentioned that you think boys are more likely to be in gangs, why?**

**B: Because they sometimes get a buzz out of it**

**B: Protection because you can get bullied at school and on the way home you could get bullied as well. And you need people to protect you so if you’re in a gang and the gang see that you’re getting bullied they’re obviously gonna come over and protect you cos they might need you. (Y8N)**

Some of the older children referenced the gang as a ‘family’ and providing a sense of belonging for some; this has been recognised in other studies (Nurge, 2003; Thornberry, et al., 2003; Curry, 2008). This shift from the negative / fearful attributes of gangs amongst the younger children, to a view from the older children that gangs can protect you from others, was visible across the age groups and is a concern. Older children acknowledged the complexity of gang life in terms of the organisation/hierarchy, the involvement of sexual exploitation of females (please see T2 ST4), the constraints of the entrenched nature of gang lifestyle and the potential impact on a young person’s future;

**B: Leave? (a gang)….yeah that’s good and all if you want to be killed…**

**B: Even if they want to they can’t just do that because once they’re in the gangs they can’t get out (Y7N).**

**B: Once you’re in there you can’t get out you’re stuck forever (Y7N)**

This highlights the diversity and inconsistency in young people’s views of gangs. It is possible that hyped up discourse around ‘gang talk’, as well as exposure to gangs in Ward Unite, have resulted in an insecure understanding amongst young people of the role of gangs in today’s society. It is possible that misconceptions have resulted in unhelpful constructs surrounding gangs and their prevalence.
This illustrates the need for either a reduction in ‘gang talk’ to reduce hype and misconceptions, or for young people to be accurately informed about the prevalence of gangs in their area. They also need education and support about the consequences of gangs to reduce fear and manage risk.

**ST2. Voice of the Estate**

All groups talked negatively about the ward, referring to the high levels of crime, a lack of resources for youth, increased fear of crime and exposure to negative role models and the geographical isolation of the ward.

Sadly, some of the young people’s dialogue was underpinned by deterministic rhetoric. Referring to the estate being, ‘like a black hole’, suggests feelings of constraint in regard to social mobility, freedom and reduced opportunities to lead a desired lifestyle for those living there;

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{G:} & \text{ it’s the main area of where that happens..} \\
\text{B:} & \text{ it’s like they can’t not do it because…} \\
\text{B:} & \text{ The areas like a black hole you’re gonna get sucked in sooner or later} \\
\text{Q:} & \text{ So you’re saying they don’t have a choice?} \\
\text{B:} & \text{ They do but it’s just hard to resist…it’s hard to avoid it (Y8N)}
\end{align*}
\]

The boy above acknowledges free will but also says he is constrained by the environment he lives in due to the exposure to and temptation by crime. This shows how some young people make external attributions, for example the impact of the local environment, when accounting for offending behaviour (Heider, 1958). It also demonstrates low self-efficacy amongst the young people which is likely to result in feelings of lack of control and impact on self-esteem (Judge et al, 2002). It also leads to an increase in perceived susceptibility to crime (Killias, 1990; Denkers & Winkel, 1998).

The Year 9 girl below referenced to the possible desensitisation to crime due to living in a high crime area, in conjunction with other research on neighbourhood effects and crime (Turner et al., 2006).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{G:} & \text{ They might not (be fearful of crime) because if they are born into this area they’re kind of used to it and stuff (Y9N)}
\end{align*}
\]
Many of the young people gave personal accounts of witnessing crime outside their homes or close by. It is difficult to determine whether the emotive language adopted by the young people, ‘gangsters’, ‘dealing drugs’, ‘gang member’, are a reflection of their reality or if the use of these terms in the media and policy have filtered down to them and consequently underpins their language used to convey their understanding, knowledge and awareness of crime (Hallsworth & Young, 2008). Whilst it is important to bear this in mind, this study clearly shows that young people in Ward Unite are exposed to gangs, drugs and weapon use.

B: I live on the 4th floor and people that live near us, they don’t have guns but when they go outside they’ve got them cricket bats, the wooden ones (Y5R)

B: They’re afraid (young people) because the gangsters, they kick at the door and you can hear shouting outside (Y5R)

B: I was playing out with my friend and there was this man and another man he started a fight and the man smashed a bottle over someone’s head (Y6C)

B: Normally dealing drugs because there’s like loads of people who are in front of my flat they like sit down on that wall all day drinking (Y6R)

Some young people in Ward Unite clearly exist in chaotic high-risk environments, where they are exposed to, and are fearful of crime. It is imperative that this is not ignored.

Some young people said they had experienced or learnt about crime in school; they were aware of criminal activity in and around school and of their peers being involved in crime. This included damage to school property, graffiti, vandalism and theft, illustrating the regular exposure of young people to crime in the systems they exist in. There is a need for young people living in high-crime deprived areas to be given more support and encouragement to discuss their worries or concerns. There is also a need to challenge existing deterministic perspectives that might be maintaining low self-efficacy and self-esteem and to support young people in developing positive psychological constructs to empower and equip them with skills to protect them from crime. These findings also highlight the need for more positive role models and ways of living, to stop young people from getting ‘sucked in’ to crime.
**ST3. Fear of Crime**

In a socially and economically deprived neighbourhood rife with concerns about youth crime and gangs, young people are likely to be anxious about their safety. (Dolan & Peasgood, 2007; Action for Children, 2008; 11 Million, 2009; Gunter, 2010; Swift, 2011). In this study, every young person, regardless of their age said they thought young people are fearful of crime. Younger children (Y5-6) expressed their own personal fear of crime, whereas the older children tended to acknowledge fear amongst young people indirectly, and did not acknowledge their own experiences.

Different levels of fear were conveyed; robbery, violence, weapon use, and all groups mentioned fear of gangs. What was concerning about these findings was the suggestion that young people fearful of crime are adopting self-protection measures, including carrying weapons; synonymous with other studies (11 Million, 2009; Kinsella, 2011; Swift, 2011). More young people in London now carry knives (NCIS, 2003). This can be explained less by the rise of organised gangs and more by the sudden escalation in street crime that has occurred from 2000 onwards (NCIS, 2003). Along with the quote below, this challenges the predominate discourse that only young people in gangs carry weapons.

*B*: Some people round my estate are like 12, 13, they carry knives around with them cos they know they’re gonna get beat up.

*B*: carrying knives and guns

*Q*: So why do you think that some people are carrying weapons?

*H,: For protection, they’re scared (Y8N)*

Girls spoke more directly about their fears, whereas boys tended to talk about others being fearful. This is possibly a result of boys suppressing their fear because of social desirability (Sutton & Farrall, 2005), rather than actual differences in fear. Perhaps ‘being fearful’ does not align with masculinity that the young boys aspire to identify with. The girl below conveys empathy as she communicates her awareness of victims, and the psychological impact that crime has on people.
G: I feel Scared

Q: Why do you feel scared?

G: Because there’s so many people who want to have a good life and they don’t want to waste it and then after they might get murdered or something and then they might not want to go back out again because it might happen to them again (Y6R)

The psychological impact of fear of crime is widely recognised in the literature (Gabriel & Greve, 2003) and can impact directly on people’s psychological health through experiences of worry and anxiety, and indirectly on physical and mental health (Dolan & Peasgood, 2007). Whilst fear was prevalent amongst young people in this study and they talked about their awareness and exposure to crime, typically they did not convey their victimisation. This suggests that much of their fear of crime is related to their perceived susceptibility to crime. This involves an appraisal of threat, the seriousness of the consequences of victimisation, the likelihood of crime and their ability to control its occurrence (Jackson, 2009). If young people assess the impact of crime as high and feel that they have low levels of control, it is unsurprising that levels of worry are high; this again reinforces low self-efficacy amongst young people in this study. Jackson (2009) calls this a psychological sense of vulnerability, which determines levels of fear and anxiety. A sense of vulnerability is likely to underpin an individual’s cognitive facet, for example, their perception of a situation, their expressive facet and the behaviour they engage with, i.e. fearful or self-protection, avoidance behaviour (Gabriel & Greves, 2003) and can all impact an individual’s social identity and social exclusion (Pain, 2000).

Parental fear was mentioned amongst the Y5 and Y6 children. They discussed protection/safety measures adopted by their parents and firm boundaries on independence and mobility;

B: …my mum, she has chains at her house and she puts them on the door so nobody can come in and burgle (Y5R)

G: Sometimes your parents say don’t stay outside for long after school and come straight home…..they’re scared, there are people who’ve been kidnapped around here (Y5C)
It is possible that parental fear leads to increased fear and anxiety in young people, however Pain (2006) argues that parent and child fears about gangs and antisocial behaviour in high-risk neighbourhoods are real and should not be overlooked. This study clearly shows that parents and young people in Ward Unite are fearful of crime. Research conveys how living in high-crime neighbourhoods can potentially aggravate discord within families as young people struggle for autonomy (Connolly & Parkes, 2012). Fear of crime is consistently recognised in the literature as something that has geographical, economic, social, cultural and psychological dimensions (Pain, 2000). This illustrates further the need for schools and other community stakeholders to take these issues seriously and to involve parents and young people in exploring this fear, supporting and empowering them to live and travel safely in Ward Unite.
4.3. Thematic Analysis 2 (TA2) – Context of Youth Crime for Adult Community Stakeholders

This thematic analysis explores how adult community stakeholders in this study conceptualise youth crime; including how they view their role in preventing youth crime.

Numerous references were made to the current social and political context, which is explored further in Theme 1 (T1). This discourse appeared to be underpinned by the notion of ‘change’, in that the current picture of youth crime is worse than it used to be. Much frustration was targeted at the government and the impact the recession has had on the local context. Under the remit of ‘change’ was recognition amongst adult participants of the increasing involvement of girls in crime, discussion of how adults conceptualise this is reported in Theme 2 (T2) Subtheme 3 (ST3).

Generally, dialogue amongst adults was negative as to the increasing risks to youths and the vulnerabilities they face living in Ward Unite. Adults in youth services particularly conveyed a bleak outlook about the lack of opportunities for youths living in the ward, the risky environments they have to negotiate on a daily basis. They also highlight the challenging context of contemporary youth culture that consistently puts pressures on young people to ‘fit in’. All adult groups conveyed a sense of injustice for young people in today’s society when they referred to a young person’s right to be supported and educated about the realities of youth crime and its risks; this included outlining how important they think early intervention is in order to resourcefully and successfully prevent youth crime.

This echoes some of the young person’s views illustrated in TA1, including the relationship between boredom and crime (T1, ST3), cutbacks to youth resources and perceptions about gender differences in crime. In discussion about crime, the recognition of boys and peer pressure, the increasing involvement of girls in crime (T2), and the role of gangs (T2, ST2), suggesting all of these are prevalent concerns in Ward Unite. Although TA2 does not have a specific theme specifying the ‘exposure and lived experience of crime’ amongst young people in the ward, this was clearly identified by all adult groups.
TA2 aims to answer the following research question:

**RQ2** How do a range of professionals in the youth and community sector, and the education sector view youth crime prevention and its role in schools? What can we learn from community stakeholders to inform school-based interventions?

**Table 4. Thematic Analysis 2 – Themes and Subthemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Analysis 2</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. Sophistication of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST3. Tackling Boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST4. Academica Vs. Social &amp; Emotional Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST5. Perceptions of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2. Gender &amp; Crime</td>
<td>ST1. Boys, Stripes, Status &amp; Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. Media and the Glamorisation of ‘Gangs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3. The Rights of Vulnerable Youth</td>
<td>ST1. Vulnerabilities of Primary School Children – The Need for Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. A Need to Feel Safe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 T1. Social & Political Context

This theme was developed in response to the numerous perceptions regarding how the current social and political context is impacting on the systems around young people and the level of support available to them. It explores how adult community stakeholders view youth crime prevention and young peoples’ vulnerability to crime in the current social and political context.

ST1. Government Blame – Cutbacks & Restraints on Effective Working

Despite the focus of current government policy on early intervention and prevention (Allen, 2011) and tackling crime (HM Government, 2011), these findings show that recent cutbacks have resulted in a lack of resources that have had a huge impact on Ward Unite. These include, the closure of youth clubs, limited police resources, the diminished role of PCSO’s in primary schools, and a reduction in joined-up working between the SNT and youth workers. Cuts to youth services in Ward Unite have resulted in fewer staff which is clearly impacting on the level of support for young people. There was clearly a sense of anxiety and fear for the future of young people in the ward.

*with the government making cuts and cuts and cuts they’re all going to end up on the streets even the ones who have channelled themselves into youth organisations right now, once they’ve gone where are they going to go? What are they going to do? (C22)*

*There were youth clubs for children that were 11 to whatever age and they would all go there and find people to talk to and do social things, go on trips but now they’ve gone and closed it down (C22)*

Adults from youth services made several references to this and directly pointed their frustration, anger and blame towards the government. Cutbacks and insecure, short-term funding for the local community has led to individuals feeling constrained in their roles supporting young people. Feelings of a lack of control were evident, particularly amongst adults at Catch 22 who are unsure if their funding will continue. Frustrations, personal anxiety and ambiguity about their future roles are inevitable.

The Catch 22 mentor below acknowledges the paradox of current government agenda and the frustrations that this brings. This resonated across all the adult groups/interviews in youth services.
when you look at Government legislation for kids, all the focus is with the children but at the same time they are taking the resources away from children so it’s two conflicting messages…they say we want to build communities, we want to take children off the streets, we want to reduce youth crime, but you are not giving us the resources and funding to do that and in actual fact you are taking it away (C22)

Negative, deterministic dialogue appeared to mask possible underlying anxieties amongst adults in youth services about their own professionalism and capacity to carry out their professional roles supporting young people to the degree needed, whilst living in an economically deprived community.

These findings suggest that in Ward Unite the support, enthusiasm and knowledge of people exist within the young person’s ecology (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), both at the microsystem and mesosystem level, and individuals are ready to engage and support young people through adolescence. However unfortunately it seems that the impact of wider contextual factors, at the exosystem and macrosystem level, are proving to be problematic and restricting the level of support available. This theme illustrates the ‘conflicting messages from government’ which was a view held by many of the stakeholders in this research. Whilst the relevant policy appears to exist, in reality the failure or barriers to policy enactment appear to lie within the paradox inherent within the system.

**ST2. Sophistication of Crime**

Adult participants said that crime had recently become more sophisticated. Media and technology has contributed for example by making the commercial buying and selling of drugs more organised, increasing exposure to sexual images on the internet leading to more sexual exploitation. The sophistication in the hierarchy of gangs has made young people who live in such areas feel vulnerable and an increasing in use of weapons, which directly impacts on the young people’s risk of violent crime. The participant below references the ‘economic value’ that young people attach to crime and acknowledges the level of sophistication of the gang in Ward Unite.

…it’s the economic value that young people present in that they have a commercial benefit to people and that is probably the most worrying bit in terms of offences and crime. It’s the fact that behind all of the kids getting involved in little bits of gang activity there is a bigger organisation and certainly the Ward
Unite gang is an extremely sophisticated and established commercial organisation.... sophisticated to know which of the kids will be able to operate and some of the kids will have been groomed from a very early age (PH)

This subtheme shows the increasing complexity of criminal activity and the inevitable vulnerability and risks posed to young people in high-crime areas, further outlining the need to support young people to manage these risks to prevent their involvement in crime.

**ST3. Tackling Boredom**

Numerous adults raised boredom as a reason why young people get involved in crime. They related this to the lack of resources and recent closure of youth services/clubs, the appropriateness of the activities/services available to young people, and the need for more constructive activities, reinforcing previous literature (Hallsworth & Duffy, 2010). The police said that young people tell them they have nothing to do, this is clearly problematic and links to involvement in crime.

*My perspective is for the whole borough it’s boredom.....they haven’t got the sense to look for something else to do or they are just unaware there are other options…*

*Boredom they’ll be sitting and see something go past or see something and think ‘that’s fun instead of sitting here doing nothing’.....Unwillingness to try something new so that they’re always in that cycle, lack of input (SNT)*

*Also there’s a lack of opportunities for them to do stuff and learn and gain new experiences (YW)*

This theme highlights professional views on the need for economic development in communities like Ward Unite and how that creating environments where young people can frequent safely, making positive activities and opportunities visible and accessible will contribute to reduced involvement in crime.

**ST4. Academica Vs Social & Emotional Needs**

Despite recent legislation stressing the need to reduce bureaucratic burden on schools (DfE, 2010a), all participants recognised the profound pressures on schools. In both youth services and education, participants referenced the lack of time and resources in schools to address the social and emotional needs of pupils (BERA, 2010a). These frustrations appeared to be targeted at the wider systemic level rather than at teachers. There was a consensus across the data
that teachers have extremely difficult roles, are often very stressed and pushed to meet the holistic needs of the child and that the social and emotional needs of young people are often not met as well as they could be within schools.

One of the Catch 22 workers referred to her experience of attending a school in Ward Unite; she describes feelings of isolation which resulted in her wanting to leave the school. She reported having no one to talk to, and feeling anxious because of the school system; its bureaucracy and involvement with other services.

The school system then endorsed her exclusion after they clearly did not meet her social and emotional needs;

I was 13 and started mixing with the wrong people, I didn’t want to go to school, the main problem with school is you think you are going to tell the teacher and the teacher is going to tell your parent and you think the whole school is going to talk about you and you think social services are going to get involved and stuff like that so it’s not worth saying anything, because there is no one in school to tell anyway (C22)

I think it’s a young person’s right to receive it…I think we need to put it on the agenda as much as all the academic subjects because without living legally all them bits of paper are a complete waste of time… (MB)

These findings suggest that the drive and pressure on schools as academic teaching institutions may mean that they cannot meet the holistic, social and emotional needs of pupils or their academic needs. This was a common theme amongst adult groups suggesting that schools remain under too much pressure and are restrained by bureaucratic burdens, such as league and achievement levels.

ST5.Perceptions of Police
Adults expressed concerns about negative perceptions/relationships with police amongst young people. This is not a new concern - data exists confirming the high rates of young people’s adversarial contact with police (Anderson et al., 1994; McAra & McVie, 2005; Kinsella, 2011). This contributes to the construction of negative attributions (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) of police amongst young people. Despite apparent efforts from police to improve their relationship with young people, these findings suggest that it remains a challenge, with persistent barriers preventing positive relationships with some young people.
I think it’s important for young people in general not just to have a relationship, but have an understanding of police…we have tried and invited police into some things that we have done before here, but it’s not got the best reception…I think if you asked 20 young people their opinion on the police probably 90% would be negative (YW)

Generally, the stakeholders appeared to view the barriers as a two-way problem; the police need to understand young people and their needs more and young people need to understand the role of the police and be supported to view them as protection, rather than the enemy. Public perceptions of crime and justice are often believed to be largely derived from the media, however Dowler’s (2003) review concluded that perception of police effectiveness is not related to media consumption.

These findings illustrate a possible communication breakdown between police and young people in Ward Unite, resulting in negative perceptions of police amongst some young people. This reinforces the continuous need for police to strive to build positive relationships with young people. This is however likely to be a particular challenge for police within the constraints of their role and as they face relentless cutbacks to their services, which does not support the aim of building relationships amongst police and local communities.

4.3.2 T2.Gender & Crime

Professionals often spoke about the gendered aspects of crime, including the importance of gaining respect and status from peers predominately amongst boys, and how this is believed to influence involvement in crime, how crime is perceived to be ‘cool’ and lastly a recognition of the increasing role of girls involvement in crime.

ST1.Boys, Stripes, Status & Reputation

A common theme discussed by adults and young people (TA1, T2, ST3) are the problems around crime being perceived as ‘cool’ and ‘fashionable’ amongst young people; all participant groups made reference to those involved with crime doing it to ‘earn stripes’ and ‘gain status’ and respect from others, suggesting the prevalence of this as a current area of concern.

For him it’s a status thing, it’s a family thing, you know he sees himself as one of the boys, proud. (LMN)
Other reasons why young people might commit crime was a concern that for some, it is perceived as a way to climb the social ladder or earn respect and admiration from others. This suggests that for some young people self-esteem may be gained from a ‘cool’ reputation. Such individuals may be placing more value on gaining status and respect illegitimately rather than thinking about the consequences and impact of their behaviour on themselves and others.

*It’s the glory of stigma, it’s the tag thing, it’s the stripes thing, you know you are up there if you have done this* (C22)

*We need to build a culture within young people that makes crime a negative aspect. I think there’s a concern at the minute that crime, bad behaviour, antisocial behaviour has suddenly become the new cool and I think we need to do something to really smash that image and get young people talking positively about anti-crime* (MB)

These findings imply the need to challenge prevalent perceptions of crime being ‘cool’ amongst young people, particularly boys, and illustrates the need for some young people to be educated and supported to think differently about crime and particularly the wider impact on both the offender and the victim.

**ST2. Media & the Glamorisation of ‘Gangs’**

Whilst gangs do exist in Ward Unite, there appears to be a lot of unhelpful propaganda around gangs in media and policy (Hallsworth & Young, 2005; 2006; 2008; Hallsworth & Duffy, 2010). Gangs and behaviour of those in gangs was mentioned frequently amongst the young people and adult groups, but such dialogue tended to be underpinned by assumptions and perceptions about gangs and gang members, rather than direct experience. It is possible the media, and other such sources, has provided excessive exposure of gangs and ‘gang talk’ resulting in a heightened glamorisation being attributed to gangs that is unhelpful to both adults and young people.

Media sources are extremely accessible nowadays, especially for young people. Inevitably some of the information they access is not always targeted at them and this can have consequences, for example if media information about gangs is taken out of context it could be misleading. Children in Years 5 and 6, particularly the boys, wanted to talk about gangs and appeared to get some enjoyment out of sharing their indirect experience of gangs. (TA1, T3, ST1).
Learning Mentor below alludes to the interest of gangs and ‘gang talk’ amongst young people;

*There’s been a few occasions where specific gang names have been said to me by Year 5 and 6; they seem very interested having watched clips on YouTube of gang related raps that are almost encouraging gun crime….so you know even as young as 9,10 year olds they’re very, very, aware (LMR)*

In conjunction with the glamorisation of gangs there appears to be a fear of gangs, described more overtly by the younger children;

*that is all that they seem to want to do, just follow the gang culture and I think that’s had a massive impact on our youth…they also think they can’t beat these gangs and they are terrified and so they end up with them and doing the same thing. (LMR)*

This illustrates the need for young people to be provided with information to provide them with a more realistic picture of the activities and prevalence of gangs. Misconceptions may result in increased fear, labeling and a self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1968);

*It is real to these kids but because of the media all’s they get is gangs, gangs, gangs when actually that’s not always how it is so they need to hear it balanced…they think that every young male teenager is in a gang then they assume that there path is laid out for them so that they’re gonna look to join so that they don’t get left behind (SNT)*

The police made reference to media hype around gangs not always being helpful in raising the profile and increasing fear, but said that it boosts sales or publications and far wider publicity of their work;

*…..you know it’s a nice headline for us, if we do something it’s like ‘oh yeah, yeah we’ve arrested a gang member marvelous isn’t that a great thing’ and that sells (SNT)*

The quote above demonstrates how some professionals both criticise the media glamorisation and reiterate it in their own stories, and how they also see that sometimes it may benefit them professionally by directing resources towards their work.

Adult participants in youth services and education made reference to the need for the presence of more realistic positive role models local to the community for young people to aspire too; this was recognised in Kinsella’s (2011) review.
You know children always aspire to footballers or rappers, fireman, whatever just get different sorts of people to talk them because all children see these days are the older brothers or older people in the area and that’s who they aspire too…they watch TV and they can’t relate to people on TV, what they can relate to are people that are running around in gangs or selling drugs, stealing making money, and they see that as the only way or the easy way…they don’t know that some footballers have come from the same place that they come from or just other people that are successful like doctors that have come from the same places and say I was where you was, this is what I did to get here…they need inspiration (YW)

The youth worker above recognises the negative influences on young people and how this inevitably influences their perceptions and their behaviour. Young people need to access a different narrative other than the restrictive one that appears to dominate Ward Unite. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) informs us that people learn within a social context and that learning is facilitated through modelling and observational learning. It is vital that young people are exposed to realistic positive role models who can provide an alternative positive narrative to the often more dominant, influential voice of the estate.

In summary, the frequent mentions of gangs by adults and young people in this study reveals that young people are clearly exposed to gangs both in Ward Unite and throughout their social worlds, which is likely to impact on their perceptions and possibly their behaviour. It is possible that ‘gangs’ are useful vehicles to identify how young people and adults negotiate the complexities around youth and crime (Joseph & Gunter 2011), leading to increased ‘gang talk’ amongst stakeholders.


Consistent with the literature and statistics, the majority of adults believed boys to be more at risk of committing crime, however discussions about gender and crime highlighted an apparent shift in existing gender barriers. Some participants in this study reported that in the current context both boys and girl are at equal risk for involvement in crime. Whilst this is not portrayed nationally, this may be indicative of the context of Ward Unite, reinforcing further the increase in girls’ involvement in crime. All adult groups communicated an increase in girls getting involved with crime, particularly violent crime involving weapon use. They described being exposed to this both in Ward Unite and via
the media, TV and Internet. The Catch 22 worker below suggests a shift from previous dialogues focusing on specific race and gender relationships with crime, to a more universal conceptualisation of youth crime;

\[I \text{ don't actually think it's a gender thing or a race thing anymore, I think it's just 'youth'.} (C22)\]

The participant above conveys her beliefs that such boundaries have dispersed and that in the current context race and gender specifics do not determine involvement in crime. This indicates somewhat of a shift from the constraints of previous discourse as discussed in Chapter 2.

Despite adults recognising a growing involvement of girls in crime, they found it hard to accept and understand possibly due to predetermined gender assumptions. Participants tended to make comparisons between male offenders and female offenders and these descriptions were extremely different, as demonstrated in the quote below from a police officer;

\[\ldots I \text{ think that girls are vicious; I think that there is a really nasty element to them. I think that we've been lucky down here we've had very few girls sort of trample around there’s one little posse I would call them and they’re just nasty evil individuals there’s nothing particularly pleasant about them at all but whereas the boys, on the whole are quite pleasant (SNT)}\]

Despite the evident shift in gender stereotypes and equality in today’s society, when discussing gender and crime adult participants tended to excuse male offending behaviour merely as a result of their gender, and expectations of gender typical behaviour, such as aggression. Female gendered stereotypes have clearly shaped the existing perspectives of participants and this appears to have caused some dissonance with their understanding of the increasing role of girls’ involvement in crime. For example, some participants attributed very negative constructs towards female offenders and were much less forgiving and understanding than they were when exploring male offending behaviour. For some participants, if girls don’t fit predisposed constructed gender stereotypes, their behaviour can only be explained in terms of individual/internal factors, such as flawed personality traits (see quote above) or because of personal choice, rather than a function of the person and the situation (Ross & Nisbett, 1991). As displayed in the quote below;
I think girls are getting tough now…There’s girls beating men up there’s girls with guns…there’s girls trapping boys to sit there and cause fight….a lot of the killings that have happened with the lads, that is the reason because the girl has helped to set it up (C22)

The above two quotes are misogynistic and clearly indicate a need for educating and training professionals on gender awareness.

In accordance with traditional criminology literature, participants acknowledged that females are vulnerable to crime. Some participants referenced the increasing exposure to sexuality via the Internet and amongst the perceptions of young people, which has made women more vulnerable, as shown below;

Actually the type of offending that young women get involved with is an element of sexual exploitation…it’s the fact that there is money to be made from young women in a way that is less prevalent with boys and that some of what crime is about is about an alternative economy and that actually girls have a retail and marketable value in a way that boys don’t and so they get drawn in to it. (PH)

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the role of girls and gangs and the risk of sexual exploitation is a growing concern in society; this was one of the biggest concerns raised by adult groups in this study.

What we are having now is lots of girl members of gangs who are being sexually exploited…they’re been told to hold the drugs, guns…the sexual exploitation is sort of becoming a norm and expected….a young person can tell me how they’ve sexually exploited a girl and not see they’ve done anything wrong and you can talk to a girl who has been sexually exploited and them not seeing they’re being sexually exploited, and instead believing that’s their role in life (JG)

Concerns were expressed around the low levels of self-worth and self-esteem in girls which leads to them being exploited, their lack of awareness that they are being exploited, and concerns about boys’ ‘owning’ girls;

Girls in a mainstream gang are just fodder really they’re just possessions they’re not a gang member in their own right….the only way they can accumulate any status is to sleep their way up the hierarchy in the gang (SNT)

Girls are more stuck because when girls in relationship with one gang, they’re then seen as their owners, ownership rights (YW)

Community stakeholders were concerned about the increasing sexualisation of society and how this has filtered down to young people. This was recognised in the attitudes, behaviours and use of language amongst young people. Teaching staff in Nixon school conveyed such concerns:
We witnessed something at the school prom, it was called daggering….it’s basically a dance like you’re having sex with clothes on, so the girl will do all these different positions, it’s all over the Internet. We were shocked but the kids thought it was normal….It’s in the media everywhere, you look at all the music videos that’s just the norm.

I think a lot of young children now watch hard-core pornography regularly and they think that that is how women should behave and how you should have a relationship…I mean that’s pretty terrifying for the future (SN)

It’s the terminology for it, daggering, beating (having sex)… why are they using that violent term for sex? (SN)

This theme raises concerns mirrored in literature (Race on the Agenda, 2011) and policy (HM Government, 2013) regarding the vulnerability and exploitation of some young girls, including gang-associated activity, living in communities rife with crime. These findings expose the need to educate young people about the impact of sexual exploitation in order to raise awareness and encourage them to reflect on their behaviour, including their use of language.

4.3.3 T3. The Rights of Vulnerable Youth
Throughout data collection there was a sense of anxiety amongst adults regarding the failing of society to support and protect young people from involvement in crime. Despite their supportive roles, adult participants conveyed feelings of injustice for young people, identifying they need more support with the challenges they face living in a high-risk, deprived neighbourhood. Some of these frustrations could be linked to anxieties about their own capacity to act as professionals, as discussed earlier, in T1 ST1. In conjunction with feelings of a young person’s ‘right to know’, the need for early intervention and prevention was consistently cited as important by all adult groups/individuals, particularly to address the vulnerability of primary age children.

ST1. Vulnerabilities of Primary School Children - The Need for Early Intervention
Whilst it appears that in Ward Unite much of the existing crime prevention support, in terms of information giving and explorative discussion about crime, is targeted at the secondary school level, many of the community stakeholders in this study expressed concerns for primary school children, particularly Years 5 and 6. Adults discussed their knowledge of, and their concerns that children under 10 years old are being targeted by older gang members for drug running
and holding things, predominately because they are too young to be searched and arrested. Concerns about older criminals grooming young people and misleading them with incorrect information regarding the consequences of crime and the criminal justice system were also raised during group discussion as the quote below shows;

*Paedophiles groom children for sex and older criminals groom children to go and commit crimes for them... everyone will say paedophiles are terrible people but there’s not the same distain and disgust about people who groom kids into going out and committing offences which is equally kind of stealing their innocence and is harmful (JG)*

They are more just runners and they are trying to get involved in the gang... some of them 10, 11, 12 and some even younger ones...they get told by the olders that you’ll be alright because you can’t get arrested and they tell them that they can’t be convicted until you’re 18 or older...some of the information that they get from the older gang members is amazing when it’s not the case at all, they give them false information to get them to go and do stuff for them and the younger kids believe it and think it’s gospel (JG)

Currently it appears that the younger children are been targeted specifically for their age and their lack of understanding, developmental level and awareness; this makes them extremely vulnerable on an economically deprived estate like Ward Unite.

There was a sense from community stakeholders that as a result of prevalence and experience of crime in the ward, young people have a right to be given information and facts about crime, as well as opportunities to explore their decision-making and its consequences. The learning mentor from Richton Primary school conveys a rational choice view on children’s cognitive processes when exploring the need to support young people, who are evidently being exposed to crime.

*I definitely think it could be differentiated for the younger groups, especially for children growing up on estates like this because whether they’re 10 or 16 they’re seeing it, so they are taking it in and making their own decisions about what’s happening instead of being educated about what’s happening so they know where to steer themselves, or the consequences about what they are doing so they can think whether to do it or not (LMR)*

*It doesn’t make a lot of sense because if the age at which someone is criminally accountable is 10, that’s a primary age that’s not a secondary school age so actually it’s quite illogical, they need to be supported before that (HTR)*
**ST2.A Need to Feel Safe**

These findings show how many young people in Ward Unite feel unsafe in their local environment and how this leads young people and their parents to fear crime – this was prevalent throughout TA1 and is clearly shown in the two quotes below;

All year 9’s and year 8’s had to do a profile of their local area...it was amazing that nearly every student put down what was wrong with their local area was they were scared to go out, scared of mostly violent crime, gangs...so how many this has actually happened to might be relatively small but there is certainly a growing fear that people are very scared (SN)

...speaking to parents here they say ‘I’m not going to let little Johnny out because it’s really scary on this estate’...it’s actually quite a dark estate, it’s not the most inviting area to walk around at night and you know you wouldn’t want your kids hanging about the streets at night (SNT)

This theme identifies the need for systemic intervention in Ward Unite, including economic development and increased resources to create safe places for young people to go, increasing their feelings of safety and reduce their anxiety.
4.4 Thematic Analysis 3 (TA3) - Ways of Working

When exploring the role of the school in crime prevention, whilst all participants thought that this is something that schools and government policy should be engaging with, various ‘barriers’ were identified. This theme combines findings from both data sets and was developed to expose and overcome any barriers, to ensure that support and intervention recommended has the best chance of successful implementation.

The data collected was solely in Ward Unite and cannot be representative of the wider population. However some of the themes will be common and can be used to facilitate further thinking and discussion on youth crime prevention in Ward Unite and other socially and economically deprived neighbourhoods.

This theme aims to answer the following research question:

RQ3) What approaches to tackling youth crime prevention are likely to be most effective in UK schools?
### Table 5. Thematic Analysis 3 – Themes and Subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Analysis 3</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA3. Ways of Working</td>
<td>T1. Specialist Knowledge &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>ST1. Ex-Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2. Teachers &amp; Schools</td>
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#### 4.4.1 T1. Specialist Knowledge & Delivery

Experience, knowledge and trust were key attributes identified by participants to support and engage young people with crime prevention. The knowledge appeared to be related to facts about youth justice and the law, and experience having either experienced crime themselves or having worked with young people or adults that have been in similar situations. Individuals also need to be able to successfully engage with young people to develop rapport and trust. Familiarity was identified as a necessity for successful engagement and trust of primary school children. All groups said that individuals who engage with crime prevention support have knowledge and familiarity of the local context. Concerns were raised that exposure to crime prevention might increase fear of crime.
amongst young people; this is discussed in T1, ST5. Adults also recognised the need for structure and guidance to ensure successful implementation of support in schools.

**ST1. Ex-Offenders**

Whilst it appears that ex-offenders are increasingly involved in crime prevention work in schools, research reviewing its effectiveness remains limited. It is apparent that over the past twelve months in Ward Unite, ex-offenders have been discussing their experiences with young people to try to prevent their involvement in crime. In this study the role of the ex-offender in crime prevention was discussed by adult participants in different ways, concerns were raised about possible adverse effects.

In secondary school;

… *they come away with like a little fan club, they’ve got the girls flocking after them asking for their facebook pages and twitter accounts...It felt like they were enjoying the attention off the girls...at the end of the day he’s killed somebody and they (girls) were like but he’s really nice...they find it fun and girls think the blokes are sexy...Its completely the opposite I think to what the school expected it to be* (LMN)

In the youth club;

*I don’t know what his intention was but he was supposed to come in and show us about prison but it was all glorified and then it got to the point where he was goading young people and then they ended up wanting to fight him and he was like ‘ok then let’s go outside then’* (YW)

Youth workers and staff at secondary school described both the positives and negatives of the ex-offender in crime prevention. A positive was that they are experienced and adolescents tend to take notice and listen.

*We had ex-offenders they were really realistic about it all and told them (year 10) hard facts, my group were just sitting there completely shocked saying this does not happen on the TV* (LMN)

Not all ex-offenders are skilled at communicating the hard facts of criminal involvement and this could contribute to the glamorisation of crime, rather than the prevention intended.
they made it a joke...the year 11s were laughing and joking and I was thinking but he’s just told you that his friend got shot and he didn’t stop them to say ‘no no no this is a serious thing’ he just kind of laughed along with it (LMN)

The quote below shows the difficulty of the ex-offender role and that the success of this intervention seems to be dependent on the individual and their ability to engage appropriately with young people; this appears to be a difficult thing for the ex-offender to master, as it is for most programme facilitators;

*I think it needs to be careful you don’t want to get an ex-offender in there whose saying I went through all this, wish I hadn’t, my life was shit but now I’m doing really well because then its giving the wrong message that I can go out mess around and then I’ll turn myself around when I’m 20 and be like him. They need to give the message that life’s not good for me life is very difficult and you don’t want to be ending up like this (JG)*

It is also important to consider the ways the expectations young people have of ex-offenders might steer them into particular ways of ‘performing ex-offender’. Through social discourse young people will have developed a narrative about the identity of offenders and this ‘social construct’ is likely to impact on both how the young people perceive the ex-offender and consequently how the ex-offender responds to this; this relationship is reciprocal.

Ex-offenders do have firsthand experience and this can be quite powerful for young people, however these findings suggest that if this is depicted in an unhelpful way it could have the opposite effect. Though various youth crime prevention programmes have sprung up, some using ex-offenders, because of a lack of evaluation of their effectiveness, there are concerns they may be doing more harm than good (HM Government, 2011; Kinsella, 2011) and engagement with such programmes should be taken with caution.

**ST2. Teachers & Schools**

There are huge pressures on schools and staff regarding academic achievement, league tables and Ofsted inspections (Kokkinos, 2007; McCarthy et al., 2009). Teachers voiced concerns about the pressure this involves and the difficulty of meeting the holistic needs of young people.

*When you do get the chance to talk to students on a one-to-one they’re so different and you start to find out their problems, you think crikey how on earth do they cope, where as if you just see them in a lesson you can’t relate to them like*
that, you can’t understand what the issues are for students, how some of them get through school is amazing really (SN)

All adult participants were very empathetic to teachers and the school system; nobody blamed teachers for the lack of crime prevention support in schools.

I think there is still a bit of a them and us between schools and local authorities; schools are often invited to training sessions with us and they don’t turn up and the reason is they don’t have the time they are massively over worked it’s like everything it comes down to money and struggling to fit it all in with the time they’ve got anyway (JG)

In conjunction with previous literature (Botvin, et al., 2006), teaching staff recognised the need for support at the national and local level, for guidance, training and materials and time to deliver successful crime prevention support in school. Some staff talked about the need for a handbook and other such resources.

The majority of secondary school children said that teachers were not best placed to deliver crime prevention because they lack knowledge and experience; generally young people do not see this as the teacher’s job. However, some primary school children reported that because they trust teachers and feel safe talking to them despite their lack of knowledge and experience about crime.

The quote below is representative of the perspectives amongst young people regarding the role of the teacher;

B: No, because the teachers only teach Maths and stuff they haven’t been in a gang so they don’t really know what happens out there

G: I think teachers have no use talking to us about gangs (Y7N)

Adults also recognised that teaching staff lack knowledge and experience and that they simply do not have capacity within their roles to do crime prevention. Such pressures were recognised across all adult groups.

As a teacher you are completely tied to meeting targets for English, Maths and Science… that is where our focus has to be because otherwise we get an OFSTED inspection (SR)
The quote below illustrates the pressures teachers are under to meet the wider needs of pupils;

*I think sometimes they (pupils) might come in and tell you something and you’re like actually I’ve got this lesson to do, so you don’t really want to have a 15 minute conversation, if it was serious you probably would but you just can’t lose that lesson that I’ve planned* (SR)

To conclude, although young people feel teachers are not best placed to carry out crime prevention work, teachers themselves want to support young people’s wider social and emotional needs but are constrained by academic pressures. Catalano et al’s study (2004) also concluded that teachers are well placed to facilitate crime prevention in schools. These findings did not mirror this, raising questions about whether teachers are the right people. However, what is missing from the perspectives of stakeholders is insight into the skills teachers have in understanding learning processes, familiarity with young people, and pedagogical skills, all of which are lacking in the other groups discussed in this theme. This might also explain why police were anxious about doing this kind of work, explored in ST3 below. If teachers were to engage with specific crime prevention work they would need time and support in order to do this successfully. This is discussed more in T2.

**ST3.Police**

The young people in Year 7-9 did not want police to be involved in crime prevention. They recognised that police are knowledgeable and experienced but they said police were too directly involved and obvious in their approach.

*G:* I think what’s wrong with the police yeah, when they come in like last time they were just telling you this is wrong, this is right, if you do this you’ll get arrested, they wasn’t asking your opinion and how you felt, it’s too obvious cos they’re the police

*B:* They’re trying to mould you (Y8N)

There were mixed messages from the Year 5-6 children about the role of police; some said they were fearful of police and others felt that police would be helpful because of their experience and knowledge of crime.

Adults felt that police should be involved at some level, but in conjunction with others in the community. Police tended not to view youth crime prevention in
schools as their job and were concerned about the lack of guidelines about how they deliver it, the lack of pedagogical skills and had only a vague understanding of the appropriateness of targeted intervention for children of different ages.

_I worry that it is so piecemeal, it’s different approaches everywhere, you kind of think if you are putting this input into kids surely there should be some kind of thought and plan beyond the individual school or the individual council to say actually this is right or this is the level it should go at …I always have really mixed feelings about it because it’s nice that kids talk to us and it’s good that we prepare them but I worry that you can kind of over prepare and getting that balance right at the right age group is way beyond my skill set, I just have to do what I think is right and hope for the best but that’s not helpful (SNT)_

There were concerns from the police in terms of the boundaries of their role and the expectations of them to be friends to young people and then later possibly the enemy;

…I just wonder if it’s the police’s role…are we their friend that’s taking them out down the youth club or are we the enforcement and I think when it gets blurred it’s a really hard one and it’s confusing for kids…our job basically at the start of the day is to fight crime and lock up baddies and if that’s your start point then that’s the message you’re putting across, so it’s not balanced (SNT)

This ratifies existing literature on the difficulty police have building relationships with young people in high-crime communities (McAra & McVie, 2005; Pennant, 2005; Kinsella, 2011). The Year 8 boy below describes his own personal experience of ‘stop and search’, which he expresses as being something that triggered further dispute with the police, contributing to negative ideas/feelings about police;

_B:Some people don’t like the police

B:They’re trying to mould you

B:On my estate I’ve been walking around at not even 3 o’clock in the afternoon and I got stopped, searched and everything and you don’t really wanna get searched…I nearly got arrested that day for having an argument with the police so I don’t like getting talked at (Y8N)_

These findings show that efforts need to be made to address negative perceptions of police amongst young people. It also suggests that whilst police should and inevitably are a fundamental part of the solution, they should not be the sole drivers of youth crime prevention work in schools.
**ST4. Youth Worker**

The current and potential role of the youth worker in crime prevention was mentioned various times in different ways by all groups. Both adults and young people were optimistic about the positive influence of youth workers. People mentioned the potential role of the youth worker bridging the gap between school, home, police and the community. This suggests they are very well placed in communities to influence and support young people, and to meet their social and emotional needs.

*We obviously do this kind of thing and talk to young people about real truths and it seems that nobody else is...if they're not getting it from home and not from school and we are only talking to a very few percentage of young people, then what happens to the others we are not talking to (YW)*

Young people tended to recognise the youth worker as supportive and friendly and as an advocate for them; there was a sense that youth workers understood young people more than other groups and are consequently liked and respected by young people;

*B: I think youth workers are a good source of information because they are normally quite friendly so when they introduce themselves you kind of feel a bit more safe around them....they know what it's like (Y6R)*

The youth workers said that the secondary schools do sporadically engage with them, however this is usually only because a specific young person has asked for their involvement; this suggests reactive intervention rather than collaborative and preventative. The youth workers reported having difficulties getting into schools, however over the past twelve months the secondary school have been more receptive to their involvement in school, but it remains challenging;

*Youth workers at the minute don’t play too much of a role...it’s a nightmare to get into schools they just weren’t interested, it’s not been easy it’s taken two years or so to get in a couple of the schools (JG)*

*In the past it’s been a bit tricky...it helps when you might have a member of the youth support team in the school already, like a connections worker, they are kind of the link person we use to get in the schools....so it’s a little bit easier for us to get in now, but it’s still difficult (YW)*

The school were positive about youth workers who previously delivered a crime prevention workshop in school; they described them as being very good at engaging with young people, facilitated discussions and said that young people
responded positively to them. Whilst every group were positive about youth workers, it seems they are only accessible to children who attend the youth club. The youth workers voiced their aspirations about working collaboratively and preventatively with schools in the future;

Rather than the young people coming in here at 6.30pm and just moaning to us about what the teachers done or what they haven’t done or why they hate them and blah blah blah, we could be doing more in schools before that (YW)

These findings suggest youth workers are well placed in communities and can engage parents, school, young people and police. The quote below was from a Catch 22 worker, she describes her experience of youth workers;

my mum was depressed and so I was out most the time and that’s when I started getting into trouble and it weren’t until I grew up and started going to the youth club got a key worker and they helped me, they worked with me and my mum together and I would talk to my worker and then they would go back and tell my mum, they would come to the house and meet with mum, so they got both sides, what’s going on at home and what’s going on in school and they’ll know how I’m acting at the youth club, so they got the whole picture. (C22)

All groups mentioned youth workers as appropriate professionals to support young people with crime prevention. They were identified as having both knowledge of the local community and as having experience of the youth justice system. The current barriers and problems with youth workers appear to be their visibility in the community and accessibility to young people, and challenges engaging with schools. This theme illustrates the need for more joined-up working between youth services and education, particularly on youth crime prevention in schools. This is discussed further throughout T2.

**ST5. Avoiding Aggravating Fear**

Both adults and children expressed concerns that crime prevention education could increase young people’s fears they may not have otherwise had. There were also concerns and uncertainties about the appropriate level and content of targeted crime prevention education/support available and the effect this has on fear.

The police acknowledged the difficulties they face in crime prevention and the possibility of increasing fear. The police officer below indicates a lack of confidence in knowing the appropriate level of support and engagement for
young people of different ages;

When I give the crime prevention talks, I just think is it right that we’re having to give these talks at this age because we’re kind of stealing innocence…even when we go in and do the stranger danger stuff you think is this going to be something that stays with them for the next four years whereby they are twitching constantly…sometimes when you do crime prevention and we come in with our complete policeman’s head on and you end up walking away thinking should I have to be telling 10 year olds about how not to get mugged, am I just making them scared and then you think am I helping or hindering (SNT)

The Year 5 and 6 children were mainly concerned about increasing fear amongst children younger than them, and the Year 7-9's were concerned about raising fear amongst all primary school children. The quote below is representative of these discussions;

B: I think it should only be key stage 2 because some people they’ve been brought up in such a good home or the parents haven’t told them anything about crime or anything even in Year 5 and 6 they might know anything about it so if you do it all at the same time people might be at different stages of knowing about it and that could scare some people (Y6R)

Many stakeholders were not sure what the appropriate level of crime prevention support was for young people and there currently does not seem to be any guidelines. This is a concern for future implementation of crime prevention in schools, suggesting a need for appropriate resources and guidance. This would have to bring in the knowledge of a range of community stakeholders and experts in issues such as youth justice, professionals who have an understanding of the cognitive, social and emotional aspects of children’s development, and suitable teaching and learning strategies, to minimise fear and maximise preventative support.

4.4.2 T2. Collaborative Systemic Model

This theme evolved in response to the numerous references to the need for collaborative working and community cohesion to bring about positive change and successful crime prevention for young people. The benefits of a collaborative systemic model has been recognised throughout existing literature and policy regarding crime prevention (Kinsella, 2011; HM Government 2011). Various community stakeholders recognised the ecology of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), identifying that young people exist within various interacting systems and how imperative it is that those systems communicate
and collaborate to support the holistic needs of the young person, as the quote below demonstrates;

_As young people educators there should be some kind of collaboration between all the parties that are going to work with the young people so teachers, youth workers, police, other community based groups...maybe if there was like an A-Team and they were called in to the schools so that way you have got people from every field and walk of life that can be involved (YW)_

The quote below highlights the need for regular crime prevention support in schools to balance out the voice of the estate;

_They’re hearing a lot more of the positive message about crime on the estates from the people they see on a daily basis, not someone that comes in for an hour once an academic year. You’ve got to compete with the voice on the estate, if you’re not in their ear as effectively or as often as that voice then you’re not going to compete with that voice (MB)_

**ST1.Exosystem – Government Support**

Frustrations were expressed about the need for support at the national level to drive this agenda forward. The Year 6 boy below conveys the importance of the influence of wider political systems and how policy and agenda are likely to inform and underpin perceptions of the importance of different issues;

_B:If it’s not taught in schools then people might think it’s not as important (Y6R)_

Uncertainties, including the lack of commitment to services, schemes and the constant threat of change and cuts are clearly impacting on the availability and quality of support for young people, particularly on preventative work. Although there are clearly some programmes (HM Government, 2011; Kinsella, 2011) in place, it seems that the current social and political context increases pressure for those trying to work preventatively at the ground level (micro and mesosystem) and impacts on the quality of support available, the accessibility including decisions regarding the recipients of such support;

_We’re funded until march 2013 and so we can’t get our teeth into anything and so we are being encouraged to work more with the young people who aren’t quite at risk as the other ones so we can get quick wins so that we can get the funding to do it for next year and that’s the reality of how things work and that’s not the way it should work, you need to be working with the people who need the support the most (JG)_
Political constraints at the exosystem level are always going to bring difficulties in terms of constraints on various other systems and stand in the way of effective working.

*I think nationally something needs to be offered to schools saying these are your priorities and then let the schools, along with the local authority work that out how they deliver it…I think locally we’ve got the product, we’ve got the staff but we still don’t seem to have the structure and the coordination to get it to schools* (MB)

Many adults felt that without the wider support of government, the support for young people will inevitably remain piecemeal, lack consistency, which in turn can confuse schools and result in ineffective intervention/support;

*Until they sort that out it’s going to be lots of bits and bobs and the other thing is every time they bring out a new priority another agency gets a load of money to go into that school and offer something to the school so the school are being bombarded with calls, emails, face-to-face meetings with all these professionals, some of which are only around for a year, offering all these various programmes* (MB)

Participants said that they believe schools should be engaging with more crime prevention work, but they are concerned that without it being on the curriculum, it would be difficult to fit it into the school day due to the pressures of the curriculum. This resonates with previous literature regarding the implementation of non-statutory education (BERA 2010a; Humphrey et al., 2010; Ball et al., 2011b).

*I don’t think there is room on the curriculum …I think it needs a whole overhaul because the programmes are out there, the wills out there from a lot of professionals – some within schools some out of schools, but unless there’s the actual time to do it and the actual logistics in terms of delivering it it’s never going to happen, it’s going to stay piecemeal* (MB)

Whilst recent agenda (HM Government, 2010) recognises the need for community empowerment and promises to create opportunities for support and intervention to be localised, unfortunately this study finds that this hasn’t yet happened in Ward Unite, where the current picture is quite the opposite of enthusiasm and opportunity and instead rather quite bleak due to cuts that have compromised crime prevention support for young people. This subtheme recognises the pressures that schools and teachers are under and highlights further the need for wider systemic support. The programmes evident in schools
in Ward Unite, such as Anti-Bullying Week or Junior Citizenship, have national/government backing; this reinforces the importance of sustainability and the need for national support, structure, money and time in order for successful crime prevention in schools.

**ST2.Micro & Mesosystem - Local Context**

Various adult participants called for crime prevention in schools to become mainstream, although they recognised this would be difficult. They reported that although crime prevention in schools needs national recognition, its content and implementation needs to be adjusted and implemented locally so that local concerns are addressed and the support offered is relevant and contextualised. Local support should be targeted at prevalent offences in the community, and address specific problems young people have or attitudes they hold.

*I think there needs to be more visibility from youth services and people out there doing outreach work and I think young people need to see that the community is aware of what’s going on (JG)*

*It could be like the RE curriculum which is not statutory and it’s meant to reflect your local community. There are things you should cover, but it’s meant to reflect your local community (SR)*

There was a particular focus on community cohesion; the need for unity within the community and for communities to work together to support young people from crime and communicate a universal message about crime.

*I mean we can talk to children and try and empower them and talk about consequences but unless a community buys-in to supporting that, we’re never going to shift it, so that’s important (HTR)*

*It’s three-way really it’s not just a dialogue between youth services and education its ourselves, youth services, education and local families and local communities…its actually the links that we can develop with communities and some of the faith groups is actually the need for attention (PH)*

Adults from youth services recognised that schools and teachers are under pressure, and thought schools could be used outside of hours. Labour’s Extended School initiative (DfES, 2005) promoted community-orientated schooling, but this no longer exists under the Coalition.
...it needs to be a priority or we need to look at how do we deliver all these things maybe outside of the school day but still on the school premises (MB)

It would be also important to note that many of the young people who are most likely at risk of offending will be spending significant time out of school...so I think a whole-school approach but it actually needs to be a related outside of the school into the community as well (PH)

**ST3. Youth Services & Education: Joined-Up Working**

One of the key findings in this study is the lack of communication and joined-up working between youth services and education. Although they both work with young people in Ward Unite, there appears to be minimal communication between the two groups and a lack of systems to support joined-up working. Interestingly both adult services, youth services and education, reported a desire to work more closely together and thought this would better address the holistic needs of young people.

*I believe that if the parents, teachers and the youth workers all work more closely then, it would definitely help them*

Yeah you hit them from every area....let them see that as a community we’re against this sort of behaviour (YW)

The desire for joined-up working expressed by participants in this study is recognised in government policy and agenda (HM Government, 2010; 2013).

*Schools need someone who is like a generic kind of person who might work in the youth club and the school and so that would help...(C22)*

When asked where they think young people are currently receiving crime prevention education/support, the adults in youth services tended to say the school, and adults in education reported either the school or youth services. There was a genuine confusion as to where the responsibility lies and where young people are receiving such support/education.

Many of the adults made reference to the possible reluctance of schools to engage with crime prevention work due to the impact this may have on the image and reputation of the school; this has been recognised in other literature (Kinsella, 2011). For example, by adopting crime prevention strategies, it may be perceived as the school acknowledging they have a problem with crime, which in turn may not reflect well in terms of the school’s image and status.
...it would be seen as guilt by association and some of the schools would not want to publicise that, there will be those that take on the challenge and do it really well but you know it’s a problem for schools because of the pressure on them...it’s trying to break down those kind of barriers which isn’t easy (PH)

This suggests that there is a possible taboo for schools associating with youth services, in this instance the gang and youth violence co-ordinator. The quote below demonstrates the reluctance from schools engaging with youth services in relation to young people identified as ‘at-risk’ of offending.

There’s a definite barrier between youth services and schools...some of the kids we are working with, we’re not telling schools and the reason being through experience before, as soon as you tell them that the gangs team and the youth offending team are working with the child they somehow get excluded...that’s not every school...but there needs to be the open communication and the in-house support in schools to manage such situations to protect the young person (JG)

Some adults suggested that putting crime prevention on the curriculum would take away such pressure and reduce the possible taboo of schools engaging with crime prevention. This subtheme suggests a lack of formal systems to facilitate communication between youth services and education which impacts on the well-being of some young people, in terms of supporting and protecting them from school exclusion and involvement in crime. Despite this, school staff and youth workers both reported their enthusiasm for joined-up working:

Teachers;

Resources are always really an issue but I think making links, if you’re put in touch your local youth worker so you can have them in and actually make them more of a face around schools so that when they see them outside of school that relationship might already be there.

It’s quite separate, and actually in the holidays when we’re running the play centres links are created but it’s not within school and only specific children access that (youth club) (SR)

Youth Workers;

...kind of have that in-between person that is almost like the spokes person for both parties but with a way to diffusing and finding a way around difficult situations...a youth worker would definitively benefit the young people but also the teachers as well...not to take anything away from the teachers but to support the teachers...I think there’s often nowhere for kids to go in school when they are struggling in class so they end up getting kicked out of class...there’s no one really for them to talk to who they think understands them, those kids need the most help (YW)
This highlights the need for systems to support joined-up working and suggests this is a valuable future ‘way of working’ in Ward Unite.

**ST4. Parental Involvement**

The role of parents and the family was recognised as having a huge influence on young peoples’ behaviour, and the need for schools and families to work together is well established in the literature (Smilth, 2006; Welsh & Farrington, 2006; Nixon & Parr, 2008). Unsurprisingly all adult groups expressed their views on the need to work collaboratively with parents to support and protect young people. These findings suggest that parents in Ward Unite are fearful of letting their children out; both adults and young people made reference to this during their discussions. If parents are fearful then it is important that they too are given the opportunity to explore their anxieties and be supported to manage their fears. Unsurprisingly all adult groups conveyed the need to work collaboratively with parents in order to protect young people from crime.

> I was stumbling across kids and I was like oh I’ve never met you before and they’re like 14-15 and their mums don’t let them out (YW)

Participants also referred to the lack of parental knowledge about crime and how crime in Ward Unite is often generational in families, both of which reinforce the need to educate, support and work with parents to reduce youth crime and break the cycle of generational offending;

> Sometimes even parents being totally oblivious of things and not knowing that actually they’re child can be arrested, if parents don’t know what chance do the children have? We should be sharing more knowledge with them to educate both children and their parents together (LMR)

This theme reinforces both the existing literature regarding the need for schools and families to work together to meet the holistic needs of the child and to support and protect young people from crime.

**ST5. Experiential Learning & Facts**

This theme was developed because all participants groups indicated the need for young people to be educated about the consequences to crime to fill the gaps in their existing knowledge. There were numerous concerns about some young people being misinformed by offenders and the media.
Even with young offenders who are quite experienced they believe that you can offend as much as you like because it gets wiped off when you’re 18 and your criminal record is clean…that’s what they’re being told. It’s a myth that goes around that is extremely common until we tell them and then it’s too late…we need to be giving them some real information, the right information so that they can then make an informed decision about what they’re going to be doing…we need to balance this out (JG)

All groups of young people said they would value the opportunity to explore and discuss the consequences of crime, and decision making in relation to various crimes. They indicated the most helpful way to do this would be through experiential learning, like in the ‘Junior Citizenship Scheme’. All young people spoke highly about this scheme and had remembered key facts from the day, even though some did this four years ago. They also said that having the chance to acquire and apply knowledge and skills and explore feelings involved with crime by being presented with scenarios in drama, or watching a short film would be helpful. Having the opportunity to discuss issues and engage with role play to experience feelings, would also be useful. They also said crime prevention would need to be enjoyable and fun, using discussion work and role-play.

The two quotes below, from a Year 6 girl and Year 9 boy, are representative of the views of most of the young people. They suggest that being given the opportunity and space to ‘act out’ and reflect on the impacts of crime would be helpful;

G: If we did drama we could feel like we’re actually in that position, putting yourself in someone’s shoes, and role plays I think we would understand that people do and what people are going through every day and how they feel (Y6R)

B: It makes you understand…it makes you think (Y9N)

**ST6.Visibility & Accessibility**

This theme outlines the need for opportunities and events that are visible and accessible for young people in their community to engage them and offer support. The youth worker below highlights how they only engage with young people who chose to attend youth club and this means there is a large population of young people they don’t engage with;

A lot of kids round here we don’t engage with them, we might engage with them by accident because during the Summer I was doing a programme doing
outreach in the area and I was stumbling across kids and I was like oh I’ve never met you before (YW)

It is evident that much of the support available in Ward Unite is targeted, and young people invariably only engage with these services when they are in the youth justice system. This questions whether or not such support is preventative;

YOT work unfortunately has become very much young people don’t see you unless they’re going to custody, I think to be effective in crime prevention is where the young people don’t have to look for you in the community, you need to be out in the community, they won’t come to you. (MB)

The Learning Mentor below expresses her uncertainty about the accountability of schools in crime prevention and questions who else is supporting young people if schools are not. This highlights the ambiguity in this area, expressed by the community stakeholders;

There is like snippets of it about and it’s almost like you know if they wanted more where would they get it from and if they don’t get enough then is it us failing them? (LMN)

The analysis revealed that crime prevention support is limited, inconsistent and fractious in schools in Ward Unite. The visibility and accessibility of the limited support for young people is also problematic.
Chapter 5 – Summary & Conclusion

This chapter will summarise the key findings of this study and the implications for the role of the school in crime prevention. I will then outline the role Educational Psychologists (EP) could play, before reviewing the research methodology, discussing future research and closing the chapter with a conclusion.

5.1 Key Findings

There is currently no generic crime prevention education for young people in Ward Unite. Any support available from youth services is usually targeted at individuals identified as being vulnerable. This support appears to be reactive rather than preventative, and is at risk of closure.

Young people and adult stakeholders do not feel that young people are getting enough crime prevention support in schools, and think that schools could and should be doing more. Young people’s engagements with crime are shaped by the contexts in which they live. These findings, in conjunction with previous literature, show how gender and age pattern their responses, along with their lived environments. Therefore it is important that interventions take into account age and gender and are tailored to localised contexts, norms and belief systems.

5.1.1 Which Young People?

Whilst the implication is that we need to take into consideration young people’s own perspectives, it is important to recognise that their understandings are shaped by and infused through the social world of media, policy, school, neighbourhood, peers and family and how all of the above are likely to affect a young person’s cognitive, social and emotional development. These findings illustrate that in Ward Unite, exposure, awareness and fear of crime are prevalent amongst young people.

5.1.1.1 Targeted Support

These findings convey the need for intervention to be localised and meaningful as different communities have different needs, therefore a blanket approach would not be effective. Crime prevention support in schools should be targeted at economically challenged neighbourhoods where crime is rife, as opposed to a universal approach and be responsive to the reality and needs of the local
context. However this is not without its challenges, because offering support in this way could unhelpfully stigmatise individuals and communities. The danger is that this could lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy, which ultimately has a negative impact; restricting social mobility and increasing the risk of social exclusion (Parkes & Conolly, 2011).

Emotional stresses and strains for young people living in challenging environments should not be ignored. Research suggests that young people who are fearful of crime are likely to experience increased psychological stressors, which impacts on their cognitive, social and emotional well-being and development. Whilst there appears to be a huge focus and push on academic achievement in schools, it is important to recognise that young people who are experiencing increased psychological stress are less likely to be able to learn and reach their full potential. These young people would benefit most from additional support in schools targeted to meet their social and emotional needs, before they can fully attend to learning and school curricular.

5.1.1.2 Primary AND Secondary
Concerns regarding the vulnerability of some primary school children were featured across both the adult and young persons’ data. This highlights the need for crime prevention support to start in primary schools and continue into secondary school.

The primary school children were easier to talk to and more open when discussing crime in comparison to those in secondary school age. This suggests that primary school children are likely to engage with a programme or intervention in schools. It is possible that the secondary age participants were more difficult to engage because they are at an age where crime is closer to their lives. Upon transition to secondary school young people are seeking autonomy and the location of their social lives tends to shift from the family to the peer group and neighbourhood, thus putting more pressure on them in terms of deciding how to live in their environment. This research highlights the vulnerability of adolescents in terms of increased psychological stressors, such as fear and anxiety, involved with moving around the estate and how for some this might lead to adopting self-protection measures, such as weapon use. A
young person’s relationship with their neighbourhood changes with age and gender; this has implications when planning crime prevention in schools, both in terms of the content and delivery of support.

5.1.2 Structural / Institutional Change

5.1.2.1 Government Contradiction
Community stakeholders reported that in Ward Unite, services and resources for young people are diminishing fast as a result of government cutbacks. Not only does this mean that support for young people seems to be more reactive rather than preventative, it also implies a contradiction in that whilst policy is increasing in this area, resources are reducing. The conflicting message from government was a view held by many stakeholders and is a concern. This highlights that attention, support and commitment both in government policy and policy enactment is essential for successful implementation of crime prevention in schools.

Many of the community stakeholders reported the need for crime prevention to be statutory, both in order for it to happen and to reduce the possible stigma attached to schools who do engage with crime prevention work; however this has implications in regard to the need for a targeted approach to crime prevention in schools.

5.1.2.2 Systemic Support
This research supports Bronfenbrenner’s ESM (1979) and highlights that in order to support young people’s well-being it is important to engage with all of the systems around them to achieve the best outcomes.

Crime prevention needs to be systemic and collaborative at all levels; wider government/national level, borough level, local community, schools and families, to give a holistic consistent message that crime is not acceptable. Adults both in youth services and education recognised the need for further policy, structure, guidance, training, and resources both nationally and locally if schools are going to successful in engaging with crime prevention support.

Adults in both youth services and education expressed the desire to work more closely with one another, however it appears the systems do not currently exist
to support such collaborative practice. These findings suggest the need for development at the wider systemic level to enable and encourage joined-up working between adults in education and adults in youth services. EPs are well placed to support community collaboration and enhance relationships between schools, youth services and police with interventions to deter young people from crime.

5.1.3 Is it the Role of the School?
Schools in Ward Unite do engage with interventions such as TAMHs and Place2Be, with an emphasis on children’s social and emotional needs and development. However, the data conveys the recognition of the need for the school to support young people’s social and emotional well-being, rather than focussing solely on academic achievement.

All adult groups felt that the school has a responsibility to engage with crime prevention work, however it was unclear how this should be implemented, facilitated and supported within the scope of their roles.

All adult groups thought that crime prevention work in schools needs to engage parents at some level and the school was felt to be a good place to support young people and their parents. The literature suggests that targeted schools need to adopt a whole-school approach, including in school policy that promotes pro-social behaviour to tackle youth crime. A national drive would also help to diminish any negative effects, such as scrutiny from Ofsted or media publications, of schools promoting crime prevention, as this is recognised as a current barrier (Kinsella, 2011).

5.1.4 Which Adults?
Specialist knowledge was identified as being an essential component needed to deliver crime prevention support in schools. However, the specialist knowledge typically referred to was about the criminal justice system (CJS) and the law. Therefore, generally teachers were described as not having the appropriate knowledge to facilitate crime prevention, and do not have the capacity because they are under too much pressure in terms of academic achievement. Participants did not refer to the specialist knowledge of teachers in relation to pedagogical skills and their understanding of how children learn and learning
processes. This advocates the need for joined-up working and scope for police and youth services to work in conjunction with adults in education, to share knowledge in order to plan and develop appropriate crime prevention support in schools.

This study paves the way for the possibility of youth workers engaging more collaboratively with schools. Adults in youth services thought schools were reluctant to involve them. This contradicts the views of adults in education, who identified the need to work more collaborative with youth workers and acknowledged that this might support both staff and young people with crime prevention. These findings highlight the need for youth workers to receive both an increased status and further support to fulfil these roles and expectations. It also signals a need to broaden their training and professional development so they can facilitate future crime prevention work in schools, and to increase their visibility and accessibility to all young people.

This research highlights the need to be cautious when engaging ex-offenders in crime prevention work with young people; if this is happening then ex-offenders need to have sufficient training and support to manage their presentation and identity. This highlights further the need for intervention in schools to be well thought out and have input from a range of professionals to determine its level and appropriateness to make it effective, and ensure that it does not lead to an increase in fear. More evidenced interventions and effective policy or guidelines available to schools are needed, to ensure they have access to appropriate support.

These findings not only highlight the psychological stressors evident amongst young people in the ward, but also the pressure evident amongst professionals as they strive to achieve professional integrity whilst working in this challenging context. This was evident in the discussions of some adult stakeholders who felt they not able to meet the holistic needs of young people. Support and recognition of pressures on adult professionals working in such contexts is something that needs further attention. The data reported in TA2, T2 identifies the need for some professionals to be educated further and given appropriate training in order to develop their understanding of some issues, particularly in
relation to gender awareness, to ensure they have an informed balanced understanding before they are allowed to educate young people about crime.

In view of the complex psychological needs associated with young offenders, many local authorities have placed an EP within their youth offending teams (Ryie, 2006; Hill, 2013). Many EP services have added the word community to their title and this provides a context in which the role of the EP can develop to allow them to work across contexts, for example schools and communities, to prevent youth crime. This development is clearly still in its infancy, but this research provides a rational for EP involvement and is discussed later in this chapter.

5.1.5 Content

This research raises the question of whether the focus should be on specific crime prevention programmes or whether support need to be much broader. These findings, for example, reveal a need for schools to be given more support so they can better meet the social and emotional needs and development of young people. This should in turn strengthen their psychological well-being, including moral competencies, self-esteem, self-efficacy and resilience, to protect them from crime. Specific programmes and interventions may be included within the remit of such support, however these would need to be responsive to the needs of the local context and again the scope of embracing this work within the role of the EP is clear.

Young people and adults identified helpful effective approaches and methods to delivering crime prevention education. These included role-plays and/or watching short video clips followed by in-depth explorative discussion, giving young people the opportunity to reflect on decision-making and engage with perspective taking and empathy building. Generally young people reported that they found these ways of learning the most helpful, fun and memorable. This support was identified as needing to be continuous rather than a one-off intervention.

Gangs clearly exist in Ward Unite and other similar neighbourhoods, however this study like others, argues that gangs are not the only youth crime problem, and therefore should not be the sole focus of youth crime prevention in schools. Instead, it should be addressed in a measured way alongside other concerns.
The glamorisation of crime, particularly gangs, amongst young people was regularly expressed. This signifies the need to challenge prevalent perceptions about crime being cool, increasing status and reputation amongst young people and the evident social pressures this places on them. Both adult stakeholders and young people regularly expressed concern about the increased vulnerability of girls’ and their involvement in crime, particularly in regard to their sexual exploitation, often in gangs. Both of the above highlight the need for increased intervention and education in schools to address ‘local’ issues and support young people to explore issues around crime in a more constructive way.

Gender and age affects the way that young people are able to talk about crime; this is an important factor when developing and implementing crime prevention in schools. It is important to recognise and acknowledge how masculinities and femininities shape thinking, and how this affects young people differently in the way they engage with discussions about crime. For example, if talking about crime creates a space for bravado talk, as it did for some young people in this study, then we may need to challenge what lies behind this in order to tackle it; otherwise crime prevention intervention may be in danger of reinforcing such bravado and consequently having a negative effect. The gender gap was more apparent amongst the younger children (Y5-7) when discussing crime. Interestingly as children got older, the gender gap closed and boys and girls in Year 8-9 engaged in similar discussions. Whilst mixed gender groups worked well in this study when talking generally about crime, more sensitive issues such as sexual violence might be more challenging to discuss. This study demonstrates that issues around age and gender need to be thought through in more depth when developing and facilitating crime prevention interventions.

Whilst the literature clearly provides evidence for the relationship between school exclusion and youth offending (MORI 2004; Ryyie, 2006), it wasn’t mentioned by anyone in this research. It is important to highlight that irrespective of what a young person brings to exclusion, being excluded creates the potential for crime. This suggests the need for schools to focus on preventing exclusion of young people in order to protect against possible future involvement in crime. This is an area that needs further exploration and attention when thinking about crime.
prevention in schools, and is a key area for EP involvement at a proactive and preventative level.

5.2 Ways Forward for Educational Psychology

The EP profession is undergoing many changes with its role and future direction being re-examined (Jimerson et al., 2006; Rothi 2008; Farrell, 2010; Hill, 2013). It is important that the EP profession continues to be responsive to changes in social systems and structures (Stobie, 2002) including those at a local level to make sure EPs remain relevant to their contexts, and can act in the best interests of children, young people, their families and schools in their community (Farrell, 2010). Hill (2013) summarises how the recent rebranding of many educational psychology services reflects the profession taking control of its future through the application of a range of applied psychologies to meet the needs of diverse contexts.

In other countries, EPs are recognised as being well placed to carry out some of the large-scale preventative and interventionist work within high-risk violent communities, systemically, to bring about change (Dunbar-Krige, Pillay & Henning, 2010). EPs are trained to skilfully engage children and young people, as well as being specialists at understanding behaviour within a context. They are also able to work with the systems around the child in the hope to facilitate change and ensure the best outcomes for all; ecological theory and interactionist perspectives underpin the Doctorate training. More recently, Hill (2013 p.7) discusses new directions in applied psychology and demonstrates the scope for EPs to work more systemically in communities with vulnerable groups, “working with young offenders systemically in the local context by developing preventative strategies and interventions, and through direct work with individuals, their schools and families”.

Edwards (2001) recognises that EPs may not feel prepared to deal with crime prevention and are not likely to have received specialist training in this area. However, they do have many of the skills needed to promote and support crime prevention strategies in schools and communities effectively. This study and previous literature reviewed highlights the need for the focus of crime prevention to be local - on places rather than cases. EPs work systemically in schools and
communities and other educational/developmental provisions, whether it is with families or other professionals/agencies, and to promote joined up working. EPs are familiar with psychological knowledge and research and understand how to apply this appropriately. They advise and work with schools in a holistic way with the aim of increasing recognition of the social, emotional and developmental needs of children and young people.

This research is also effective in illustrating the role of EPs as researcher practitioner. EPs are able to contribute to the evidence base for interventions by providing research in this area to inform practice in schools and communities like Ward Unite.

This research supports Hill’s (2013) perspective that EPs are well placed to acknowledge and address the complex psychological risk factors prevalent amongst populations of young people and their families living in high crime neighbourhoods, and to work effectively with schools, parents and other agencies, ‘community stakeholders’, to support the implementation of crime prevention initiatives in schools.

5.3 Strengths and Limitations of Research

My experience working as a TEP in Ward Unite strengthened this research by making me familiar to some of the younger children in the focus groups. In contrast, my lack of familiarity with the secondary age participants was a limitation, as was the short-term nature of the study.

Talking is the way in which most humans interact and make sense of their world (Burr, 2003) and the methodologies employed in this study allowed me to collect a wide range of views from a diverse selection of community stakeholders. The lack of a voice for parents in this study is a limitation and future research in this area would benefit from including this element.

In this study, the use of visual prompts and a brainstorming activity helped to stimulate discussion, increase participation, and was something that the young participants seemed to enjoy - they were more animated when these were presented.
Despite their strengths, focus groups are time-consuming and require a lot of careful planning, preparation and organisation. Focus groups with younger children (Years 5-7) were challenging to facilitate and transcribe – children often talked over one another. I was aware that groups can conform to one view, however as the participants in each group knew one another other, they seemed comfortable to challenge ideas and offer different perspectives.

It was sometimes difficult to understand exactly what young people meant due to differences in their language and reference points. I therefore had to explore the meaning of their language, for example their use of “bad” and “bare” had to be clarified to ensure that I interpreted their discussions correctly.

Despite the limitations mentioned, the methodological design allowed for thorough exploration of the research topic and generated data which enabled the research questions to be answered. Please see Chapter 3 for further details of the rigorous approach to data analysis.

Another clear strength of this research is that it engaged various community stakeholders, enabling exploration of a broad range of thoughts, feelings and perspectives from different groups within a particular community. I would therefore argue that this study provides a multi-faceted construction of the ‘truth’ (Yardley, 2000) and whilst it is not feasible to generalise the findings to whole populations, the reality constructed by the community stakeholders is meaningful. Their perspectives and recommendations can be applied when developing and exploring the future role of the school in crime prevention in similar contexts.

5.4 Future Direction

The recent cutbacks to youth services are clearly detrimental to the young people in Ward Unite. Numerous participants referred to the relationship that exists between boredom and young people’s involvement with crime. This was clearly borne out in the discussions, and is especially relevant now because of the continued cuts to resources such as youth clubs, suggesting the need for further exploration of this as a risk factor to crime.
This study aims to pave the way for future research exploring the role of crime prevention in UK schools. Whilst the international literature is abundant, in the UK it is sparse. Until programmes and interventions are either developed or implemented in appropriate schools and communities, it will be very difficult to evaluate their effectiveness.

I would argue that there is a need for programmes/strategies/interventions to be developed according to localised needs. One size does not fit all and it is important that they are evidenced qualitatively to expose experiences and impact rather than just looking at statistics, which very often lose the key messages to data.

The effectiveness of crime prevention programmes and interventions are not easy to measure, however research exploring attitudes and perceptions about crime before and after an intervention to evaluate its effectiveness would be insightful. It is difficult to evaluate effectiveness by looking at crime statistics as they are influenced by so many other factors.

There is a need for interventions to be vigorously reviewed, for consultation with a number of relevant professionals, and then carefully planned in terms of facilitation. The current understanding and availability of such interventions is sparse and the schools in this study who have engaged with crime prevention are therefore doing so based on what is available to them, rather than having a clear understanding about what is most appropriate or effective. If schools are expected to adopt crime prevention strategies then they need more policy guidance and ongoing support from relevant professionals so they can better meet the holistic needs of children and young people. For some, this includes the need to protect them from the involvement in and the detrimental impact of crime.

Personal reflections of the study can be found in Appendix M.

5.5 Concluding Comments

Families and young people are living in stressful conditions, in overcrowded houses, and this stress and frustration inevitably spills out on to the estate. All young people living in these neighbourhoods need safer places to go. We know
where these vulnerable communities are and therefore support should be preventative, not reactive. There are lots of young people who are not involved in crime but who are afraid to leave their homes because of crime and their fear of it. They therefore have limited freedom and feel they are being punished for living in their particular context. One of the biggest things to counteract fear is knowing there are alternatives available to young people. Efforts need to be made to offer other ways of being for young people; opening doors for them, promoting positive choices and supporting them to become better role models in their community. This research also challenges typical negative constructs about young people living in economically challenged communities being feared, as these findings show these young people as being fearful of crime. Negative constructs often underpin unhelpful community narratives that can be detrimental to young people. Efforts should be made to recognise that many young people living in such contexts have to navigate their way through childhood and adolescence whilst consistently being challenged by numerous risks and social pressures in their ecosystem. Something as simple as their daily journey into school can be a significant stressor.

Support in communities like Ward Unite should be inclusive for all young people, not just those on the edge of crime. It is not preventative when children living in the same environment, but not identified as being ‘at risk’, do not receive such support. Communities need to feel safer for all young people. The New Labour extended schools approach provided hubs in and around schools and if interventions are not happening, but resources are still there, it is important for communities to think creatively about how they can make these resources available. Schools should be used as building positive places. There needs to be a wider range of provision and better use of resources existing on estates like Ward Unite to reduce and prevent youth crime.

Crime prevention in schools is part of the need to engage communities to identify appropriate support in schools and local resources available. Space and time is needed to actively manage and address and respond to local needs. Alongside this, there needs to be an unconditional commitment in both policy and practise to engage and support young people living in high-crime deprived
neighbourhoods with the aim of promoting their well-being and protecting them from crime.
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1. **Summary of planned research** (please provide the following details: project title, purpose of project, its academic rationale and research questions, a brief description of methods and measurements; participants: recruitment methods, number, age, gender, exclusion/inclusion criteria; estimated start date and duration of project). It’s expected that this will take approx. 200–300 words, though you may write more if you feel it is necessary. Please also give further details here if this project been considered by another (external) Research Ethics Committee.

Project timescale – 07/2012 – 05/2013

**Rationale:**

England and Wales have particularly high rates of youth crime, with more young people
in custody than any other European countries (besides Turkey) (Natale, 2010). Action for Children's report (2008) concluded that becoming either a victim or perpetrator of crime is a real fear for children and young people growing up in the UK today.

The current focus and political agenda is that of community cohesion, as well as the need for prevention and early intervention (HM Government, 2011; Allen, 2011). Recent Government papers focus on the need to find ways to prevent and protect children and young people becoming involved in youth crime (HM Government, 2011; International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC), 2010).

Although children and young people spend so much time in schools, the crime prevention role for schools is rarely mentioned in UK educational research (Hayden et al., 2007) and the potential of schools in relation to crime prevention is also a relatively neglected area in contemporary UK criminological data. Previous literatures, predominately in the USA but also in other parts of the world such as Australia, conclude that generally, school-based interventions targeting youth crimes are effective. The concept of crime prevention programmes in schools, in the UK, it appears is still in its infancy. Crime prevention programmes do not currently feature in the National Curriculum and due to the demands of the Curriculum, and pressure on schools to achieve, it is not unwise to question how and when would schools adopt preventative initiatives? This is something that needs to be explored with schools.

In light of Governments recent focus on prevention, early intervention and community cohesion, as well as the current literature that supports schools being best placed to engage with children and young people, this study aims to contribute to knowledge about the role of UK schools in crime prevention. More specifically, it will explore how UK schools and other community stakeholders, in a socially deprived neighbourhood, view the role of the school in crime prevention work with children and young people.

**Aim of Research:** To contribute to knowledge about how to strengthen the role of youth crime prevention in UK schools, through the analysis of the perspectives of a range of stakeholders in an inner-city community.

**Research Questions**

RQ1) What are children and young people’s views about their vulnerability to youth crime, and the role of youth crime prevention in schools? How are their perspectives influenced by gender and age?

RQ2) How do a range of professionals in the youth and community sector, and the education sector view youth crime prevention and its role in schools? What can we learn from community stakeholders to inform school-based interventions?

RQ3) What approaches to tackling youth crime prevention are likely to be most effective in UK schools?

**Method:**

Participants:
It is intended that the research will use 6 groups of participants. The participants will all be community stakeholders and will either live, work or attend school in the focus neighbourhood.

1) Children and Young people – Primary Year 6 children x 2 schools (12 children) Secondary Year 7 and Year 8 Year 9 – 1 school (maximum 24 participants) (FOCUS GROUPS)

   The participants will be recruited by contacting schools in the London borough. The SENCo will be contacted to identify suitable participants for the research project. (FOCUS GROUPS)

2) School Staff (in both primary and secondary) – SENCO class teachers / Learning Support Assistants / Teaching assistant (FOCUS GROUPS & S-S INTERVIEWS)

3) Youth Workers – (FOCUS GROUP/S-S INTERVIEW)

4) Catch 22 (a charity supporting children and young people who are faced with difficult situations or live in challenging neighbourhoods) – (FOCUS GROUP)

5) Safety Neighbourhood Team – (FOCUS GROUP)

6) Borough Early Intervention Team (S-S INTERVIEW)

7) Other significant professionals in the borough, if successful recruitment.

Recruitment of participants:

All adult participants will be approached by the researcher of the study or with the help of colleagues in the borough. The researcher will approach the schools, in the focus neighbourhood, where she already works and therefore has existing relationships, to gain permission to carry out the research. The schools will be involved with recruiting the children and young people. The children and young people will receive information about the research and what their involvement entails and following this, they will be asked whether they want to be involved. If the children consent, then letters explaining the research project will be sent to their parents to obtain consent for their children’s participation in the research.

Methods of data collection:

- Review of the research literature related to elements of effective intervention programmes
- Semi – Structured Interviews
- Focus Groups

**Semi-Structured Interviews** - The in-depth interviews will consist of semi-structured questions, allowing flexibility for the interviewer and interviewee when discussing their experience (Qualitative data). These will be recorded on a dictaphone for the purpose of analysis after. In the study, the participants who will be interviewed will all be aged 18 or over and so will be able to sign the informed consent form themselves. Before the consent form is issued to the participant’s, information about the aims of the study will be given to the possible participants. They will be informed where and how the interviews will be carried out and what will happen with their data once the interview is
completed. Please see ethics below.

**Focus Groups** - Focus groups will be carried out with all the children and young people in the study. They will last no more than 60 minutes and will have no more than 8 participants in each group. The focus groups will take place in school time (familiar environment) and refreshments (biscuits/drinks) will be provided by the researcher.

Focus Groups with adult participants – teaching staff and youth workers – will take place in their workplace, e.g. the school (after school) and the offices of the youth workers. They will last no more than 90 minutes and each group will have anything between 6 -12 participants.

All focus groups will be recorded on a dictaphone, for the purpose of later transcription and analysis.

2. **Specific ethical issues** (Please outline the main ethical issues which may arise in the course of this research, and how they will be addressed. It’s expected that this will require approx. 200–300 words, though you may write more if you feel it is necessary. You will find information in the notes about answering this question).

All participants involved in the research will be briefed about the study and asked to give both verbal and written consent to their involvement. This research study will consist of both interviews/focus groups with adults as well as with school age participants (under 16 years old). Children and young people will be initially informed about the research and then asked if they want to participate. The researcher will consult with the teacher so that together they can select the appropriate group to ensure that there is a range of participants included. All children will be reminded that their participation is not compulsory. Following this, the researcher will provide the children and young people participants with a brochure about the research. A consent form will be presented to participants, and or participant’s parents, with details of the research as well as informing them of what their participation entails as well as informing them of their right to withdraw. The researcher holds a current Enhanced Criminal Records Bureau check and participants’ safety will be ensured. The focus groups with the children and young people will be carried out in a familiar environment, in school, with the consent of the school. The option to exit the study will be offered at any stage and briefing will be offered following completion of interviews or focus groups.

As the researcher is currently a trainee educational psychologist in the schools where the research will be conducted, she has worked with several children and young people and is familiar to the school environment/ethos and skilled in supporting children and young people as well as being able to access children’s meaning through careful clarifying and probing.

Dissemination of the results will be made within the professional arena of Educational Psychology services, and the results will be owned by the Institute of Education, London. Participants will be made aware that they can access the full report upon completion.

The interviews will be semi-structured, using several open-ended questions, where answers may be followed up with a probing question, as necessary, depending on the
quality and depth of the participants’ answers. The interviews will be recorded using electronic dictaphones and participants will be required to sign consent to them being recorded for the purpose of the study for analysis of their responses. The researcher will hold the data securely and individuals’ interview data will not be transported. Participants’ names on the assessment information will be anonymised and any responses in the interview that are included in the report will not be traceable to individual participants. This information will be communicated with the participants, and or their parents as well as with the institutions involved, i.e. the school, youth centre.

Whilst the focus of the research is on the role of the school in prevention youth crime, it is not anticipated that any worrying or sensitive information will emerge. However, the researcher is aware that participants involved might find this topic emotive to discuss and if they show signs of distress, the researcher will respond sensitively and appropriately. Debrief sessions will be offered to participants following the data collection. This will be indicated on the consent form.

Data collected, both electronic data and written data, will be stored with the researcher to ensure confidentiality. Once data has been transcribed electronically it will be stored with a password so that only the researcher can access. Any other data, such as written transcripts will be kept locked up with only the researcher having access. Upon completion of the research all data will be destroyed.

The researcher will familiarise themselves with the schools’ child protection policy and ensure they adhere to this when collecting data in the school. In the event that any information regarding a child protection or safety issue is shared, the participant will be informed that this will need to be passed onto the relevant child protection professionals to ensure safety and wellbeing. However disclosures are not anticipated as the researcher will only be working with groups of children and young people. It is anticipated that there will not be any other risks to participants or the researcher when engaging with this study.

Participants will be thanked for taking part and given the opportunity to talk to the researcher about either the research or their participation at the end of the interviews/focus groups (appropriate to their age and level of understanding). In addition to making the child and young people participants feel at ease through encouragement and praise for their participation in the groups, and an appropriate reward will be offered at the end of each session (e.g. a certificate). The researcher will approach the school about the possibility of bringing in snacks and drinks for the participants during the focus groups, as a tangible means of acknowledging and rewarding their efforts to participate.

### 3. Further details

Please answer the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will you describe the exactly what is involved in the research to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to do?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you obtain written consent for participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent to being observed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at any time and for any reason?</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With questionnaires, will you give participants the option of omitting</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions they do not want to answer?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theirs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. give them a brief explanation of the study)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have ticked No to any of Q1-8, please ensure further details are given in section 2 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expect?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will your project involve deliberately misleading participants in any</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way?</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any realistic risk of any participants experiencing either</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical or psychological distress or discomfort? If Yes, give details</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on a separate sheet and state what you will tell them to do if they</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should experience any problems (e.g. who they can contact for help).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your project involve human participants as a secondary source</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of data (e.g. using existing data sets)</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have ticked Yes to any of 9 - 11, please provide a full explanation in section 2 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expect?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve working with any of the following special</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• School age children (under 16 years of age) ☑  ☑  ☑
• Young people of 17-18 years of age ☑  ☑  ☑
• People with learning or communication difficulties ☑  ☑  ☑
• Patients ☑  ☑  ☑
• People in custody ☑  ☑  ☑
• People engaged in illegal activities (e.g. drug-taking) ☑  ☑  ☑

If you have ticked Yes to 12, please refer to BPS guidelines, and provide full details in sections 1 and 2 above. **Note that you may also need to obtain satisfactory CRB clearance (or equivalent for overseas students).**

There is an obligation on the Student and their advisory panel to bring to the attention of the Faculty Research Ethics Committee any issues with ethical implications not clearly covered by the above checklist.

4. Attachments

Please attach the following items to this form:

• Approval letter from external Research Ethics Committee, if applicable
• Where available, information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research.

5. Declaration

*This form (and any attachments) should be signed by the Trainee, Academic and EP Supervisors and then submitted to the Programme Office. You will be informed when it has been approved. If there are concerns that this research may not meet BPS ethical guidelines then it will be considered by the Faculty Research Ethics Committee. If your application is incomplete, it will be returned to you.*

For completion by students

I am familiar with the BPS Guidelines for ethical practices in psychological research (and have discussed them in relation to my specific project with members of my advisory panel). I confirm that to the best of my knowledge this is a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project.

Signed ............................................... Print Name  Sally Swift........Date.22/03/2012...........

(Trainee Educational Psychologist)
**For completion by supervisors/ advisory panel**

We consider that this project meets the BPS ethics guidelines on conducting research and does not need to be referred to the Faculty Research Ethics Committee.

Signed ........................................... Print Name
.......................................................... Date ............

(Academic Research Supervisor)

Signed ........................................... Print Name
.......................................................... Date ............

(EP Supervisor)

If you feel the application should be referred to the FREC, please contact Ed Baines in the first instance.

**FREC use**

Date considered:_________ Reference:_________

Approved and filed     ☐     Referred back to applicant     ☐     Referred to RGEC

☐

Signature of Chair of
FREC:____________________________________________________________
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Information Sheet for Young People

This leaflet gives some information about the research project:

Why is the project being done?

We would like your help with planning a study with children and young people on the role of the school in youth crime prevention. We think that decisions about what is best for young people are often made without asking young people, so this project is about listening to your views.

Who am I?

The project is being carried out by Sally Swift, who works at XXXXXXX psychology services. She might be familiar to you, as she visits your school regularly.

Who will be taking part in the project?

Sally will be speaking with young people, usually together with people they know, others in their year groups. These groups will take place in school. She is also going to be talking to various other adults who work in XXXXXXX (the ward), including teaching staff and local youth workers.

Do I have to take part?

You can decide whether you want to take part or not. Even if you say ‘yes’ to start with, you can still change your mind at any time.

What will happen if I take part?

Sally will meet with you and approximately 5 other young people in your year, at your school. She will ask you about your ideas on how young people avoid youth crime or why they get involved in youth crime as well as if young people think there is a role for the school in preventing and protecting children and young peoples’ involvement in youth crime.

The group discussion will be audio-taped so that Sally can listen back to the discussion at a later date.

Who will know if I take part or what I have talked about?

If you decide to take part it is up to you who you tell. Sally will not tell anyone what you say, but you can tell other people about it if you want to. We will give an information leaflet about the project to your parent/carer.

What will happen to the findings of the project?
If you choose to take part, your ideas will be used to help when thinking about future school policy and curricular, and a report will be written on what has been learnt from this project.

We hope that the project will help communities to increase the support and protection for young people in preventing them becoming involved in youth crime.

Please tick one of the following faces:

I am **happy** to take part in the study

I am **not happy** to take part in the study
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Focus Groups Children – Information & Structure of Session

Script: My name is Sally Swift and I work with young people in the Borough. I am carrying out a project about the role of the school in preventing crime. I am really interested in hearing your thoughts and feelings and opinions on what you think schools are doing or could be doing to support young people to not get involved in crime. I am aiming to find out information on what would help young people to not get involved in crime to protect young people from crime. I hope this information will be used to help schools and youth services in the borough improve things for young people in the future. I am really interested in learning what you think about this topic.

(In order to develop the discussion I will ensure I use prompts such as; Can you tell me a bit more about that? In what ways? Why do you think that is? – remain inquisitive and interested)

Ground Rules:

1) Everyone gets a chance to speak
2) Speak one at a time
3) You don’t have to put your hand up to talk
4) Ask if you want to go to the toilet

Ask children if anyone wants to suggest any other ground rules.

Procedure:

1) Make sure all children have read the information sheet about the research
2) Make their own name badges (one for me too)
3) Ground rules – explaining procedure and rationale for their involvement – importance of honest answers – not a test interesting to learn about their beliefs thoughts and feelings – confidential not going to parents or teachers, anonymous.
4) No longer than 45 minutes – two sessions of 20 minutes and a break for toilet
5) Use mats (if available) in room for all children to sit in circle or in their chairs
6) Use of vignettes, photographs, and pictures/statement cards = stimulate discussion, increase participation
7) BRAINSTORM ACTIVITY – Crime
8) “Tell me what you know about crime” “why do people do crime?” (rationale for crime)

9) Why children might do crime – how can we stop young people from doing these things

10) A series of questions following – questions short, simple and concise, and cover a range of topics language that is accessible.

11) Activity - pretend to be the teacher and think of one message to teach their class about crime – write their message down on card and present to the rest of the group

12) Explore crime prevention strategies and who should be responsible for delivering this

13) Ask children to suggest some crime prevention activities they would like to do in their classroom – explore who should administer crime prevention, how should they be administered and what should they include

14) Summarise the main points back to group and give them opportunity to ask questions
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Focus Group Children Schedule (Y6-Y9)

Before start discussion:

- Information Sheet
- Name Badges
- Ground Rules

Explain what is meant by youth crime (ages 10-17 year). Ensure all young people have seen and read the information sheet about the research.

Questions:

1) If I was to say the word crime to you, what do you think of? (Brainstorm the answers) prompt the children to come up with a list of different crimes that they are aware of.

2) Where is it happening? Do any of these crimes happen in Ward Unite?

3) Which one do you think is happening the most in your area?

4) Who does these? (refer to the crimes in brainstorm)

5) Do children your age do it? If so which crimes?

6) Do people of other ages do it? If so which crimes and why is this?

7) Which crime do boys do? And why do you think boys do this?

8) Which crime do Girls do? And why do you think girls do this?

9) Why do you think some children and young people might do all the things we’ve just discussed?

10) Why do you think some children choose not to do these crimes?

11) Do you think children and young people who live in Ward Unite are worried/afraid of getting involved in these crimes in your area? Why?

12) Can you think of any good ways to stop children from making bad decisions and doing these crimes?

13) What would you say to one of your friends or someone younger than you, to help stop them committing crime? What would be helpful?

1) Crime prevention education
14) Has anyone in school, ever talked to you about how to keep yourselves safe from getting mixed up with the wrong people and doing crime? If so who/where/when? Was it Helpful etc? what did you learn?

15) Do you think it would be helpful for children to learn about these crimes (refer back to the brainstorm) and what happens to you if you commit crimes? If so why would it be helpful? Helpful In schools?

16) What do you think that schools could teach children and young people to help them to not do any of these crimes?

17) In other countries there are lots of different ideas about teaching children in schools about crime, (like these ones here – refer to the brainstorm of crimes). They talk to children to give them information and help them understand the bad things that can happen if people commit crime.

18) These are some examples of the different types of help given to children in school in this country and other countries around the world. (show them cards with a visual to support the point and writing explaining the intervention on the back):

1) Police officers talking to children in schools
2) Drama groups come into schools and do role plays about different crimes and tell children about what happens to the person, their family/friends and the victim (explain victim if needs be) when a crime is committed (refer to list of crimes).
3) Teachers talking to children about different crimes and been given a story about each crime and then the children have to think about making good decisions and to think about what happens after a crime – victim awareness/empathy
4) Youth workers visit schools to work with children and teach them about ways to keep themselves safe to help stop them getting involved with crime.
5) Mentoring – other older children or adults come in to schools and talk to children who might live in areas
6) Somebody comes in to the community and talk about a different topic/crime (explain by pointing to the list of crimes) each week and gives the children information on ways to stop them from being a victim of the crime or doing the crime
7) Children putting on plays/role plays about what it would be like to be in a gang? In prison? Hurt somebody else? Stolen?
8) Should this be happening here – show photograph of Primary School
9) Or here – show photograph of Secondary School…..or both?
19) Have you ever seen any of these cards happening in school?
20) Would you like any of these cards in schools? What would you like? What is good/bad about these? Which one would you like the most? Least? (ask young people to rank them in order of the most liked and least)

21) Anything that you think could be better than the cards?

22) What could be more helpful?

23) Pretend to be the teacher and think of one message to teach their class about crime – write their message down on card and present to the rest of the group

24) Is there anything that we have discussed here today that you would like to talk more about?

25) Is there anything about this topic that we haven’t discussed today and that you want to talk about?
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Focus Group Schedule / Interview Schedule – Adults in Education

Community/Context

What types of crime, if any, do you feel are typically committed by children and young people in your community? (BRAINSTORM in focus group)

What are the most significant problems arising from youth crime in Ward Unite?

What are the reasons do you think some children and young people in Ward Unite are involved in crime?

Views / Vulnerability to Youth Crime

Large youth surveys in London and the UK reveal that fear of becoming a victim of crime amongst children and young people is prevalent, what do you think would help to reduce fear of crime amongst this group?

Do you think boys or girls are more at risk of becoming involved in crime and why? Are boys and girls at risk of becoming involvement in different crimes? (REFER TO BRAINSTORM & LIST FOR BOYS AND GIRLS)

Are you aware of any crime prevention education/strategy, in the local community, available to children and young people? If so what is it and how and whom is it delivered?

How do you see the best ways to prevent or reduce the numbers of children and young people becoming involved with crime in your community?

Current Crime Prevention Education

Where, if anywhere, do you think children and young people currently receive information or education about crime prevention?

Is it important for children and young people to receive crime prevention education and why?

What if anything do you think schools can do to help to reduce risk factors of crime for children and young people?

Role of the school

There is currently no statutory part of the national curriculum that focuses on crime prevention. Does your school offer any extra-curricular that focuses on educating children about the risks of becoming involved in crime and ways to prevent their involvement?
In other countries, crime prevention education is taught in schools and is often adopted as a whole-school approach. Do you think it is important for children and young people to receive crime prevention education in classrooms/schools? Why?

Do you think there should be a place for crime prevention education in the curriculum? If so, is it important for young people to receive crime prevention education in the upper primary school or secondary school, or both?

If crime prevention education was to be delivered in schools, what topics do you feel would be most helpful for young people to learn about and why? (i.e. Vandalism, graffiti, stealing and shoplifting, gangs, consequence of crime for self and victim, police and CJS, Public spaces, acceptable community behaviours, drugs and alcohol). (REFER TO BRAINSTORM)

Who do you think should deliver it in schools to children and young people and why? i.e. Teacher, police, youth workers, other members of community?

Do you feel that it is important to have police involvement with crime prevention education in schools?

What do you feel would be needed to ensure that crime prevention education delivered in schools is successful? do you foresee any difficulties/barriers with schools delivering crime prevention education?

Is there anything that we have discussed here today that you would like to talk more about?

Is there anything about youth crime prevention that we haven’t discussed today and that you want to talk about?
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Focus Group Schedule / Interview Schedule – Adults in Youth Services

*Explain youth crime is crime committed by 10-17 year olds. Youth Justice System.*

Community/ context

What types of crime, if any, do you feel are typically committed by children and young people in this community? (BRAINSTORM CRIMES in focus group)

What are the reasons do you think some children and young people in this area are involved in crime?

Views / Vulnerability to Youth Crime

Large youth surveys in London and UK reveal that fear of becoming a victim of crime amongst children and young people is prevalent, what do you think would help to reduce fear of crime amongst children and young people?

Do you think boys or girls are more at risk of becoming involved in crime and why? Are boys and girls at risk of becoming involvement in different crimes? (REFER TO BRAINSTORM AND LIST BOYS AND GIRLS)

Current Crime Prevention Education

Where, if anywhere, do you think children and young people currently receive information or education about crime prevention?

Is it important for children and young people to receive crime prevention education and why?

Role of the school

There is currently no statutory part of the national curriculum that focuses on crime prevention. Are you aware of schools in your community offering extra-curricular that focuses on youth crime prevention? Is it happening in schools in Wandsworth?

In other countries, crime prevention education is taught in schools and is often adopted as a whole-school approach. Do you think it is important for children and young people to receive crime prevention education in classrooms/schools? Why? Is it needed?

Do you think it's important that crime prevention education takes place in primary or secondary school, or both?
If crime prevention education was to be delivered in schools, what topics do you feel would be most helpful for young people to learn about and why? (i.e. Vandalism, graffiti, stealing and shoplifting, gangs, consequence of crime for self and victim, police and CJS, Public spaces, acceptable community behaviours, drugs and alcohol). (REFER TO BRAINSTORM)

Who do you think should deliver crime prevention in schools to children and young people and why? i.e Teacher, police, youth workers, other members of community?

Is it important to have police involvement with crime prevention education in schools? Why?

What do you feel would be needed to ensure that crime prevention education delivered in schools is successful? Do you foresee any difficulties/barriers with schools delivering crime prevention education?

Is there anything that we have discussed here today that you would like to talk more about?

Is there anything about youth crime prevention that we haven’t discussed today and that you want to talk about?
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Consent Letter for Adult Participants

I am a student at the Institute of Education completing my Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsych). I am currently working as a Trainee Educational Psychologist at XXXXX Psychology Services since September 2011. I work in three schools in the XXXX area.

Currently I am conducting a piece of research as part of my Doctorate studies, which is supported by XXXXX Local Education Authority and in partnership with the Institute of Education, University of London. The aim of the research is to explore the role of the school in preventing and protecting children and young peoples’ involvement in youth crime. My research aim is it to explore the thoughts, feelings and perspectives of various community stakeholders in an inner-city London community, i.e.XXXXXX.

I am hoping to explore whether there is a role for schools to prevent crime and if so what strategies/interventions would be considered to be effective in preventing youth crime. The research will help to inform future school policy and curricular.

The project involves a discussion group with members of your team to explore your thoughts and feelings about this topic / OR / an interview with me at your place of work. This should not take more than 1 hour.

To ensure responses are recorded accurately, the group discussions / OR / Interview will be audio recorded. All information collected will be kept confidential and if included in the research, used anonymously. All aspects of the research being carried out has been given ethical approval by the Institute of Education, University of London Faculty.

The findings will be confidential and used only for the research project, but if you wish to have feedback do contact the researcher. It is important to note that participation in the research is not compulsory and you are free to withdraw from this study at any point.

If you have any questions or would like further information please contact me at Sally Swift directly at XXXXXXXXXXX, where I will be happy to discuss this with you further.

I hereby fully and freely consent to participate in the study which has been fully explained to me.

Name (BLOCK CAPITALS): ______________________________________

Signature:________________________________________________________

Date:___________________________________________________________

Please note that this form will be kept separately from your data

Your participation is very much appreciated!

Sally Swift - Trainee Educational Psychologist

E-Mail: XXXXXXXXXXX
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Parent/Child Consent Letter

Dear Parent/Carer,

XXXXXX school has agreed to take part in a research project supported by XXXXXX Local Education Authority and in partnership with the Institute of Education, University of London.

We are supporting Sally Swift who is a Trainee Educational Psychologist in our school. She is conducting a piece of research where the aim of the research is to contribute to knowledge about how to strengthen youth crime prevention in education in the UK, by exploring the perspectives of children and young people as well as a range of other members in the community. Sally is hoping to explore whether there is a role for schools to prevent crime and if so what strategies/interventions would be considered to be effective in preventing youth crime. The research will help to inform future school policy and curriculum.

The project involves various discussion groups with children in school to explore the children’s thoughts and feelings about this topic. This should not take more than 45 minutes.

The findings will be confidential and used only for the research project. Individual children’s results will not be shared or discussed with the school, but if you wish to have feedback do contact the researcher.

It is important to note that taking part in the research is not compulsory and your child is free to withdraw from this study at any point.

If you DO NOT want your child to take part in the group discussions then please sign and return the slip below by XXXXXXX

Thank you for your support and co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXX Headteacher

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Research Study Group at XXXXXX School

Name of child: ................................................................. Class:

I do not want my child to take part in any group discussions for the purpose of the research project carried out by Sally Swift in school.

Signature:_________________________________________________________ Parent/Carer
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Participant Details

Schools

Richton Primary School

Richton is a one-form entry primary school with approximately 212 children. Three-quarters of the pupils come from minority ethnic backgrounds and almost half are learning English as an additional language; over half of the pupils are eligible for free school meals.

Cliffe Primary School

Cliffe is a one-form entry primary school with a nursery and reception class, and has approximately 268 children on roll. Over two thirds of pupils come from a wide range of minority ethnic heritages, and around two out of five speak English as an additional language. Approximately two out of five children have special educational needs (SEN).

Nixon Secondary School

Nixon is a smaller than average secondary school with approximately 740 pupils on the school roll and 204 pupils on roll in the sixth form. The proportion of students from minority ethnic heritages is above average and those eligible for free school meals is high. A higher proportion of students than usual have a statement of special educational needs.

Catch 22

Catch 22’s programmes are both locally and nationally funded and they also offer consultancy services to third sector organisations. In 2011/12 they worked directly with 34,000 young people, families and adult offenders in 150 localities, supporting a further 49,000 young people through national partnership programmes.

Police - Safety Neighbourhood Team (SNT)

The SNT office is based at a central location in the ward, which makes them visible in the community. Their role is to ensure the ward is a safer place to live, work and visit.

Youth Workers

The youth club has a music studio, sports hall and gym and the young people can engage with a range of activities such as music, cooking, sports, dance, drama and discussion groups.
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Various Stages of Analysis

• Sample Transcript – Year 8 Focus Group General Notes from Year 8 Focus Group Transcript
• Brainstorms in relation to Children & Young People Data
• Context of Crime for Children & Young People – TA1
• Collation of Various Themes/Issues raised in Children & Young People Data
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B- To get money

G- Because like, in gangs they normally have like the one girl like to get money and she’s being pressured into being a prostitute.

B- In gangs there’s a boss, there’s a younger, there’s a newer and there’s a sket

B- The sket’s basically a woman

B- The sket is basically just like the lower one and the boss owns the sket so if the younger does something good...

S- What’s this, a sket?

B- Yeah so like a woman slut

B- So if the younger does something good, then the boss would give the younger the sket for the day or so and then you pass her on

All- yeah

B- Some women are like on drugs Miss and they don’t have no way to pay for it.

S- Why do you think some young people or children might do these things?

G- Because they don’t have like a good home life so like they feel like that’s the only thing they can turn to because like if they’re in a gang and like everyone in the gang is nice to them and that, they’ll like well right now that’s the only people that care about them, so they might feel like ‘Ok, well, I’m nothing else.’

S- So not feeling like they’ve got a good home life. That’s a good one, any other reasons?

B- Some people round my estate are like 12 13 they carry knives around with them cos they know they’re gonna get beat up.

S- So you think they’re doing it because they’re scared?

B- Most kids I know, like some of them do do drugs. Yeah weed

B - carrying knives and guns

S- Weapon carrying. So you think that some people are carrying weapons because...

B- For protection, they’re scared

S- Any other reasons why you think children might do these things? There’s something about protection, there’s something about home life, any other reasons why you think people might become involved with any of these crimes?

G- Because they’re bored

B- To act cool

B- They’re scared.

S- What are they scared for?

B- Because say if you’re parents, they love you but they don’t show it enough and you wanna go do something to get their attention but at the same time you don’t wanna do it because there’s other people who are watching you so you’re scared to do it and you want to do it at the same time
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B- Miss I'm not being racist or here anything but I don't know why most people think it's all blacks. Most people think it's all blacks, I just wanna establish that it isn't. You do get white people as well.

B- Yeah

S- Yeah of course it's not about race, it's usually about the ethnic population in the area so in Manchester, what you were saying earlier, there's predominately white gangs, because that is the ethnicity that frequents the areas with the gangs, so your absolutely right it is not to do with race. Why do you think some children choose not to do these crimes?

B- Cos they've got a good life, they've got a caring family; they're not in a bad estate

G- They don't wanna act like them; they don't wanna grow up like them

B- They don't wanna be a killer or anything

G- Even some people like who live in like a bad place they don't want to get involved cos like they know what can happen. They like turn to school and they do well and then they get a job.

G- I think it's more like really it's what you choose

S- Ok and what do you think informs your choices cos everybody has the right to choose but what do you think helps you make a good decision or a bad decision?

B- Your education

G- The way you wanna grow up being something, and if like you go in that gang you won't grow up being that

B- if you wanna grow up to be uh huh let's say footballer, you're gonna have to be good in your maths and English because maths you're gonna be having to say how far you're gonna have to pass the ball and English because you're gonna be signing a lot of documents.

S- Do you think children and young people who live in this area or even another area in the borough are worried or afraid of getting involved in these crimes?

B & G- yep

S- So tell me a bit about the reasons why you think they are?

G- It's like the main area of where that happens

B- So it's like they can't not do it because...

G- Because it's like that's what it is

B- The areas like a black hole you're gonna get sucked in sooner or later

S- Ok so you're saying they don't have a choice?

B- They do but it's just hard to resist

G- They do but it's hard to avoid it

S- What do you think could help to avoid it?

B- Buy an XBOX

B- Just get on with your life
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14 upwards
People average
starts at 4/8
1 learnt from orig gang
sibling

Both boys & girls - mostly men but both
boys = violence, gangs, weapons
why boys = G "more aggressive" deprived
isolation from family

G dep = drugs, alcohol, depression, jobless

Gang = protection, community,
boys get enjoyment
Girls = prostitution (drugs)

Sexual exp in gang - understand it

Harm of gangs - knowledge, skill

why do it? gang = family, sense of belonging
(random weapons = protection, fear) - 12/13 (knives, guns)
Kids do marketing drugs, need
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FG 4/8

why kids do it?

• Boredom
• Alt Seek
• Act Cool
• Peer

• Influence of adults
• No choice

locus of control.

Why not?

• Good life - family
• Local envir good living
• Future goals/ aspirations
• Value school/ education

Peer influence = will make diff (p. 79)

How stop = more stuff to do./X-box.

• Club is good/ preventative
• Club closed = negative for kids

Importance of family ties/ time

friendship support

think about future goals/ conseq.

Ed is key + support from Y.Cubs

In school? 18.3 days - once a term/ once a year (last)

Autumn term - 1 day

- outside - come + talk - Police - watch videos + think

about feelup

Police = black/white approach r. direct not really discuss

- once a year forget by end of week

need more fi 10/11

Relevance of the curriculum? Learn more stuff to help

clubs relate/ modern

them.
Perceptions about why/why not Crime?

Peer Influence
- Ganging
- Threats
- Bullying/peers
- Good/Bad peers
- Status/reputation
- Fear
- Sense of belonging

Home Life
- Parenting
- Family/relationships
- Good Manners
- Good Morals
- Older siblings/role models

School
- Value education
- Career aspirations
-Catch 22/mentors

Economic Restraint
- Bonded
- Lack of activities/opportunities
- Material gains
- Lack of resources in local community

Fear + Consequences
- CJS/penal system
- Letting parents down
- Religion
- Future aspirations/job prospects
- Protection/weapon carrying

Voice of Estate
- Influence from estate
- Role Models
- Environment + Exp of Crime

Lch + 4p
Peripheral
- Police - PCSO
- v. limited support + reactive

SEC
- PSHE
  - see, once a term
  - PSHE days: every 2 weeks
  - Outside Agencies
    - workshops
    - Assembly
    - drugs/gangs
    - Drama days, Ed.

Junior (National)
- Citizenship
  - yes
  - one afternoon/morning
  - outside
  - anti-bullying week

Prim
- Reactive
- one-off topic support
- work
- circle time
- learning mentor
- keeping safe
- safer spaces
- bullying
- transition support

External Agency Support
- catch 22
- place to be
- place to go

What's happening in schools
All churn
- Experience + Knowledge
- Relate to 4p

Teachers
- re-teach curriculum
- re-teachers lack know/ experience

Police
- exp + knowledge
- gents, drugs, safety, protection
- can be scary (pm) 4th
- indirect approach not 4th
- no apps to discuss feeling
- too obvious
- cant always relate to 4p
- ve views on police among 4p (respect)

Prevent
- educate so informed + law rules
- share experience, explore anxieties, fears

Why?
- opportunity to prepare + think about consequences to decisions
- need to know about it
- supported with it
- think first

Feary of crime + transition to sec school (pri)
Focus on:
- Consequences
- Law-facts

What wants/needed?
- Opportunity to talk through decision making
- Not direct lecturing right from getting in
- Police/lecture teacher
- Fun
- Engaging
- Interactive
- Out of school also

Frequent:
- Not reactive
- Not once a year
- Weekly topic

ALL CHRD
- Drama/role play
  - Experience/feel
  - Discuss empathy perspectives affecting crime
  - DVD
- Think
**Gender**

- Reputation
- Importance of peers/pressure
- Enjoy it
- Protection from gang
  - More violent
  - Rape
  - Gang
tools
  - Mug

**Boys**
- Do crime more

**Girls**
- "Weak"
  - "10k sweet innocent misinterpreted"
- Drugs
- Peripheral of gangs
  - Sexual explicit
  - Prostitutes
  - "Sket"
Children and Young People Data: Year 5 – Year 9

Experience / Awareness of crime

Riots, Drugs, Violence, (y5 a&b; y6a) (y6h) (y7) (y8)
Lots of crime in area - stabbed outside house (y6h) violence, rape (y7)
protection money gang related (y7) stabbing shooting gangs, drugs (y8)
Fireworks and dog (y7)
Knowledge of gangs SUK (y5H) (y6h) gangs and dogs (y7) (y8)
AWARE of weapons in estate (y5a) (y6h) guns, knives (y7) increase in
weapons(y8) self-protection measures – bullet proof vest
Graffiti, vandalism, murder (y6a) (y6h) (y7) (y8)
Younger kids (y56) fear of adolescence and increase of victim of crime when
teenager (y5h)
Gangs in parks (y6a) - fearful
Fear of sec school (y5a) and crime
Robbery in school (y6h)
Kidnap (y6h) (y7)
Rape (y6h) (y7)
Prostitution (y6h, y7, y8)
Gang (y6a) hierarchy of gangs knowledge (y8)
Fear of getting robbed and gangs, victim or getting involved (y9)
Transition – more vulnerable to crime more independent (y9)

Language use
Street slang, gangsters, gear (y5a)
Sket – sexual exploitation of girls (y8)

Perceptions re Age and Gender – who does it?

Age
Teenagers and boys age 14 upwards (y5h)
Age 7 upwards age 13-17 teenagers (y5a)
Teenagers 13 -19 (y6a) and some primary kids
Teenagers – ‘gangs’ (y6h) 14 – 30yrs
13 – 16/17 – teenagers 10 years plud (y7)
year 8 upwards – 14 upwards (y6)
14-18 onwards (y9)

Gender
Boys do it more (Y5h) violence
Boys more violent (y5a)
Girls weak (y5a)
Boys drugs, rape, vandalism, mugging (y6a)
Girls – drugs (y6a) – look sweet and innocent misinterpreted (y6a)
Boys (y6h) – importance of peers for boys
Boys – rape, gangs, knives, violence (y7)
Girls – money, drugs, gangs, sexual exploitation prostitutes (y7)
Both boys and girls (y8) mostly men but both
Loose family trust and fear of upsetting family (y6a)
Fear of police (y6h) and consequences and reputation from police (y9)
Thinks about consequences (y7)
Smart and sensible (y7) (y9)
Local environment/estate good – good living (y8)

What's happening in schools?
Circle time talk
Direct telling 'don't do it' doesn't help
Catch 22
Place2be – worry box
LM helps can do to her (y5a y6a)
Reactive – stole from shops, vandalism (y5A)
PSHE day - Workshops vandalism / bullying work (y6a) (y6h) – drama outsiders learnt about consequences
PSHE once a term or year (y8)
Outsiders (police) came in watch video and think about feelings and talk (y8)
Workshop re gaugs 1 day (video victim family) drama group (y7)
Police one off assembly introduce themselves (y6a)
Teacher drugs in year 4 topic work (y6a)
Junior Citizenship (y6h) – learnt strategies to keep safe (y7) (y8) role play very helpful (y8) (y9) - most animated I've known them not had anything since (y9)
Drama day in secondary school (visit) understood how felt (y6h)
(y9) – nothing in year 8 or year 9 autumn term
PSHE – sex ed, keeping safe, drugs (every 2 weeks PSHE) (y9)
Drama from police who came in, once a year, role play MH issues schizophrenic (y9)

How would like it? What's needed?
Drama / role play– feel and experience it, think about it (y5h) (y5a) helps you (y6q) understand feelings (did it in anti-bullying workshop y6a) – experience (y5a), experience, feel put in their shoes (y6h) chance to play it out and work through drama (y6h) (y7) Junior cit helpful (y8) role play makes you think (y9)
Not direct lecturing
Talk to someone you trust (y5a)
Learn things might need later on (y5a)
After school clubs (y5a)
Dvd and discussion – opportunity to learn and think and discuss decisions (y6h)
(y7)
Needs to be fun and engaging (y6h) (y7) can remember if its fun, enthusiastic about it (y9)
Teach consequences and what's happening in local area (y7)
Drama / weekly topic (y7) – focus on consequences of crime (y8)
Mentoring (y7) -weekly or every fortnight more than once a year (y6)
More often once a yeah you forget, more frequent (y8)
More school clubs – need to relate to young people more the NC doesn’t do this (y8)
Consequences, scare you fear in you not to do it, think twice before committing crime (y9)
YW – want to help and have knowledge of consequences and local area (y9)

Why?
To prevent so people can learn consequences and rules – think before they act (y5a)
Make people feel safe (y5a)
Need to know educate (y6a)
Happening so need to know ‘fear’ (y5a)
Increase in crime so need education (y6a)
Helps people make right decisions to be a good person (y6a)
Learn from media not always right (y6a) misinformation of media exaggerate (y6a) (y6h)
Fear of transition to sec school (y6a)
Need to inform kids about law so they know the rules – if not taught in schools
kids don’t think important (y6a)
To share experiences and talk it through, explore anxieties fears that are bottled
up (y6a)
Need it so you can think first and then decide (y6h)
Pass on knowledge to our children to keep safe (y6h)
Opp to think through future preparation allows to think through decision making
(y6h)
Teacher that consequences and impact on future = stop crime (y8)
Its around us so we should be supported with it (y9)

Barriers?
Need to learn in lesson time - learning is important (y5ha)
If teach too young might increase fear (y5a) e.g., nursery and reception
younger not understand, be scared (y4-6) (y6a)

Interesting points
Girls in FG tended to report more external reasons for crime, locus of control,
peer pressure, naïveté of moral understanding, empathetic (y5H) (y6a)
Children especially y 5 and 6 wanted to tell me about their experiences wanted
to talk it through 9y6a)
Concerns re increasing fear for younger prim school kids
What kids had had, drug workshop year 4, JC scheme, remembered it all and
wanted to talk about it, very animated (y6a) (y9) most animated they were
Boys = talked more about shooting violence and murder, acted out, got excited
more than the girls
Influence of media, tv, computer games – news exaggerate and not helpful (y6h)

Gender perceptions – girls depression = cope by drugs and alcohol boys
depression = violence = coping mechanisms (y8)
Appendix L

Reflections – Data Collection & Analysis

When conducting qualitative analysis an essential part of the initial research design is a statement of the philosophical standpoint of the researcher (Creswell, 2007) as their belief systems about the world will have an impact on the way in which findings are interpreted and communicated. With this in mind, I acknowledged that my previous professional experience, training, education and life experiences as well as my epistemological stance could influence the analysis (Yardley, 2003) and so various steps were taken to ensure that researcher effects were kept to a minimum. I gave limited interpersonal responses to what participants were saying, being aware of power dynamics between myself and the young people by ensuring I remained open, curious and non-judgemental to responses, and recognised that young people may have different perceptions and attitudes than adults. I engaged with an inductive approach to analysis to ensure assumptions during data analysis were minimised, I also sought the opinions of professional supervisors, which involved inter-rater analysis coding, and peer supervision to ensure the meaning derived from the data was a true reflection of the data and not preconceived as a result of researcher effects.
Appendix M

Personal Reflections

This research was at times challenging; one of the greatest difficulties I faced was exploring a concept that is not yet established within the discourse of the educational field and is somewhat of a new phenomenon in policy and practise. Amongst participants, the term ‘crime prevention’ encompassed a range of different socially constructed ideas and meanings, reflecting the vague uncertain nature of this topic area.

I identified the various community stakeholders that took part in this research as a result of my knowledge of them from my role as a TEP. However a lack of knowledge and awareness of other services may have meant that other appropriate community stakeholders were omitted from this study and their perspectives not obtained. As I collected my data and explored this topic further I was made aware of other youth services in Ward Unite but due to their lack of visibility in schools and the community I had not been made aware of these. It was also not within the remit of this study to interview every group or individual in youth services in the borough.