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Abstract

This research explores the complex dynamics between young people’s experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship. The research itself is shaped by an understanding of the interrelations between theories and practices of childhood and youth, citizenship and violence and victimisation. Developing a fluid link between these theoretical approaches has facilitated original ways of accessing and understanding young people’s own experiences. Indeed, the research develops an holistic theoretical perspective that allows young people to explore structural, social and psychological complexities of their everyday experiences, through acknowledging the tensions between structural and inter-personal violence.

The research draws on both quantitative and qualitative methodological tools to engage with over 400 11-20 year olds in Tower Hamlets, east London. The findings show that many young people understand their experiences of violence and victimisation as being shaped by their reduced citizen status. This link however has a very different emphasis than current theoretical and political thinking, particularly within the policy arena. This view instead places blame on young people for their 'lack' of citizenship and links this 'lack' of citizenship to increasing rates of violence and victimisation through punitive policies of control and conditional welfare.

Young people’s views guide the research, and through this process, the notion of respect emerged as an analytical tool. The lens of respect offers an important and original way of understanding young people’s experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship. An appreciation of the importance of 'respect' enabled violence and victimisation to be understood as a symptom of a disrespected citizenship relationship with the state. Citizenship itself is a fluid dynamic between citizens and the state. Young people who experience their relationship with the state to be disrespectful can begin to seek out alternative routes to gain respect; one such way was identified as an engagement in violent behaviours.
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Introduction: 
The Importance of Linking 'Youth, Violence and Citizenship'

"Got a few mates who have been convicted 
Yeah, so what, it's the hand life dealt them 
We weren't blessed with the system's TLC 
Governments should have tried to help them."

(Dizzee Rascal, 2004. Respect Me)

Linking Youth, Violence and Citizenship
An important juncture has been reached in the theory, policy and practice of childhood, youth and the care of young people in contemporary Britain. Central to this is a new conceptualisation of young people’s engagement with society and their role as citizens. Since New Labour came to power in 1997, a suite of ‘joined-up’ child services has emerged, being delivered through institutions such as the school, the criminal justice system, health care providers and social services (DfES, 2003; DoH, 2004). These services have the immediate aim of tackling child poverty and social exclusion, but they also have a broader aim of addressing anti-social behaviour and creating a generation of ‘active citizens’ (Such and Walker, 2005). Although tackling so called ‘anti-social behaviour’ has long been an aim of government policy (Blunkett, 2001), there has been a significant shift in the discourse relating to criminal and violent actions, particularly as it relates to children and young people (Anti-Social Behaviour Act, 2003). The current research aims to explore the links between violence, victimisation and citizenship from the perspectives of young people living in inner-city London.
There are many important reasons to explore questions of violence, victimisation¹ and citizenship amongst young people; these are interlinked and inseparable. At a theoretical level, both violence and citizenship can and must be thought of in terms of youth welfare issues. Likewise, political and practical issues must also meaningfully address the everyday experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship.

Citizenship can be thought of as the relationship between an individual or group and the wider polity (France, 1996; Isin and Turner, 2002; Isin and Wood, 1999; Kofman, 1995; Painter and Philo, 1995; Smith, 1995). Commonly conceived as a legal status, citizenship also encompasses the practice of rights and responsibilities (Giddens, 1998; Lister, 1990; Marshall, 1950). Due to the fluidity of the rights and responsibilities link, the implications of, and practice of citizenship can be highly individualised (Lister, 1990, 2002a; Smith, 1995; Painter and Philo, 1995; West, 1996). A model of citizenship shaped by an emphasis on state identified responsibility has the potential to embody state enforced control (France, 1996; Lister, 1990; Pile, 1995). On the other hand the language of rights provides a forum through which groups can strive towards recognition, inclusion and equal status (Isin and Wood, 1999; Kofman, 1995). It is the flexibility of the language of citizenship that facilitates the negotiation of its practice (Isin and Turner, 2002). The practice of citizenship therefore has the potential to exist on a continuum between a strong rights-based conceptualisation and an emphasis on the responsibility of citizenship (Smith, 1995; Turner, 2001). It is important to note however that within a citizenship framework of 'no rights without responsibilities', such as that purported by the New Labour government for example, some groups and individuals will experience their rights and responsibilities differently (Flores and Benmayor, 1997; Lister, 2002a; West, 1996). As such, citizenship is also an experience, a conscious understanding of oneself within, and in relation to, society.

¹ To clarify, the term violence will be explored further in following chapters. However, violence and victimisation are inseparable. When the term violence is used the dynamic of violence and victimisation are implied.
There is a continuum of political thinking in relation to citizenship, which in turn impact upon an individual’s very different experiences of citizenship. Citizenship as a political idea shapes the accepted balance of rights and responsibilities. This in turn shapes citizenship as a status and practice, differentiating the included from the excluded, the ‘deserving’ citizens from the ‘undeserving’ (Lister, 1990; Smith, 1995).

For the New Labour government, citizenship is a newly defined political tool whereby an individual’s place in society, and ultimately their individual self, can be judged (Dwyer, 2002). In turn, what a citizen can expect from the state in the form of welfare, protection and rights are judged and regulated. In this sense, citizenship has once again been reconfigured; it continues to be defined in terms of rights and responsibilities, but the balance has been shifted towards “no rights without responsibilities” (Giddens, 1998).

One of the main ways this notion of citizenship acts as regulation is by the conditionality attached to ‘responsible’ behaviours. The discourse of anti-social behaviour for example, has been largely uncritically adopted by political parties, popular media and citizens alike (see however, Batmanghelidj and Gaskell, 2005; Howard League for Penal Reform, 2005; Muncie, 1999; Pain, 2003; Payne, 2003). What is actually meant by anti-social behaviour, and how it might be regulated remains highly problematic and largely un-debated. As regards to the law, anti-social behaviour encompasses any behaviour which causes a member of the public to be: “intimidated, harassed, alarmed or distressed” (Section 30, Anti-social Behaviour Act, 2003). Such an all encompassing definition of ‘low level’ violence and victimisation is crucial in two ways. First, this is a fundamental change to the meaning of criminality and control. Anti-social behaviour, although often not criminal in nature, can now be controlled through new police powers of restriction and dispersal, and criminally through court orders and ultimately prison sentences. Second, this reconfigured and newly criminalised notion of appropriate behaviour has been explicitly linked to
the new meaning of conditional citizenship (Muncie, 1999). 'Deserving' and 'undeserving' citizens are subjected to a 'two-tier' conditional citizenship (DfES, 2005a; Lister, 2001). Welcomed political moves towards promoting the holistic care and wellbeing of all children and young people have been overshadowed to a degree by the conditionality attached to care (DfES, 2003; 2005a; Revans, 2005; Russell, 2005).

In this thesis, I explore young people's experiences of citizenship and the meanings they themselves apply to these experiences. I argue that young people often feel disproportionately targeted by the newly re-conceptualised notions of citizenship and violence and victimisation (Such and Walker, 2005). For young people, citizenship can become an experience of reduced rights and of an increased and often untenable expectation of responsibility. Their experiences of violence and victimisation within this reduced citizen status can amount to criminalising young people as perpetrators before they are protected as victims. This in effect is the removal of citizenship before it can even be practiced. Thus, I argue that there is a pressing need for a critical approach to the notion of citizenship particularly as regards the ways in which it has been utilised in relation to children and young people. A critical approach of this nature is necessary if an understanding of the complex links between violence, victimisation and citizenship is to be gained.

The Meaning of Citizenship for Children and Young People

Citizenship can be thought of as a balance of rights and responsibilities; a political aim, the practice of which is the focus and mechanism for struggle (Flores and Benmayor, 1997; Lister, 1990; Marshall, 1950). Yet, children and young people are restricted in terms of their status and in consequence, the extent of their rights is reduced (Bynner, 1997; France, 1996; Helve, 1997; Helve and Wallace, 2001; Lansdown, 2001; Lister, Middleton and Smith, 2001; Wallace, 2001; Weller, 2003; West, 1996; Williamson, 1997). At the same time, their obligations and responsibility are not so similarly restricted (France, 1996; Gaskell, 2003; West, 1996). The reduced status of
marginalised groups is a common theme running through the history of the struggle for citizenship (Marshall, 1950), yet, there is something fundamentally different regarding the position of children and young people and the dynamics of their citizenship (France, 1996; Helve, 1997; Wallace, 2001; West, 1996).

Children and young people are the only marginalised group absolutely reliant on another group for their wellbeing. They are the only group universally 'protected' through statutory services. They are also the only group to be the object of such stark confusion and contradiction in welfare policy. The state has a statutory responsibility to protect the welfare of children and young people under the age of 16. Family welfare policy sees children as lacking responsibility and as such, their welfare is mediated through the family unit. On the other hand, within youth criminal justice policy, children are considered criminally responsible at the age of 10. There is then, a tension of responsibility. Children and young people are considered to be responsible, only when they display 'problematic', 'anti-social', or 'irresponsible' behaviours (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005; Such and Walker, 2005).

In this context, it is important to scrutinise what 'youth citizenship' might mean within the New Labour rhetoric of 'no rights without responsibility'. The possibility that New Labour’s conception of citizenship can be used as a tool of criminalisation, marginalisation and oppression against some of the most vulnerable groups of citizens must also be considered.

This thesis aims therefore to explore the complex web of citizenship and violence and victimisation guided by the voices of young people living in inner-city east London. The thesis explores the impact of structural inequality on the lives of young people. Youth must be considered as a period characterised by vulnerability; children and young people are often politically, physically and emotionally vulnerable to violation. This research explores violence and victimisation within the context of structural
inequality, and looks to understand the relationship between this and the nature of a young person's relationship with society; a relationship that ultimately represents their citizenship.

The Cycle of Violence, Victimisation and 'Undeserving' Citizenship

It is clear there is also a need to explore the impact of structural inequality upon a young person's ability to generate self-esteem, self-respect and interpersonal respect (Bourgois, 1995). Violence may be considered as a tool for negotiating self-esteem and respect, in turn, many young people find themselves subscribing to a cycle of violence and a subsequent lack of citizenship in order to negotiate their own respect (McDonald, 2003). The redefinition of citizenship as conditional to welfare from the state serves to trap many young people into a cycle of structural inequality, shame and disrespect and searching for respect through violence, this violence is understood to be a lack of citizenship, and thus the status of 'undeserving citizen' is applied to many young people (Lister, 2001b). Within the context of structural inequality, this cycle might resemble figure 1.1.
As illustrated, the interrelationships between citizenship and violence are key factors in the unequal nature of welfare. It is thus vital to understand these dynamics as welfare issues, as a way of helping to bring together the theoretical, policy and practical elements of this complex picture.

There are simple underlying questions to all these issues: what does it mean to be a child or a young person in contemporary Britain? What does it mean to talk about childhood and youth in Britain today? These are questions that critically underpin the cyclical nature of youth, citizenship and violence. If we are to change the ways in which children and young people are treated in British society (the nature of young people's wellbeing), there is first a need to understand the theory and policy of childhood and youth. From this starting point, the empirical findings of this research are then imperative. The articulated experiences of young people, (the practice of youth articulated by young people) push the contradictory ways in which childhood and youth are theorised and politicised. Only within a reflexive theory, policy, and practice framework, can the concepts and practice of citizenship and violence be brought together.

The Situatedness of Youth, Citizenship and Violence
This thesis also highlights the role of geography, and asks: what does a 'geographical imagination' offer to the study of youth, citizenship and violence? The research therefore is situated within the youth geographies literature that seeks to explore, through the narratives of young people, the ways in which childhood and spatiality are mutually constituted (see for example, Aitkin, 2001; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, 1990; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Matthew and Limb, 1999; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a, 2000; Nayak, 2003; Pain, 2003; Valentine, 1996, 1997, 2000).

The cycle of violence, victimisation and undeserving citizenship is spatially situated in its manifestation and impacts. The practice of everyday citizenship is intimately linked to:
"... the ability of individuals to occupy public spaces in a manner that does not compromise their self-identity, let alone obstruct, threaten of even harm them more materially" (Painter and Philo, 1995: 115).

In this sense, the complex ways in which young people’s use of space and the regulation of that space have been attached to expectations of violent behaviours is a key strategic tool in manipulating their own citizenship (France, 1996; Weller, 2003; West, 1996). To explore young people’s experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship it is necessary to explore how, as a marginalised group, they subvert and reformulate their own citizenship through new geographies.

The geographically situated impacts of structural inequality are associated with disrespect and shame (Sayer, 2004), which can in turn lead to violence, victimisation and a reduced citizen status. Place is also imperative to potential interventions into the cycle of violence and undeserving citizenship. Young people’s experiences of their localities, as violent or disrespectful to their citizenship, are significant in the shaping of future behaviours and coping strategies (Lister, Middleton and Smith, 2001; Weller, 2003). Children and young people can be supported out of this cycle at any stage in the process; those living in the inner city however, are located in greater inequality. The stigma of poverty is also significant and in this context, perceived and real barriers to respect are substantial. For young people living stressful lives in the inner city, statutory education, youth and welfare services are stretched beyond capacity. Social and welfare services are unable to pick up those young people dangerously close to being trapped in this cycle. In the inner city, where these services are stretched, young people are far more likely to be criminalised before they are protected. Bound up in the need to re-conceptualise childhood and youth is a need to think critically about the pressures and distress brought about by living in the inner city. Children and young people’s attachments to space
are implicated within their understandings of the links between violence, victimization and reduced citizenship status.

Thesis Structure
This thesis will provide a theory, policy and practice framework through which the voices and experiences of young people emerge as a guide to understanding the dynamics of citizenship and violence. The thesis structure is as follows.

Chapter Two: Welfare or Control? Youth Citizenship in Contemporary Britain
As New Labour reconfigures the meaning of citizenship, through changing the balance of the extent/content/depth of citizenship, the nature of young people’s welfare and welfare policy is simultaneously being reconfigured (Isin and Wood, 1999). Increasing importance is being placed upon the site of the school in the delivery of welfare services (DfES, 2003). Schools are becoming significant in the practice of citizenship, and ultimately, the control of citizens. This chapter starts by exploring the nature of New Labour’s model of citizenship for young people. A conceptual framework of citizenship as extent/content/depth will be used to explore a brief history of the concept of citizenship. This same framework will then be used to understand New Labour’s policies of welfare, criminal justice and education which all contribute to the notion of citizenship’s ‘rights and responsibilities’. The (extended) school will also be examined as a site of welfare delivery and as a space of citizenship teaching, control and practice.

Chapter Three: Shaming Society? Understanding the Process of Violence and Victimisation
Violence and victimisation must be thought of as processes embedded within a wider structural, social and psychological dynamic. This chapter aims to explore theories of violence through the lens of ‘process’, thinking specifically about the causes and consequences of both violence and victimisation. Shame and related low self-esteem directly underpin the negotiation of respect and disrespect. This is considered to be a damaging
battle that serves to trap young people within the cycle of violence and undeserving citizenship (see for example, Bourgois, 1995). These dynamics of shame and respect will be explored further through the examples of bullying and youth 'gangs' as specific forms of violence and victimisation impacting upon the day-to-day lives of young people. The importance of the presentation of particular types of gendered identities will be explored in relation to bullying, gangs and peer dynamics more generally (Anderson, 1999; Goffman, 1969; MacLeod, 1995).

Chapter Four: Methodological Framework
There are two conflicting approaches to conceptualising childhood and youth. The 'developmental' and 'socialisation' approaches to childhood critically underpin the ways in which young people are theorised in academic and policy forums (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). In turn, these approaches to childhood impact upon young people's ability to practice their own lives. Within academic research, there has been a move away from the developmental approach to youth, towards seeing young people as active agents, capable of influencing their environments and deserving of an active role within the research process itself (Alderson and Morrow, 2004). However, in public policy the dominant approach is still that of age related development (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). The direct impact of this manifests itself in age related targeting of education, child welfare mediated through the family, and the contradictory age of criminal responsibility. Despite tokenistic gestures towards service user participation and youth 'consultation' in service design and delivery (DfES, 2003), children and young people remain the passive recipients of statutory services (Such and Walker, 2005).

The methodological framework of this thesis emerges out of the socialisation approach which conceives of children and young people as active agents. At the same time, it seeks to engage with public policy, and does so by producing data on a scale and breadth necessary to engage and challenge youth policies in education, criminal justice and welfare. The research uses a range of quantitative and qualitative methodological
approaches in order to engage with a range of young people; it draws upon quantitative and participatory tools for use within a classroom environment. The methodological framework developed around the need for rigorous flexibility and the need to devise a research experience that was neither threatening nor un-engaging.

Chapter Five: Violence and Victimisation: Young People’s Experiences of the Violence Process
There is very little existing data regarding young people’s views and experiences of violence and victimisation. This empirical chapter explores the extent and nature of violence and victimisation amongst young people in inner-city east London. The desire to be respected amongst peers is a strong influence in the behaviours of young people, and many thought respect, peer pressure and status to be a major cause of violence and victimisation. This is reflected in the spatial dynamics of bullying and of gangs. It is clear that, while bullying and gang related activities are very different, they do hold some similarities. There are significant links between the gendered dynamics of bullying and the gendered dynamics of gangs. Particularly important for both is the nature of presenting oneself in the bullying or gang process. The need to be ’seen’, and ’seen’ in a particular way, is most significant for young men (Anderson, 1990). The ways in which young women generate respect are different.

Chapter Six: The Capacity to ‘Change’? Young People’s Experiences of Negotiating Citizenship
Young people’s relationship with their communities, and with society more generally, is rarely understood from the perspective of the child. Adultist views of the practice of youth citizenship suggest that young people have a simple choice between ‘responsible’ and ‘irresponsible’ behaviour, between ‘engaging’ with society and being ‘disengaged’. When young people act as a guide through the pressures and opportunities of growing up in inner-city east London a different, more complex picture emerges. Young people have a detailed and complex understanding of citizenship and of their role in society and the pressures that they face in engaging with society. They articulate the ways in which they believe it might be desirable to behave
and a model of citizenship that they would like to be able to practice. In addition however, young people explain the pressures they face living in an inner-city environment of structural inequality. Young people’s experience of citizenship is understood as flux between three positions, trusting, protecting and respecting citizenship. When trust is lost in the government and other state institutions, citizenship is experienced as a position of disrespect. Young people thus commonly practice a compromised citizenship, and one that is very well thought out and shaped by their lived experiences. Citizenship is compromised by a lack of trust in the protection of the police and a defeatist view of government institutions. The protection that the police can offer and a positive view of the possibilities of democracy offer ways out of the cycle of violence, victimisation and undeserving citizenship. Negative views based upon real experience serve to further block the ways out of this cycle.

Chapter Seven: 'Respecting Street Capital': Understanding the Dynamics of Violence

The final empirical chapter seeks to draw together the broad findings of the extent and nature of young people’s experiences of citizenship and violence. The underlying affect, shame, is used as a lens through which to understand the importance young people place on the generation of peer respect (Kaufman, 1993). The dynamics of respect are explored through young people’s views of its importance, the ways in which it is generated and negotiated, and the debilitating implications of disrespect. For young men, physical violence and verbal 'cussing' provide an important forum through which they can generate peer respect. For young women on the other hand, physical violence and violent posturing are ascribed with shame and disrespect (Campbell, 1991). Young women face a far more complex route to self-respect, one associated with heterosexualised, hyper-femininity and an often veiled capacity for physical strength and self-protection.

In addition, the chapter argues that it is important to see the significance of respect as a form of 'street capital'. In the context of structural inequality,
where real and perceived barriers to respect exist, the importance of violence, being able to 'look after yourself' in public places, and presenting oneself as inaccessible for victimisation become so important that they take on the role of a form of capital (Anderson, 1990; 1999). This type of street capital gives young people living under the pressures of an inner-city environment a currency with which to live their lives. At the same time, young people who rely too greatly upon street capital for their self-esteem and respect are at risk of being trapped within the cycle of violence, victimisation and undeserving citizenship. The risk to these young people is very real, given the main statutory institution geared towards their 'needs' is the criminal justice system. The cycle of violence, victimisation and undeserving citizenship is institutionalised; children and young people are at risk of becoming criminalised before they are protected. Thus, routes out of this cycle of violence, victimisation and 'undeserving' citizenship are increasingly being blocked.

*Chapter Eight: Listening and Learning: Practical Implications of Youth, Violence and Citizenship*

This research has stark implications for building bridges between theory, policy and practice; the practical and policy implications of which must not be underestimated. This chapter outlines young people's views of the potential solutions to the problem of violence and victimisation. It also highlights the positive attributes of the community, and the importance of peer support structures in times of crisis. Participants suggested that providing a greater range of youth facilities and including young people in the design and delivery of services is crucial not only to the effectiveness of services, but so that they include young people within the political process. The views of these young people are understood within the context of a range of current youth policies, including policies of anti-social behaviour, anti-bullying initiatives, extended schools and citizenship education.
"We don't need no education
We don't need no thought control
No dark sarcasm in the classroom
Teachers, leave those kids alone."
(Pink Floyd, 1979. *Another Brick in the Wall (part II)*)

The theory, policy and practice of *youth* citizenship cannot be fully understood when divorced from the changing and multiple conceptualisations of childhood and youth itself. The ways in which children and young people are conceptualised profoundly informs the nature of relationships between other children, children and adults, and between children and society. The politics of childhood and the expectations attached to the nature of childhood undeniably shape the very practice of being a child. Through this relationship, children and young people’s behaviours, thoughts and emotions are inscribed with adult meaning. Through this 'knowledge', children and young people can be controlled and regulated. When thinking about young people’s relationship with society, of the question of youth citizenship, it is important to deconstruct the 'knowledge’ from which the ‘practice of youth’ is derived. Notions of ‘appropriate’ and ‘timely’ child development are interwoven through political constructions of the theory, policy and practice of youth citizenship.

This chapter aims to acknowledge this intricate and influential relationship between the politics of childhood and the complex relational practices of being a child. It will first outline the main debates relating to the politics of childhood. The varied and contradictory conceptualisations of childhood are crucial to understanding both the theoretical approaches to youth
citizenship, and the practical implications of determining the rights and responsibilities of citizenship for young people. The remainder of the discussion will set out the conflicting theorisations of citizenship, highlighting its fluid and malleable nature. This chapter will place emphasis on the nature of New Labour’s model of citizenship in order to explore the various ways in which citizenship can be utilised as a political tool of welfare and control. An extent/content/depth framework of citizenship will be set out as an effective tool for understanding what citizenship does and can mean for children and young people. Finally, this chapter will outline the implications of the politics of childhood and the political construction of citizenship for young people’s lived experiences. The example of the National Curriculum for Citizenship will be used to assess the very real way in which the political rhetoric of citizenship impacts upon the lives of young people.

The Role of Youth Geographies in Theorizing Childhood
The importance of childhood and youth has recently been acknowledged within the discipline of geography (see for example, Aitkin, 2001; Dwyer, 1998; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, 1990; Katz, 1998; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Matthew and Limb, 1999; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a, 2000; Nayak, 2003; Pain, 2003; Valentine, 1996, 1997, 2000). Early concerns around youth geographies were aimed at addressing the absence of children and young people within the conceptualisation of space and place (James, 1990). More recently empirical and theoretical research within geography has challenged to need to think geographically about the politics of childhood and youth itself through understanding children and young people as active agents who are impacted by and impact upon their localities (Holloway and Valentine, 2000; Valentine, 1996). In addition, youth geographies have been influential in developing innovative and meaningful ways in which children and young people’s narratives of the everyday can shape the theorization of childhood and youth within and beyond the discipline (see for example, Kesby, Kindon and Pain, 2005; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Pain and Francis, 2003; Punch, 2002; Winton; 2003; Young
and Barrett, 2001). The ‘social studies of childhood’ drawing upon socialisation approaches to youth has been highly significant in influencing the work of youth geographers (Holloway and Valentine, 2000).

There are two highly influential schools of thought regarding the conceptualisations of childhood and youth: presociological approaches, and socialisation approaches (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). My aim here is not to argue for a particular stand point, but rather to outline the approaches and highlight the implications these have on the policy and practice of childhood and youth. Furthermore, I aim to outline the impacts of confusing and conflating the various approaches on young people themselves (Such and Walker, 2005). The implications of theory are crucial to understanding the pressures facing young people in their relationship with society, and to understanding the subtle political reconfiguration of young people’s lives.

The presociological child is conceptualised as distanced from the social context in which they reside. James, Jenks and Prout (1998) outline five main sub-groups of the presociological child: 'the evil child', 'the innocent child', 'the immanent child', 'the naturally developing child' and 'the unconscious child'. The concept of 'the evil child' suggests that children are naturally self-gratifying, and must be disciplined and punished to stop them establishing bad company and bad habits. In Foucauldian terms, the corrective training of (evil) children gives rise to docile adult bodies. The child’s body therefore becomes the primary site of social control (Foucault, 1977). Elements of this approach are undoubtedly apparent within the philosophy of, for example, the dispersal order, where children’s use of space is controlled and managed. In addition, Sure Start ‘early intervention’ policies and recent political assertions that future criminals can be identified as toddlers draw upon this philosophy (Bagley, et al. 2004; Winnett and Porter, 2005).

In contrast to the ‘evil child’, the ‘innocent child’ is afforded an innate angelic and uncorrupted nature (Valentine, 1996). This approach assumes
that children are valuable individuals in themselves, and their innate innocence must be nurtured (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). In contrast, the immanent child derives from John Locke’s views of childhood education. Locke suggested that children were not partially formed adults, but that through education they would become rational members of society (Locke, 1989). In many ways, these presociological approaches consider childhood in terms of ‘stages’. This is made most clear by the work of Piaget (1950), who considered the child to progress through stages of age related and cognitive development. This approach has been particularly significant in the increasingly targeted, monitored and sanctioned approach to education and attainment in UK education.

Indeed, child welfare, education and youth criminal justice are all based, in part, upon the Piagetian (1950) view that children and young people are cognitively ‘different’ to adults, based on age related competence (See also Piaget and Inhelder, 1967; Varma and Williams, 1976). Within the realm of child welfare, children and young people under the age of sixteen are constructed as part of a ‘family unit’ (Frost, 2005). Children’s welfare is thus mediated through the family (Such and Walker, 2005).

Finally, the ‘unconscious child’ has roots in the child psychoanalytic work of Freud (2001), Klein (1998) and Winnicott (1991). These approaches have commonly been conceived as dispossessing childhood, reducing it to the cause of adult dysfunction. This view however, seems to draw only upon the early Freudian work of instinct and drives, a view now widely discredited (Nathanson, 2000). Psychoanalytic approaches to childhood do provide a legacy of understanding the importance of the inner world of the child, and the implications of this on children’s wellbeing (see Alvarez, 1992).

Socialisation approaches challenge many of the assumptions of the presociological approaches to childhood and youth. These approaches are understood under the umbrella of the ‘new social studies of childhood’ (Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). And
although these approaches continue to draw upon many of the ideas from the presociological approaches, they seek to understand the implications of theory on children’s lives. In so doing, James, Jenks and Prout (1998) set out four conceptualisations of childhood: 'the socially constructed child', 'the tribal child', 'the minority group child', and 'the social structural child'. The 'socially constructed child' offers an individual approach to childhood and youth, arguing that these constructions cannot and must not be created in a finite form. The notion of childhood and youth as a constant and finite notion has been challenged historically (see Aries, 1962) and cross-culturally (see Mead and Wolfenstein, 1954). Thus, the social construction approach argues that children and young people cannot be understood outside the time and society in which they exist.

'The tribal child' approach takes the view that children’s social action is structured within a system that is unfamiliar to adult social structures (Mayall, 1994). This approach argues the need to conduct research with children and young people in order to understand their lives. In this sense, children’s worlds, such as the playground, the club or the gang, are considered to be insulated in many ways from adult society, with their own rules, structures and meanings (Opie and Opie, 1977). With a different emphasis, the 'minority group child' sees children as forming a minority group in society. By constructing children and young people in this way, this approach seeks to challenge, rather than confirm children’s minority status (Oakley, 1994). Children, according to this approach, are not considered 'different' from adults. They are argued to be a conscious group, awaiting mobilisation to challenge their status as a minority group.

Finally, the 'social structural child' is a category that sees childhood as a constant feature of social worlds. Children are present in all societies, and as such they all share a common identity. This approach also acknowledges that children are not incomplete adults, they are indeed social actors, but through a common identity, all children have the same needs and rights (United Nations, 1989).
This social construction approach to childhood and youth is not restricted to questions of age related development and in this context, children and young people can be constructed as competent, active agents. Increasing numbers of academics have built upon this approach and recognized children and young people as active agents, impacting upon and informing their lives and society (Holloway and Valentine, 2000a; 2000b; James and Prout, 1997; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Matthews and Limb, 1999; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a; Pain, 2003). The implications of these changing theorizations for the lived experiences of children and young people are much less clear. Whether young people’s perceived voice and active agency has indeed been realised, and by whom, does however remain in doubt (Stafford et al. 2003). This approach is informing public policy makers (DfES, 2003; 2005a; Such and Walker, 2004, 2005; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). There has been an increasing acknowledgment that children and young people have intricate understandings of their needs, and are therefore an integral part of designing and delivering effective services (DfES, 2003). The important input young people can have into the design and delivery of services is being realised through ‘youth consultations’ (DfES, 2003; Sinclair, 2004; Tisdall and Davis, 2004; Williams, 2004). Through this, the barriers of assumed age-related competence are being broken down, offering young people greater responsibility within policy formation. It must be acknowledged however, that there is a marked difference between listening to and valuing children and young people’s views and having the expectation that they will engage with the political process.

The Basis of ‘Contradictory Childhood’
Different theoretical approaches to childhood and youth are potentially damaging to the ways in which young people are able to ‘practice’ their citizenship and ultimately live their lives. These theoretical approaches underpin the expectations of childhood, the expectations of youth citizenship and the appropriate lived experience of being a child. Young people are likely to internalise these mixed messages. By offering young people greater responsibility, through policy consultations, through lowering
the age of criminal responsibility, or through a new language of citizenship, children and young people are simultaneously provided with a greater forum for failure (Muncie, 1999). Drawing from Foucault (2001), offering young people greater responsibility over their lives means that any problems they face are no longer the fault of the parent, the school, or society. Instead, it is individuals themselves who are responsible for their own failures (Lister, 2001b). In this sense, raising the expectations of responsibility and expecting a greater engagement within the political process may in reality provide a greater basis for controlling young people’s behaviours, and ultimately ‘shaming’ them for their perceived ‘irresponsible’ behaviours.

This can be seen in the contradictory nature of child welfare and criminal justice policies (Goldson, 1999, 2001; Muncie, 1999; Muncie and Hughes, 2002). In child welfare policy, the child is protected through the family and the carers are provided support through which they can meet the needs of their children (DfES, 2003). Yet in criminal justice terms, it is the child who has ultimate responsibility (Such and Walker, 2005). Although policies such as parenting orders are aimed at the carers of children, if behaviour cannot be managed sufficiently in this way, the child becomes the main focus of control (Home Office, 2003). This amounts to criminalising children in their own right, often before they are protected.

This provides a stark example of the importance of the discourses of welfare and control in the conceptualisation of childhood and youth (Moss, Dillon and Statham, 2000). As Stainton-Rogers (2001) has outlined, the competing discourses of welfare and control are central to the reconfiguration of youth theory, policy and practice. On the one hand,

---

2 The concept of shame will be addressed fully in the following chapter. Here, I refer to the damaging impact of New Labour’s conditions of responsibility on young people’s self-esteem and wellbeing. The damaging psychological effects of shame are clearly understood, if not explicit in New Labour policy. ‘Naming and shaming’ for example, relies on the idea that shaming will profoundly impact an individual’s self-image, such that they will be ‘shamed’ into changing their behaviours. If ‘shame’ were not such a debilitating emotional response, a policy of naming and shaming would not be considered (Kaufman, 1993).

3 If the child is considered to be at ‘significant risk of harm’ the welfare will be provided away from the family and the child will be ‘looked after’ by the local authority.
welfare is based upon a romanticised notion of childhood where innocence is innate and must be protected. On the other, children are seen as sinful and therefore must be regulated, controlled and punished (Goldson, 2001; Valentine, 1996; Stainton-Rogers, 2001). Both these discourses highlight a concern for childhood and youth, and in order for youth to be protected or controlled, young people must have interventions 'done to them' (Stainton-Rogers, 2001). But the nature of a welfare-control dichotomy of childhood outlines one clearly destructive issue. The welfare of children and young people must be considered a universal aim. To counter pose welfare and control serves to construct children whose behaviours are considered to be troublesome as not deserving of welfare. The deserving and undeserving child is replicated through the rhetoric of the deserving and undeserving citizen.

I would like to augment Stainton-Rogers' view that these positions are not only linked by a concern for childhood and youth, but also by a sense of disrespect and marginalisation of children and young people. These discourses distance young people from adult figures and the very meaning of adulthood. Whether young people are seen to be in need of protection or control, the position young people assume is a subordinate one (Stainton-Rogers, 2001). An understanding of this is central, I believe, to exploring the meanings of youth citizenship and the meanings young people themselves apply to their own positions in society. A subordinate position becomes understood, internalised and re-directed into young people’s views of themselves and their role in society.

The implications of these discourses of welfare and control for the theory, policy and practice of citizenship, violence and victimisation are clear. Through the theoretical and policy frameworks of citizenship and violence and victimisation, the discourses of welfare and control have been conflated. Controlling policies⁴ are increasingly being couched in terms of

⁴ For example, Anti-Social Behaviour Orders. These policies will be explored in greater detail later.
welfare (Muncie, 1999). Introducing children to the criminal justice system at an earlier age is seen to be in the interest of the child’s welfare.

Defining the Nature of Citizenship Thought

Historically, citizenship as a concept has been, and continues to be highly contested, not least because the theory and practice span wide reaching disciplines, from sociology to law (Delanty, 2002; Faulks, 2000; Hoffman, 2004). Unlike many debated terms in social sciences, citizenship is legally binding. Cut down to its roots, citizenship defines those individuals who belong to a polity. The implications of the language of citizenship are far more wide-reaching however, even for those with ‘legal citizenship’ (Isin and Wood, 1999).

Citizenship can be thought of in three main ways. Firstly, citizenship is a process and tool of struggle. Citizenship, by its very nature, raises questions of inclusion and exclusion (Kofman, 1995). The concept relies on those who ‘have’ citizenship and those who do not. The concept also relies on the highly unequal, tangible and intangible, nature of citizenship. The rights and responsibilities of citizenship are not equally distributed amongst individuals and groups who have legal membership of a polity; the ways in which the language of citizenship is used varies, along with its implications. For these reasons, the language of citizenship has been utilised in the struggle for both group and individual rights. The language of citizenship has been drawn upon in the fight for recognition of minority groups (see Lister, 2002a on gender, and Flores and Benmayor, 1997 on multiculturalism). In this context, citizenship is part of the democratic process; it is an attempt to reconfigure the nature of citizenship at the very heart of a citizen’s identity.

Secondly, citizenship can be thought of in terms of a tool of state repression and control. Despite ideas about the decreasing importance of the nation-state in an era of globalisation, the political institutions of the nation-state continue to impact greatly upon citizens’ everyday lives (Hoffman, 2004).
While the language of citizenship can be used as a tool of struggle against the state, this language is used for a reason. In this context, it is important to meet on common ground, using the same terminology. If citizenship is used as a tool in the process of struggle, the other side of this coin must be citizenship as a tool of state control. In the British context, under New Labour, the language of citizenship is central to the reform of welfare (National Policy Forum, 2003a). Citizenship is seen as an 'appropriate' relationship with the state, an embodiment of which affords a citizen the right to welfare (Giddens, 1998). In these terms, when a citizen behaves 'irresponsibly', both welfare and citizenship is withdrawn (Blunkett, 2001, 2003; Giddens, 1998). The rights of citizenship can thus be withdrawn even where legal citizenship status remains. The responsibilities of citizenship are therefore explicitly tied to New Labour conditional welfare (Béland et al. 2002; Giddens, 1998 Lister, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2003).

The third definition, and the one I wish to use throughout this thesis, is an amalgamation of these two approaches to citizenship. It seems that citizenship does offer possibilities for the redistribution of recognition (Lister, 2001b); it acts as a democratic tool for change. At the same time, this is in many ways organised by the state (Hoffman, 2004). Through public policy, the dynamics of citizenship are reconfigured (Giddens, 1998). The meaning of citizenship can be changed, while the legal status of citizenship may remain the same. For these reasons it is important to think of citizenship both in terms of possibility and control. At the root of this, it seems to me, are the meanings citizens themselves apply to their own positions in society. Without dignified, respected position of wellbeing, the perceived possibilities that citizenship can bring about are slim, and the controlling aspects can be overwhelming (Lister, 2001b). The notions of dignity and respect are key to an holistic understanding of citizenship. As Susan Smith outlines:

"Citizenship is not, in essence, about being in a community and deriving rights. It is about having the entitlements
Dignity and respect are intangible but highly significant aspects of these entitlements, and key to an individual's wellbeing. As such dignity and respect are central to a citizen's ability to participate (Bourgois, 1995; Lister, 2002b; Pile, 1995; Sennett, 2003). Very simply, without having a validated, dignified and respected sense of self, the steps to a full and active citizenship are limited. An individual must first consider themselves to be worthwhile within society and believe that their worthwhile citizenship is recognised by the state. When an individual feels themselves to be worth more than the indignity and lack of respect to which they may be subject, they can then move towards political activism for greater rights and responsibilities of a more meaningful citizenship. When dignity and respect can be fostered, breaking away from the subtleties of citizenship as a controlling political tool can come into view. Citizenship then must be thought of as the complex relationship between citizens and the state.

Citizenship is in many ways a state of mind; it reflects how a citizen feels about themselves, other people, and the state. Citizenship reflects how citizens' interpret the actions of the state and state institutions and how they themselves fit into this interpretation. It is about self-esteem, respect and dignity, and how these are shaped and moulded by the state's actions and citizens' acceptance, rejection and subversion of them. Although at this stage, such a definition might seem abstract, I believe it has a specific relevance for children and young people as they attempt to negotiate a period of vulnerability and reduced citizen status (France, 1996; West, 1996).

5 Rather than adopt the approach of youth 'transitions' seeing youth as a linear development (MacDonald et al. 2001), I find it more useful to think of childhood and youth as a period of upheaval. Youth is a period during which negotiations of respect are critical for a young person's self-esteem. In addition this is a period during which young people seek to understand themselves in relation to others and to the state. The contradictory
The Theory of Citizenship

T. H. Marshall is often described as the 'founding father' of modern notions of citizenship. His work has been afforded considerable academic and political attention, particularly as it has been critical to the reformulation of New Labour citizenship. His work *Citizenship and Social Class* (1950) is widely drawn upon due to its influential role in the formation of the post-war welfare state. In Marshall’s early work he identified three types of citizenship; the civil, the political and the social. Civil citizenship he referred to as:

“Individual freedoms of speech, thought and faith, and rights to property, contract and justice. Political citizenship included the right to participate in public decisions and vote. Social citizenship consisted of the right to security and welfare and to share in the 'social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards of the prevailing society’” (cited in Isin and Wood, 1999: 26).

In this work, Marshall saw citizenship as a rights based concept and one that developed temporally. This was considered to be a linear development of rights, and he demonstrated how civil and political citizenship developed by the 1900s. For Marshall, social rights were more problematic. Due to the inherent 'rationality' upon which citizenship is based, social rights, the right to security and welfare were only afforded if an individual gave up their civil and political rights. A citizen would only gain the rights to protection under the assumption that they were unable to meet their own needs as citizens.

6 Contemporary notions of citizenship developed by New Labour draw upon this idea in a number of ways. The notion of 'dependency culture' creates what could be considered a two-tier citizenship (see later). Where those dependant on the welfare state are considered not to be adhering to their full citizenship duties.
Marshall’s approach to citizenship has however, been criticised on a number of fronts. It has been argued that Marshall did not engage sufficiently with the development of citizenship to emerge out of class struggle. Instead he saw citizenship as making the inequality of class more tolerable (Giddens, 1982). Secondly, his linear development of citizenship has been criticised as being too simplistic. Some suggest that citizenship develops in a more circuitous fashion than in the linear way suggested (Birnbaum, 1997, cited in Isin and Wood, 1999). Finally, Marshall has been criticised for focussing too much on class and its relationship with citizenship, rather than other markers of inequality, such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity and age (Chisholm, 2001; Flores and Benmayor, 1997; Lister, 2002a; Wallace, 2001).

Viewing citizenship as a linear development is also problematic when trying to understand the relationship between youth and citizenship, and exploring what it means to talk of youth citizenship. Using this framework, age is negated and the range of citizenship rights for children and young people become meaningless. Indeed, in thinking through the opposing conceptualisations of childhood and youth outlined earlier, only social rights would be available to young people. Social rights, the right to security and welfare are in place to protect children and young people. More often than not however, these are mediated through the family. The discourse of dependency can then stigmatize the family and the children, effectively reducing the nature of civil and political rights (Goffman, 1968; Hastings, 2004; Lister, 2001b; Spicker, 1984).

When thinking through debates about youth citizenship it is imperative to use more wide-reaching notions of citizenship. Marshall’s later work holds greater possibilities for a framework of youth citizenship. Marshall went on to explore the nature of the civil rights movement in the US. This, he claimed, was intricately linked to citizenship and to power. He suggested that what was being argued for was not power over, or the redistribution of power, but rather it was an effective share in the total power of society. It was the power to escape disrespect and alienation. Defined in these terms,
this citizenship framework is helpful when attempting to understand the experiences of young people, their own sense of self and their wider disrespected and marginalised position (see chapter three). In these terms, understanding citizenship becomes an exercise in understanding citizens' relationships with society, grounded in a need for self-esteem and respect.

This seems to be an extremely useful way of understanding the citizen-state relationship. Such an approach to citizenship also offers a framework for exploring another of Marshall’s most pertinent questions as to whether citizenship is an institution that merely masks various forms of inequality (Isin and Wood, 1999). Unfortunately the aspects of Marshall’s work taken up by New Labour in their policies of citizenship and welfare are not those of recognition and respect. Instead, the influence of the Marshallian tradition, seen in the education for citizenship curriculum, draws upon the civil, political and social aspects of citizenship (QCA, 1998). Policies of citizenship under New Labour seek to redress the balance of rights and responsibilities. The Marshall framework of citizenship, based upon civil, political and social rights is adopted and reconfigured as New Labour attempt to move towards a responsibility focussed citizenship. In doing so, the meaning of citizenship, both as a democratic tool for possible change, and as a political tool of control, is fundamentally reconfigured. The implications for the practice of citizenship are far-reaching.

Extent/Content/Depth: A Framework for Citizenship Practice

In my definition of citizenship, I view 'it' as something tangible and practical. Citizenship must mean something to people; it must be something about which they can articulate their views (Such and Walker, 2004). Citizenship as an understanding of self and of self in relation to society is something about which all citizens can offer views (Dwyer, 2002).

It must be acknowledged and accepted that the concept of citizenship will always be contested. The extent/content/depth framework however offers an analytical tool for understanding not only why this contestation occurs,
but more importantly, why it is so significant. According to Isin and Turner (2002: 2) citizenship is based upon ‘extent’ (rules and norms of inclusion and exclusion), ‘content’ (rights and responsibilities), and ‘depth’ (thinness and thickness). These three axes are so inextricably linked that the reconfiguration of one element of citizenship impacts directly upon the other two elements. So, by changing the ‘content’ of citizenship, by altering the balance of rights and responsibilities, there will be knock-on effects upon the extent and depth of citizenship. To offer an example, by creating a citizenship policy that places greater emphasis on the responsibility over the rights of citizenship, some citizens will be excluded on the basis of their behaviour. Welfare to work policies, for example, are based upon this framework. Being out of work, dependent upon welfare, is considered ‘irresponsible’ and undesirable behaviour. Welfare is in turn tied to the responsible behaviour of looking for work, or engaging in education or training. Where people refuse to enact these new citizenship responsibilities, they lose the right to welfare (Blunkett, 2001; Taylor-Gooby, 2000). Thus, by changing the meaning of responsibility (the content of citizenship), the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion are also changed and a section of society finds itself outside the norms of citizenship inclusion - excluded from the extent of citizenship (Lister, 2003).

In the context of young people, this framework highlights the implications of experiencing reduced civil, political and social rights (to, for example, vote, claim welfare, earn a minimum wage and so on). The content of citizenship for young people is fundamentally different than for adult citizens (France, 1996; Helve and Wallace, 2001; Wallace, 2001; Weller, 2003; West, 1996; Williamson, 1997). As previously stated, young people experience reduced rights, and where they are subject to the right to protection, young people are constructed as part of a family unit. In addition to this, the age of criminal responsibility is considerably lower than the age whereby citizen rights are afforded. The content of citizenship for young people is thus overwhelmingly focussed towards responsibility. This in turn creates a ‘thin’ citizenship, where depth is less than that of adult
citizenship and the meaning of being a citizen for young people is decreased in importance. The extent of citizenship then naturally excludes those young people for whom it is difficult to manage their behaviours according to the values of New Labour. These children and young people are then effectively criminalised before they are protected. This is institutionalised through a subtle reconfiguration of the extent, content and depth of citizenship. An understanding of this framework enables a greater appreciation of the use of citizenship - and a particular type of citizenship - as a party political tool of control.

Citizenship in Practice

By reconfiguring the extent, content and depth, citizenship can become more or less of a tool of control. During the Thatcher era for example, two important changes occurred. Firstly, the discourse of the 'underclass' flourished. This referred to a section of society who were making demands upon the welfare state, but were significantly removed from the 'accepted norms of appropriate behaviour' (Dean, 1997; Field, 1989; Murray, 1990, 1994). Secondly, the concept of citizenship was reclaimed and reconfigured and as a tool of control directed towards the identified 'underclass'. There was an increasing concern regarding the decline of the 'moral order' (particularly amongst the young) and the resulting social instability this brought about (France, 1996). Under Thatcherism, citizenship kept its links (following Marshall, 1950) with the welfare state, but significantly the meaning of these links was reconfigured. This was achieved on a practical and theoretical level by dismantling many of the rights preserved by the welfare state, and by redefining semantically what it meant to talk of citizenship. This was exemplified in 1988, when John Moore, the then Secretary of State for Health and Social Security, set the Conservative party the task of correcting the balance of the citizenship equation:

"In a free society the equation that has 'rights' on one side must have 'responsibilities' on the other... for more than a quarter of a century public focus has been on the citizen’s
'rights' and it is now past time to redress the balance”

To enable a redressing of the balance of citizenship, the discourse of citizenship shifted towards that of the individual as ‘active’ or ‘passive’. 'Active' citizenship referred to individuals engaging with the free market, independent of the welfare state and actively consuming. 'Passive' citizenship, on the other hand, was used to refer to the so called culture of dependency. As such, a two-tier citizenship was further augmented. While it could be argued that this conceptualisation of citizenship was not a 'mask' for inequality, it did institutionalise inequality through creating a culture of 'victim-blaming'. Here it is again useful to think in Foucauldian (2001) terms regarding the internalisation of responsibility. When responsibility is conceptualised in terms of the individual, failure will be blamed by the self, on the self. This is in turn heightened by official citizenship discourse, confirming an individual's failure, and labelling it as passive dependency (Lister, 2001b, 2002b).

New Labour Citizenship: "No Rights without Responsibilities”
Because of the malleability of the discourse of citizenship as a tool for increasing individual responsibility in the wake of privatisation and welfare state withdrawal, citizenship has emerged as a central theme in New Labour’s drive to welfare reform. But as has already been shown, the perceived need to increase the expectation of responsible behaviours through the framework of citizenship has an earlier conception (Lister, 1990). More recently under New Labour, citizenship and welfare are seen to be intricately linked in a way which diverges from the traditional Marshallian welfare rights approach. For New Labour, the reconfiguration of citizenship has provided the foundations for 'conditional welfare' (Blunkett, 2001, Giddens, 1998; Home Office, 2003). The practice of a ‘no rights without responsibility’ can be seen in conditional welfare. The rights of welfare are conditional on, or tied to appropriate behaviours.
During his period as Home Secretary (2001-2004), David Blunkett developed a series of conditional welfare schemes and punitive measures of control to enforce them. The links between ‘anti-social behaviour’ and welfare have become more concrete and formalised in policy and practice (Collins and Cattermole, 2004; Home Office, 1997, 2003). The concepts of citizenship and violence and victimisation have thus been interlinked by New Labour policy. Since welfare is linked to a particular type of engaged relationship with the state it reflects a very particular type of state ‘desired’ citizenship (DfES, 2003; DfES, 2005; Russell, 2005). The drive towards cajoling citizens into an engaged relationship with both the state and with their own citizenship is clear in a number of policies aimed specifically at young people. Engagement with the labour force is one marker of ‘desired’ citizenship (Lister, 2003; Williams, 2004). The New Deal for young people ties actively seeking work and the engagement in training to benefit receipt. The New Deal is aimed at 18-24 year olds who have been out of work for over six months. Those young people who decline the ‘opportunity’ to take part in the ‘New Deal’ lose their benefits for a defined period (Blunkett, 2001: 92-93).

The ‘New Deal’ can be interpreted through the extent/content/depth framework of citizenship. The content of citizenship, through the rights afforded in the form of benefit receipt, is conditional. This in turn puts pressure on the extent to which citizenship can be practiced by all young people. Those young people suffering at the hands of structural inequality and unemployment have their ability to practice citizenship shaped for them; they are moulded and shaped to enact a particular type of ‘desired citizenship’. Those who engage with this conditional welfare have the content and depth of their citizenship reduced. Those who choose to withdraw from the ‘New Deal’ become increasingly excluded from the boundaries outlining the extent of citizenship (Ibid, 2001).

Engagement with the labour force is just one area where young people’s ability to practice their citizenship is controlled (Lister, 2003). Further
responsibility based legislation has been introduced placing conditions on the behaviours of young people through the anti-social behaviour act (Anti-Social Behaviour Act, 2003). These new laws give police officers the powers to ‘disperse’ young people ‘thought’ to be under the age of 16 congregating on the streets in groups of more than two. These dispersal orders are effectively curfews that can be implemented against young people based purely on their (perceived) age⁷. This law reconfigures the extent, content and depth of citizenship by fundamentally changing the very meaning of public space (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005). In this context, youth citizenship has additionally been reconfigured spatially. Here, children are significantly differentiated from other citizens regarding the way in which they can use public space, and therefore the way in which they can practice their citizenship (Matthews, et al. 1999a, 1999b; Weller, 2003). These dispersal orders change the content of citizenship in such a way that both rights and responsibilities are removed. Young people can be subject to a blanket curfew order regardless of their behaviour. In areas where dispersal orders are in operation the extent of citizenship has been completely withdrawn from children unaccompanied by a 'responsible' adult.

Citizenship and the Redistribution of Opportunity
The New Labour philosophy fundamentally changes the role of the state in the provision of welfare (see Béland et al. 2002; Giddens, 1998; Lister, 2001a; Taylor-Gooby, 2000). It changes the relationship between welfare and citizenship, and in turn the very meaning of citizenship. The approach to welfare is no longer one of 'tax and spend' (Lister, 1998). Economic redistribution has instead been replaced with the redistribution of opportunity. This is influenced by the notions of 'active' (conditional welfare) and 'passive' (welfare dependency) welfare, and the positive and negative connotations of these terms. The refusal to reject the Thatcherist terminology of 'welfare dependency' has been criticised. Lister (2001b: 92) argues that the language of active and passive welfare serves to stigmatis...
all recipients of welfare, thus creating two-tier citizenship, with those in receipt of benefits as the stigmatised and shamed 'other’. Instead of seeing welfare as an integral part of the complexity of negotiating a life course, New Labour see welfare 'dependency' as a failure. The individual has, in the rhetoric of New Labour, either failed to grasp their opportunities or failed to expose themselves to the types of opportunities that other individuals have capitalised upon. To this end, the current government is:

"Putting enormous effort into driving through a programme of reforms designed to improve services and enhance equality of opportunity for 'the many, not the few'” (Taylor-Gooby, 2000: 332).

The redistribution of opportunity sounds like a much needed step towards overcoming structural inequality and the lack of citizenship that blights the lives of many. In practice however, these policies are riddled with pitfalls. Welfare as it is now conceived is a 'redistribution of opportunity', achieved through education, training and paid employment (Ibid, 2000). However, a suite of policies aimed at redistributing opportunity cannot be successful within the context of structural inequality and pervasive poverty. When citizens experience such wildly different standards of living, their abilities to 'seize opportunities' are fundamentally differentiated. Citizens who fail to grasp their opportunity are considered to have failed as citizens. Placing the burden of responsibility onto the individual, burdens them with the pressure of achieving, as well as with the pressure of failing (Lister, 2001b). Individuals lose out and are subsequently burdened with the shame, stigma and distress associated with being a perceived ‘failure’ (Lister, 2002b).

It is particularly interesting that this notion of the redistribution of opportunity is so intricately linked with the extent, content and depth of an individual’s citizenship practice. Implicit in the polices of New Labour is the notion that an individual who takes up opportunities is a responsible citizen; indeed one must be responsible to be able to take up opportunities
(Lister, 2001c). The extent, content and depth of citizenship have been reconfigured in an attempt to push the maximum number of individuals into being responsible citizens, rather than passive welfare dependants. Importantly, individuals affected by structural inequality and poverty are now not only marginalised and poor; they are also stripped of their citizenship, or ascribed a modified version of 'desired citizenship' (Lister, 2001b). This is particularly pertinent for children and young people. Their citizenship is modified by virtue of their age. They are subjected to a range of contradictory citizenship and welfare policies and finally they are the recipients of citizenship education through their position as 'citizens in the making'. In order to understand the policy and more specifically the practice of youth citizenship, it is necessary to further investigate the theoretical framework of New Labour citizenship.

The Theoretical Underpinnings of New Labour Citizenship

The New Labour approach to citizenship draws on three main theoretical areas, Communitarian political theory (see Etzioni, 1995a; Tam, 1998), Marshallian citizenship theory (Marshall, 1950) and the social capital thesis (see Fine, 1999; Harriss, 1997; Hyden, 1997; Putnam, 1993a, 1993b, 2000). There are also close links between Robert Putnam's (2000) notion of social capital and aspects of Communitarian political theory (see Etzioni, 1995a; Tam, 1998). Social capital, seen by Putnam to be the social bonds and networks between individuals in a community, can be viewed as a stepping stone to the Communitarian ideals of community responsibility (see below for detailed definitions). This is exemplified by trust in institutions, communities and individuals (Fukuyama, 1995). Without trusted social and community bonds and networks, the 'inclusive society' and shared community responsibilities cannot be achieved (Tam, 1998: 7).

The New Labour agenda holds many Communitarian values dear (Etzioni, 1995a; Giddens, 1998). Communitarianism points to the need for a new agenda for politics and citizenship. Citizenship is critical to the redevelopment of a new and inclusive society. New Labour politics through
Communitarianism and to an extent Marshallian citizenship are influenced by what has come to be known as social capital. Social capital is a highly contested concept referring to the social bonds, trusted ties and networks of individuals within and between communities (Portes, 1998). Despite there being many and varied conceptualisations of social capital it was Robert Putnam’s (2000) vision that was adopted by the Clinton and Blair administrations. Putnam develops this further, defining social capital as: “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 2000: 22). It is for this reason that the concept of social capital has been embraced by New Labour as an effective political tool (National Policy Forum, 2003a). This interpretation of social capital offers multiple explanations for New Labour’s concerns with ‘declining democracy’ and increasing ‘anti-social behaviour’. On the one hand, suggestions are that in order to build democracy and increase civic participation, a citizen’s social capital needs to be developed. On the other, it implies that those people who are excluded socially, politically and economically, have little social capital, and it is their responsibility to develop their own social capital through civic engagement (Giddens, 1998; Home Office, 2003; Putnam, 2000). This idea is borne out in welfare, citizenship and the redistribution of opportunity. Social capital theory, as conceived by Putnam (2000), can be used to institutionalise increasing citizen responsibility, and in turn, increase the blame on citizens for their ‘failure’.

These ideas derived from Putnam’s social capital thesis underpin much of New Labour’s public policy - that of ‘helping communities to help themselves’ (National Policy Forum, 2003). This approach to policy incorporates the government’s desire to increase the social capital of communities and to devolve responsibility down to local communities. There are however problems with an approach that sees social capital as inherently good (see Fine, 1999, 2000; Rubio, 1997). New Labour’s definition of social capital is as expected, very similar to Putnam’s definition in that it refers to:
"Our links with friends and family, neighbours and colleagues, voluntary groups and membership clubs, and the values and trust that we share that enable us to work together for collective ends" (National Policy Forum, 2003a: 3).

This assumes that social capital is only present in particular institutions, that 'links' with friends, groups and so on are uncomplicated, and that strong links with people automatically result in positive ends for the 'collective good'. It fails to acknowledge the potentially exclusionary nature of social capital (Portes, 1998; Portes and Landolt, 1996, 2000), and it also ignores the complexity of trust in a range of social networks for positive and negative ends. Furthermore, it fails to acknowledge that links developed through institutions considered to be negative by the government - such as youth gangs - can result in positive emotional, physical and economic support outcomes for members (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Gaskell, 2003; Katz, 1988; Laidler and Hunt, 1997; McIlwaine and Moser, 2001; Venkatesh, 1997).

New Labour’s policy makes the assumption that social change undermines social capital (National Policy Forum, 2003a). As more people enter the workplace, people have less time to devote to community organisations. It is asserted that women’s organisations, trade unions, and faith groups have been eroded by new technologies and time restraints (Ibid, Putnam, 2000). Interestingly, this is contradicted by the New Labour employment drive that it is not only desirable, but a necessity for the enactment of citizenship for people to engage in paid work. This notion however has been discredited by much academic research (Castells, 1998; Pelling 1998; Venkatesh, 1997). While New Labour suggests that social change undermines the social capital of communities, the contrary has often been found and social capital has been strongest amongst those communities most seriously affected by social and structural change (see Pelling, 1998).
This raises a serious question. Is the social capital of Putnam and New Labour exclusionary in its derivation by suggesting that poor communities lack social capital? Or is the 'social capital' present in poor communities simply a reflection of another social phenomenon? It could be argued the 'inherently good' policy framework of social capital which rejects and nullifies the social capital of, for example, poor communities and young people is exclusionary. More problematic still is that this exclusionary social capital framework informs the nature of New Labour citizenship. It might follow therefore that those whose social capital is discredited, become excluded from the practice of citizenship. This is of particular importance for children and young people, for whom networks of trust and reciprocity are paramount and widely acknowledged through peer groups and dynamics of friendships, yet often not conceived of as 'social capital' (Morrow, 1999).

Implications for the Meaning of Youth Citizenship
The extent, content and depth framework of citizenship is again useful to explore the meaning of youth citizenship and its tangible and practical nature under New Labour. As previously stated, citizenship within the UK context has been reconfigured towards 'no rights without responsibilities'. The greatest impact of this has been borne by children and young people. With an increased emphasis placed upon children’s and young people’s responsibilities and punitive measures taken against 'irresponsibility', the extent of youth citizenship is reduced. More and more children and young people find their behaviour outside the boundaries of 'desired citizenship'. At the same time, the depth of citizenship is reduced. By this, I mean how far young people’s citizenship is institutionalised; how far their identification as a citizen shapes their broader identity as a young person. A shallow understanding of citizenship would be reflected in a lack of engagement with society, feelings of disempowerment, and a lack of self-worth as a citizen. By increasing the responsibilities placed upon children and young people, whilst failing to reward this through increased rights, barriers can be erected between the state and young people, a greater distance and distrust might then underpin the meaning of the relationship.
This relationship can be seen through the policies of three interesting and contradictory examples of youth citizenship in practice: criminal justice, welfare, and education policies. Although I have touched on issues of anti-social behaviour orders and the interaction between welfare and citizenship, it is important to place these alongside new changes to education policies, and interpret them within a broader extent/content/depth theoretical framework.

As noted earlier, policies of welfare predominantly construct children and young people as part of a family unit, through which child welfare can be mediated (Makrinioti, 1994). In this context, the child is considered a 'welfare child', one who needs to be protected and provided for by adult figures and state institutions. Through such a conceptualisation children are afforded social citizenship rights, but as Marshall (1950) highlighted, their take-up of social rights is permitted by 'giving up' civil and political rights. Interestingly however, this discourse of protection and welfare is countered by the drive to incorporate young people’s views in the design and delivery of services (DfES, 2003; DoH, 2004; Such and Walker, 2005; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). By altering the conceptualisation of young service users8, to one where their views are considered valuable increases their ‘responsibility’9, changes the nature of the content of citizenship, and can serve to deepen its meaning.

8 'Service user’ refers to young recipients of social and health care. It is a term often used to describe users of mental health and psychiatric services. However I use it to refer to young people looked after by local authorities, those who have contact with social workers, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), Youth Offending Team and so on.
9 The extent to which young service user views are indeed incorporated in the design and delivery of services is subject to question (Such and Walker, 2005; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). It has been argued that a tokenistic attempt at offering service users 'choice' where the resources to back-up such choice are not in place serves only to further disempower vulnerable groups (Gaskell, 2005). It is important however to acknowledge this subtle change in the government’s understanding of childhood. Yet the implications are so far unclear. These changes could serve to empower vulnerable young people, or they could apply greater responsibility to young people whose primary care needs should be a priority, thereby increasing the likelihood of their failure to be 'responsible'. There is an extensive literature regarding service user participation which can be referred to in this context (see for example Beresford, 2001; Carr, 2004 for an overview)
Running alongside this conceptualisation of the 'welfare child' is the 'controlled child'; the child whose irresponsible behaviour requires punishment and control (Goldson, 2001; Stainton Rogers, 2001). The child is considered criminally responsible for his or her behaviour from the age of 10 (Muncie, 1999). Criminal behaviour is not considered through the discourse of welfare; it is not considered to be a result of a lack of care or protection or symptomatic of wider structural problems (Batmanghelidj and Gaskell, 2005). This lack of conflation between discourses of welfare and control is particularly problematic in the context of the social exclusion experienced by young offenders\(^\text{10}\). Despite this, children are considered through the discourse of responsibility only when their behaviour proves problematic or challenging (Such and Walker, 2005). The impact of this is that children are criminalised before they are protected; their citizenship removed before it can be practiced (Gaskell, 2005). This can be understood as reconfiguring the content of citizenship; vulnerable service users can be offered rights to welfare, yet a situation can exist where the right to welfare is preceded by responsibility of criminality\(^\text{11}\). Those young people whose behaviours are problematic are constructed through the discourse of control, and the extent to which they are considered citizens is reduced. In turn, they are stigmatised and further marginalised, and their relationship with the state can become one based upon distrust and punishment; in terms of depth, their citizenship is wafer thin.

**Youth Citizenship and the Citizenship Curriculum**

Finally, there are two significant areas of education policy which reflect interesting aspects of the practical nature of youth citizenship. These are the education for citizenship curriculum and the 'extended school' (Craig et al. 2004; Crick, 1998; DfES, 2005b). The tangible effects of citizenship are most clearly set out through the citizenship curriculum. This curriculum outlines the nature of New Labour's desired citizenship - for both young

---

\(^{10}\) According to the Prison Reform Trust, nearly three quarters of young offenders have been excluded from school, 40% have grown up in local authority care, and over 85 display one or more diagnosable mental health problem (Solomon, 2004).
people and future adults (Crick, 1998). The citizenship curriculum was introduced as a statutory course for the state education sector in September 2002. The definition of citizenship under the National Curriculum "was deliberately founded on the best of past approaches [to citizenship] updated to meet the needs of modern democratic society." (Kerr, 2000: 78). This highlights the contested nature of citizenship, and the problems of translating such an ambiguous concept into the National Curriculum. The curriculum additionally states that it draws upon Marshall’s (1950) work on citizenship, and tries to redress the balance of rights and responsibilities; towards a responsibility focussed citizenship. Through teaching and the transferral of skills, citizenship education aims "for young people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life" (Crick12, 1998: 7). Key stages 3 and 4 attainment targets (covering ages 11-16) will direct the teaching of citizenship through development along three trajectories:

- Knowledge and understanding about becoming informed citizens
- Developing skills of enquiry and approach
- Developing skills of participation and responsible action

This is an important example of the significance placed on responsible behaviour and developing young people’s abilities to participate, according to civil, political and social responsibilities. Also implicit in the curriculum is the importance placed on the role of the school, not only as a pedagogic environment, but also as a hub for the interaction of the whole community, as a site of social capital accumulation. This idea has been further developed through the idea of ‘extended schools’ (Craig et al. 2004; DfES, 2005b). These are part of a whole range of ‘joined-up’ policies aimed at improving the delivery of welfare (Craig et al. 2004; DfES, 2003; DoH, 2004; Williams, 2004). The extended school is explicitly a policy of social capital

---

11 This is not only the case for young service users, but the example for this group is most stark.
12 The Crick Report is the basis of the citizenship curriculum; it explored how citizenship ought to be taught within schools.
accumulation, where building social interaction between members of the
community is considered to be for the 'public good'. Extended schools use
existing schools sites to offer a range of services for children, young people,
parents and citizens in general. They are sites of life-long learning,
participation and engagement (Craig et al. 2004). Instead of allowing the
networks of trust and reciprocity that have been built up through student
engagement with schools to disintegrate, the extended school seeks to use
these and develop them further. This is an important move in
acknowledging the central role of social capital in school institutions. At the
same time however, questions are raised over the importance of young
people's social capital within the school. Does the extended school simply
reflect the further marginalisation for children and young people, whose
networks alone are not considered social capital? Is it only when adult
figures within the community are brought into the school that these
networks are recognised as social capital?

Concluding Comments
This chapter has outlined how the theory, policy and practice of youth
citizenship cannot be understood divorced from the changing and multiple
conceptualisations of childhood. The chapter has sought to summarize the
relationship between the politics of conceptualising childhood, and the
complex and relational practices of being a child. The politics of childhood
are inscribed through the political constructions and young people's
tangible experiences of youth welfare, education and citizenship.

Not only are theories of childhood complex and contested, but the theory of
citizenship is fluid and malleable and can be utilised to a number of ends.
The fluidity of citizenship theory is most clearly seen through the
construction of youth citizenship. The theory, policy and practice of youth
citizenship under New Labour are defined by confusion. This use of
citizenship, as understood through the extent/content/depth framework,

1 Extended schools are also policies promoting the joined-up provision of children's
services. However the extension of school services beyond existing students is significant in
the accumulation of social capital within communities.
has the potential to be exclusionary and victim blaming rather than empowering and emancipatory. The nature of the content of youth citizenship and the responsibility focus of it increases the significance of individual responsibility over the importance of individual rights. This in turn carries with it the threat of exclusion from the extent of the rights of citizenship when young people cannot embody the responsibilities required of citizenship. As a result of this, the depth of citizenship is also called into question by the state and young people themselves. When the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are defined in this way, it is difficult for young people to draw coherent meaning from the mixed messages they receive. In this context, youth citizenship can become ever less meaningful for young people’s identity. Young people’s relationship with the state can become defined by mistrust and stigma rather than inclusion and respect.

The complex implications of adopting a particular approach to conceptualising childhood and youth for policy and practice are sometimes overlooked. The political implications of the theory of citizenship are such that citizenship can be reformulated and utilised as a tool to control the most marginalised groups of young people. It is imperative therefore that the lived practice of citizenship of young people themselves is explored. For this reason, this thesis will seek to develop a body of evidence to enable the exploration of the interrelationship between the politics of childhood, and the lived experiences of citizenship and violence and victimisation in the lives of children and young people.
Shaming Society?
Understanding the Process of Violence and Victimisation

"Everyone's ashamed of the youth
'Cause the truth look strange
And for me it's reversed
We left them a world that's cursed and it hurts
'Cause any day they'll push the button."
(Tupac, 2005. Ghetto Gospel)

Within academic and political discourse, the issues of violence and victimisation are inextricably linked to notions of 'appropriate' childhood and particularly to those of 'responsible' youth (see Blunkett, 2001; Decker and Van Winkle, 1996; Goodey, 1997; Heimer and De Coster, 1999; Home Office, 2003; Jeffs and Smith, 1995; Klein, 1995; MacLeod, 1995; Thrasher, 1927). The meaning of violence and victimisation is therefore shaped through discourses of so-called 'feral' children, in need of control (Goldson, 2001; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a; Muncie, 1999; Scraton, 1997; Stainton Rogers, 2001). The meaning of youth in turn is shaped by and through discourses of violence and victimisation, and the punitive policies of control which aim to change young people's behaviours (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005; Home Office, 2003; James and James, 2001). This conceptualisation is problematic as it is based upon overly simplistic understandings of both youth and violence and victimisation. These are not rigid categories. On the contrary, they are fluid and dynamic and are directly experienced on a daily basis through young people's 'practices of living'. To overcome this simplicity, an holistic understanding is needed in order to explore the complexity of violence and victimisation and how these relate directly to young people's lives.
An holistic approach to understanding young people's experiences of violence and victimisation must be shaped and directed by young people themselves. The dominant theoretical framework of the 'crisis of childhood' is articulated, defined and understood through an adultist model (Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999b). When young people's views and experiences are incorporated, the simplistic notions upon which these theories are based can be destabilised. This chapter will therefore aim to explore the theoretical foundations to understanding violence and victimisation. It will do this firstly through adopting an holistic definition of violence and victimisation. This will enable a broad-based understanding of the nature, causes and effects of violence and victimisation on the lives of young people. Finally, this chapter will aim to place this understanding within a specifically youth-centred framework, assessing the role of the school within the community in shaping young people's wide ranging experiences of violence and victimisation.

The Political Context of Youth, Violence and Victimisation

If young people have been the subject of occasional 'moral panics' (Cohen, 1972), this panic it seems, has since been replaced by a more general and less directed 'anxiety' (James and James, 2001; Scraton, 1997; Stainton Rogers, 2001; Wyness, 2000; Valentine, 1996). It could increasingly be argued that young people are defined in isolation from adult society; childhood and youth is fast becoming a subculture in itself. As James and James (2001: 211) argue, the perceived crisis of childhood “across a variety of social, legal and political arenas, is one in which children are depicted as spiralling out of control”. Children and young people are out of control and need to be ‘tamed’ (Jeffs and Smith, 1995; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a); anyone requiring ‘taming’, in turn, must be in some way ‘morally flawed’ (Field, 1989; Murray, 1994).

14 In New Labour government discourse, what I conceive as violence and victimisation is most commonly referred to as 'Anti-Social Behaviour'. I am choosing not to use this term, this will be explored in greater detail in the remainder of the chapter.
Moral panics are certainly not new, and the confusion between children and young people being seen as ‘innocent and vulnerable’ but also as ‘dangerous’ and in need of control also has a deep seated history (Aries, 1962; Cohen, 1972; Hall, and Jefferson, 1976; Hendrick, 1990). Historical examples of moral panics around perceived ‘dangerousness’ can be found in the Mods and Rockers during the 1960s, football hooliganism during the 1980s and more recently around youth violence and specifically child murderers (Cohen, 1972; Springhall, 1998; Thompson, 1998). In the present context children and young people are undoubtedly considered to be potentially vulnerable, and the support of their holistic wellbeing is set out as a priority through the Every Child Matters Green Paper (DfES, 2003). In the same vein policies such as Sure Start, Children’s Funds and Extended Schools are aimed at early intervention and protection of vulnerable children from potential harm (Craig et al. 2004; DfES, 2003; 2005a). At the same time, when a child becomes troubled or troublesome, understandings of vulnerability are overshadowed by their potential dangerousness (Goldson, 2001; Stainton Rogers, 2001). Children and young people in this context are understood in terms of problems posed for society, rather than in terms of the problems posed to young people by society (Jones, 1997).

There seem to be a number of factors making the contemporary political context distinct from previous periods of moral panics. Most significantly for this research, moral panics around the crisis of childhood have been linked quite explicitly to young people’s disengagement from society, to their lack of citizenship (Home Office, 2003). Violence and victimisation is considered to be symptomatic of young people ‘spiralling out of control’, but these behaviours are considered menacing because they are perceived to be a threat to the social order (Jeffs and Smith, 1995). This perceived threat to the social order is certainly not new in terms of moral panics surrounding young people (Springhall, 1998; Thompson, 1998); the difference seems to exist in the newly generic approaches to quelling the periods of panic. Violence and victimisation may be a ‘target’ for policies of control and of the promotion of ‘appropriate’ citizenship in young people, but these
policies in reality reflect an attempt to control all children and young people as a fixed and 'morally flawed' subsection of society (Goldson, 2001; Home Office, 2003; Muncie, 1999).

Whilst on the one hand, attempts are being made to 'include' children and young people within processes of decision making (see for example, Tisdall and Davis, 2004), they are simultaneously subjected to both overt and covert regulation (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005; James and James, 2001; Muncie, 1997). This appears to be another significant difference between previous moral panics over young people's behaviours and the current 'crisis of childhood'. Punitive policies of control have been the trademark of the New Labour government, beginning with their 'No More Excuses' youth crime White Paper in 1997 (Home Office, 1997).

Amid continued academic debates concerning whether or not a 'crisis of childhood' is even occurring there has been a real increase in the monitoring and regulation of young people’s behaviours (Wyness, 2000). It is interesting to note that in 1997, 'anti-social behaviour' was seen as a cause of crime and violence and early intervention was considered necessary to 'reinforce responsibility' (Home Office, 1997). By 2003 however, 'anti-social behaviour' was the crime, and punitive 'tackling' of those causing 'harassment, alarm or distress' was called upon (Home Office, 2003). Not only does this impact directly upon young people’s lives, but it fundamentally alters the meaning of criminal justice (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005). Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, Dispersal Orders and Curfews have sought to control young people’s behaviours in public places (Home Office, 2003; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a). Within the space of the school, increased control and regulation has emerged through metal detectors, police officers stationed within schools, and government 'taskforces' to tackle disruptive behaviour within the classroom (Alison, 2004; Barkham, 2005; Curtis, 2004; Ross, 2005; Wainwright, 2004). These are initiatives that impact upon the lives of all young people. In all likelihood, these policies will impact disproportionately upon young men,
minority ethnic young people, and young people living in low income areas. They are however generated as blanket policies to shape the behaviours of all young people, regardless of their engagement in any 'negative' behaviour. Therefore, while exploring the intricacies and differential experiences of young people, it is also imperative to acknowledge the broad-ranging impact of these policies on all young people.

Rather than to continue to debate the nature of the crisis of childhood, or indeed to debate its very existence, it seems necessary to develop the argument in two important ways: firstly, to explore the new ways in which childhood is currently being controlled. Secondly, there is a need to explore the ways in which young people experience this control, and how they apply a broader meaning of their reduced citizenship status to their experiences, and how they resist and subvert this control through violence and victimisation.

It is important here to build upon the arguments regarding conditional welfare set out in chapter two. In the context of violence and victimisation, youth, as a politically defined category, is a period of 'irresponsibility' (James and James, 2001; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999b). Young people lack the characteristics of responsible civic engagement that make-up 'active citizenship'. In relation to young people, the New Labour government has applied its framework of conditional welfare to three important sites of control. Young people's behaviour will be controlled through the family, the school and the public sphere. Parenting Orders, greater powers to Head teachers to exclude disruptive students, and increasing the number of police officers on the streets facilitating the issuing of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, are all strategies of regulating, controlling and where necessary, punishing behaviours.

15 The choice to focus on the school and the street as sites of empirical enquiry was made partly due to methodological and ethical considerations regarding addressing children and young people's experiences of violence and victimisation within the home - experiences that would mean in many scenarios the uncovering of Child Protection cases. At a theoretical level I was interested in the group dynamics and the public nature of violence.
A final key aspect of 'Anti-Social Behaviour Orders' is the issue of 'naming and shaming' children and young people who persistently engage in 'anti-social behaviour'. As referred to in chapter two, 'naming and shaming' relies on the idea that inciting shame will profoundly impact an individual's self-image (Kaufman, 1993; Nathanson, 2000). This impact will be such that individuals in future will be 'shamed' into changing their behaviours. 'Shame' is a debilitating emotional response, if it were not, a policy of 'naming and shaming' would not be considered as an effective strategy (Sedgwick and Frank, 1995; Tomkins, 1963). This aspect of New Labour policy has been the target of intense criticism particularly with regard to children's rights to anonymity (Burney, 2005; Crossman, 2005). Also important is that shame can be linked not only with withdrawal from a particular behaviour, but also with rage, contempt and the continuation of behaviours. For many young people therefore, being publicly shamed may incite even greater displays of 'anti-social behaviour'.

These policies have real impacts upon all young people's lives, yet they are themselves based upon flawed thinking. The moral nature of New Labour's understandings of violence and victimisation emerges from the importance of 'the family' in controlling young people. But where the family fails, the state intervenes (Home Office, 1997; 2003). The 'moral flaw' premise of social disorder is itself based upon a limited and limiting understanding of the causes of disorder, violence and victimisation and in the rhetoric of New Labour, Anti-Social Behaviour. Theories of violence incorporate understanding the nature and causes of social disorder, and they are themselves diverse in nature. The complexity of the violence and victimisation debate is such that simplistic policies of control alone are destined to fail. In order to address the intricacies of the different ways in which young people experience violence and victimisation it is necessary to explore their views and the meanings they apply to their experiences.

and victimisation and how this shaped young people's experiences. For these reasons, the research focussed on school and street based violence and victimisation.
The Multi-Dimensional Nature of Violence

The study of violence spans a number of disciplines; including criminology, psychology, sociology, neuro-sciences, political sciences, geography, and development studies. Definitions of violence and approaches to studying violence are, as such, multiple and highly contested (McIlwaine, 1999). In order to fully understand young people’s relationship in and with the process of violence and victimisation, it is necessary to broaden the framework of conceptualising violence. An understanding of the complex links between structural and inter-personal violence are crucial to developing an holistic approach to understanding young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation. For this reason, the working definition of violence and victimisation I have developed is necessarily broad. I am choosing not to use the term ‘anti-social behaviour’, as I feel it to have overtly negative and political connotations. This term serves to nullify the ‘voice’ of young people as both perpetrators and victims of crime and violence. I feel it is necessary to use a term that encapsulates the broader experiences of young people as both perpetrators and victims of violence. My use of violence and victimisation, within the context of young people, refers for example to, physical violence, gang activities, verbal abuse and bullying. Because these activities, and particularly gangs and bullying rely on a particular type of peer interaction, the issues of peer groupings, image and self-esteem will also be addressed as part of the process of youth violence and victimisation.

Structural violence, first coined by Galtung, derives from the social, economic and political structures of inequality (see for example, Galtung, 1969; Salmi, 1993). Structural violence refers to: “the deaths and disabilities that are caused by the economic structure of our society, its division into rich and poor” (Gilligan, 2001: 101). Structural violence can occur overtly through repressive political regimes (see Bourgois, 2004b; McIlwaine, 1999: 458), or more subtly via, for example, the maintenance of the class structure, gender norms and access to welfare state services (see Bourgois, 1995, 2004a; Campbell, 1991; Kaufman and Raphael, 1996).
Understandings of inter-personal violence on the other hand, continue to draw upon the Freudian notion of aggressive impulse (Nathanson, 2000). As such, inter-personal violence is often defined narrowly as: “aggressive behaviour with the intent to cause harm (physical or psychological)” (Englander, 2003:2). This definition might exemplify the type of youth violence understood as 'anti-social behaviour', inter-gang violence, and school fighting/bullying. But such a definition is limited in its practical use as it defines violence as end in itself. What this definition fails to highlight is the more subtle, everyday, yet pervasive forms of violence as process that occur in everyday living. Violent and victimising behaviours may well have an intention of action, but I consider the pressures of structural inequality significant in shaping the actions and the intention behind such actions. My aim through this research is not so much to theorize the causes of violence and victimisation; rather it is to explore how young people themselves understand their own experiences. From the perspective of this research, it is the structural-social-psychological meanings young people apply to their experiences of violence and victimisation which is central to developing an holistic approach to the process of violence.

Broadening the definition and shifting the focus of violence and victimisation to include structural violence helps in understanding violence as a process, rather than an end product in itself. The importance of conceiving of violence as process is argued by Gilligan (2001: 101-102):

“Structural violence is not only the main form of violence, in the sense that poverty kills far more people (almost all of them very poor) than all the behavioural violence put together, it is also the main cause of violent behaviour.” (Italics in original).

Significant for this research is the importance of how young people apply meaning to their perceived and/ or real positions in society - their citizenship - as explained in chapter two. These understandings inform the
ways in which experiences of violence and victimisation are also understood. This provides the theoretical and empirical link between structure and individual agency, and provides a new forum through which to understand the process of citizenship, violence and victimisation.

Theories of Violence
Although theories of violence and victimisation are disparate and multiple, for the most part they can be divided into those approaches that highlight the importance of structural impacts, and those emphasising the importance of individual agency.

Structural-Social Theories of Violence
Structural approaches have historically explored economic exclusion and material poverty as a cause of violence and victimisation (for example, Short, 1997; Thrasher, 1927; Whyte, 1947). The importance of the poverty approach to violence causation is not only that spatially, poverty is distributed unevenly, but that people living in poverty understand and respond to poverty in different ways. Within areas of poverty, individuals are affected by, apply meaning to and respond to violence and victimisation very differently. It is significant for this study that the individuals often most adversely affected by both poverty and violence and victimisation are children and young people (Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a; Pain, 2003; Home Office, 1997). Moreover, it is also children and young people who have limited agency. Their abilities to manage their own experiences, not only of poverty, but also the corresponding effects of violence and victimisation are significantly restricted (Cusick, Bretherick and Goodman, 2001; Lister, 2001c, 2003).

Poverty undoubtedly impacts upon an individual’s experiences of violence and victimisation, and his or her strategies for coping (see Moser and McIlwaine, 2004). However, the ways in which poverty directly causes violence and victimisation are not entirely clear. The link between poverty and experiences of violence and victimisation are also highly complex while
arguments exist to suggest that people living in poverty are more likely to behave violently, victims of violence and victimisation are also most likely to come from the poorest communities (Baskin and Sommers, 1998; Gilligan, 1996; Pain, 2000). One explanation links poverty with inequality, to highlight the pressures of material consumption on unequal wealth. So, it is inequality, rather than poverty per se, that can generate a frustrated youth, taunted by the materiality of a capitalist culture, but who remain structurally unable to meet their aim (Vanderschueren, 1996). In the words of Campbell: “Teenagers accept the ends but not the means; they want the Mercedes but know they cannot get one by conventional means.” (1991: 129).

The urban underclass theory also emerges from a structural perspective, but draws upon and perpetuates the idea of violence and victimisation caused by a 'moral flaw'. This proposes that the growth of a politically disengaged and 'dependant' urban underclass can account for not only the increase in incidence of violence and victimisation, but also for its geographical diffusion (Dean, 1997; Field, 1989; Murray, 1990, 1994). This has been illustrated within the American youth gang literature, where community breakdown due to the growing underclass is seen as the reason for previously 'unaffected' cities experiencing gang problems (see for example, Decker and Van Winkle, 1996 on St Louis; Sikes, 1997, on San Antonio).

This approach also informs the New Labour model of conditional welfare and criminal justice reform. Anti-Social Behaviour policy for example is explicitly linked to the provision of welfare; pro-social behaviour has become a condition of benefit recipient (Home Office, 2003). A major problem with this approach is that it is based upon a 'passive dependency' notion of welfare. The 'failure' of passive dependency becomes individualised, internalised and ultimately sanctioned rather than supported (Beresford, 2001). Underclass theory facilitates the reduction of the responsibility of the state to provide welfare (Field, 1989; Murray, 1994).
Instead, it blames and punishes those in need of welfare support for their violent and victimised experiences.

Poverty and inequality approaches have also been explicitly linked to class structures and (un)employment. This is particularly significant for children and young people growing up in poverty (Bourgois, 1995; McDowell, 2002, 2003a, 2003b; MacLeod, 1995). MacLeod (1995) has clearly shown that the prevailing class structure and the education system play a significant role in the social reproduction of young people’s socio-economic class. He has also shown that perceptions of opportunities decline as young people become aware they are being schooled for low-paid work (see also McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Willis, 1977). Some may then realign their aspirations towards an increasingly violent ‘street economy’ where an alternative value system and basis for self-esteem operates (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995).

Yet, there are also problems with structural approaches to violence and victimisation. Neither poverty nor inequality alone can fully account for violence and victimisation rates. For if poverty and inequality were the absolute cause of violence, a far greater number would be involved in violent behaviours. Only a very small proportion of individuals are violent and these belong to both rich and poor communities. A large minority of the urban poor become victims, as structural frustrations are internalised against whole communities (Bourgois, 2004a). As Bourgois continues, in a highly individualistic society seeped in achievement ideology, the individual blames themselves rather than structural constraints for their situation:

"They [the crack dealers who took part in his ethnography] direct their brutality against themselves and their immediate community, rather than against their structural oppression. Worse yet, they succumb to symbolic violence by not only failing to see the structural dynamics oppressing them, but by actually blaming themselves for their failure” (2004a: 307)
Structural theories of violence and victimisation are in themselves limited, because they do not acknowledge individual agency. Individuals ascribe diverse and intense meanings to poverty, and to the links they perceived between poverty and violence and victimisation. When poverty and marginalisation are understood by an individual to be undermining their very sense of self, violence becomes a coping strategy, a strategy for maintaining the survival of the self (understood both physically and mentally). Violence and victimisation become tools of retrieving self-esteem and a sense of self-worth (Anderson, 1990, 1999; MacLeod, 1995; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003; Phillips, 2003). Theories that fail to link the structural and social-psychological impacts of relative poverty miss the significance of the links between citizenship, violence and victimisation. Relative poverty, inequality and marginalisation manifest themselves in a reduced citizenship status. When this situation takes hold, as Bourgois (2004a) states, young people internalise failures and implode within their communities. If this implosion fails to be understood, it will continue to be punished and controlled only through punitive measures. In such a situation, the cycle of (reduced) citizenship status, violence and victimisation can only continue and increase, causing greater marginalisation and distress.

Social-Psychological Theories of Violence
The theoretical approaches to violence and victimisation described as social-psychological encapsulate conceptualisations that seek to explore the individual agency within the violence and victimisation process. Although not strictly removed from the impacts of structural factors, these approaches focus upon gender, sexuality and ethnicity through a lens of identity politics to explore the causes of violence and victimisation. In this context, individual and collective identity is a fluid (re)formulation; identities are shaped by and themselves shape experiences of violence and victimisation. Also significant are a range of psychological and psychoanalytic understandings of the conscious and unconscious causes of violence and victimisation.
The issue of gender is initially a straightforward one. Those who engage in violence (either as perpetrator or victim) are predominantly male, therefore, the subsequent theorising, accounts mostly for male violence (see Hoffmann et al. 1994; Home Office, 1997, 2003; Klein, 1995; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a). It seems obvious also, that the role of gender identities and the enactment of 'appropriate' gendered roles are significant to understanding the experiences and meanings of violence and victimisation.

In gendered theorizing of research on violence and victimisation, there has been a significant division between femininity and domestic violence (Graham-Bermann and Edleson, 2001; Stanko, 1985, 1990), and masculinity and violence as spectacle (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Goodey, 1997; Greig, 2000; MacLeod, 1995). When femininity has been considered in the public domain, this has commonly been associated with fear of crime and violence (see Koskela, 1998; Pain, 1997, 2000; Stanko, 1985; Valentine, 1989), or with female gang members, constructed as feral deviants (for example, Campbell, 1984, 1987; Chesney-Lind, 1993; Joe-Laider and Hunt, 2001).

The enactment of 'appropriate' gender identities are crucial causes of violence and victimisation, but also directly shape the meaning applied to experiences. Anne Campbell (1991) effectively outlined this in relation to articulated experiences of aggression:

"In men’s accounts of aggression, we are told what it is like to take control, in women’s accounts we hear about what it means to lose control" (Campbell, 1991: 7, emphasis added).

For most women losing control of their aggression was considered a failing, a loss of control over their femininity. For men on the other hand, failing to fight, or failing to show willing to fight was tantamount to losing control of
their masculinity. This is clearly vital to understanding the gendered nature of experiences of violence.

The enactment of 'appropriate' gender identities cannot be separated from sexualised and racialised identities. Socially organised power relations between men and women and among men are constructed historically on the bases of race, class, and sexual preference (Messerschmidt, 2000: 9). The sexualised nature of inter-male violence can be understood through an analysis of behaviours that can instigate violent acts. As Campbell shows, men explained how being verbally abused as 'faggots' led them to become aggressive and violent. However, the term 'faggot' was interpreted as "an accusation not of homosexuality but rather of nonmasculinity" (Campbell, 1991: 6). It is this questioning of hegemonic masculinities that is the underlying issue of such violent incidents. A violent reaction can offer men a reward: "the reward is power over another person, a power that can be used to boost self-esteem or to gain social and material benefits" (ibid: 7). For most women however, as Campbell suggests, this reward is neither available nor desired; for women, self-esteem is less intricately linked to the violence and victimisation process.

From the psychological perspective of social learning, violent behaviours are learnt from experience. Children observing violent behaviours and bullying behaviours for example around the school would then be likely to reproduce these themselves (see for example, Bandura, 1965). Behaviours are learnt in this way, it is asserted, due to the balance of reward and punishment. The reward of increased respect and self-esteem from asserting oneself through violence results in behaviours being further reproduced.

Interestingly, this psychological approach has been largely discredited for being overly simplistic, yet social policy of conditional welfare and punitive policies of control continue to draw on it. Conditional welfare is a manifestation of this 'reward and punish' social learning approach. Welfare (reward) is provided when desirable behaviours are learnt and reproduced.
(i.e. seeking work), welfare is withdrawn (punishment) on the other hand, when the behaviours being learnt and reproduced are not socially and politically desirable (i.e. anti-social behaviour). In the context of anti-social behaviour, this balance of ‘reward and punishment’ is central. Anti-social behaviour is punished by the state through Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, Parenting Orders and so on. Yet the reward for behaving anti-socially - in terms of generating respect - when legitimate avenues of respect are blocked are often greater than the punishment (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; MacLeod, 1995).

Psychoanalytic approaches to violence and victimisation also view early childhood experience as critical to understanding its causes. These highlight for example, the effect of childhood experience and attachment on management of anxiety and neurosis (Freud, 2001). One of the psychoanalytic approaches of Melanie Klein (1997) is of particular interest for the understanding of violence and victimisation and its structural, social and psychological contexts. She suggested children’s internal conflicts were too often unacknowledged, which in turn lead to further emotional distress and violent behaviours. She suggested that many parents believe that for their child (and she argued this was particularly true for girls) to grow up loving and well behaved, they must be talked to as loving, kind and sweet. Parents often feel that the way to deal with jealousy, destructiveness, anger and sadism is to ignore it. Yet, it has been argued that “this behaviour is likely to leave the child alone with these feelings unacknowledged and unrecognised or simply defined as ‘bad’; it is unlikely to help them to modify and integrate these feelings into a more human character, able both to assert itself and feel empathy” (Segal, 1992: 134).

This way of thinking has particular importance for the discourses of children and young people as victims or perpetrators. Simply defining children and young people as ‘bad’ will serve only to cause further distress to children experiencing difficult feelings, thoughts and behaviours. Not offering an environment through which these feelings can be acknowledged by children
and adults alike, children can become overwhelmed by their difficult, and now stifled negative feelings. Indeed, failing to acknowledge particular feelings and thoughts, serves only to bind these feelings with that of shame (Kaufman, 1993; Tomkins, 1963). The psychoanalytic viewpoint can offer one important focus for conceptualising violence and victimisation in the current research: the need to openly acknowledge and explore the full range of classed, gendered, raced, and sexualised meanings individuals apply to their experiences of violence and victimisation.

All these approaches to violence and victimisation however, appear to lack something in terms of youth. Although psychoanalytic viewpoints incorporate childhood through either their focus on working analytically with young children, or through interpreting adult difficulties through the experience of childhood, such approaches are regardless, based upon an adult interpretation of childhood and child behaviour. There is a need to further understand and incorporate young people's own views and voices within an exploration of the violence and victimisation process. There is a need therefore, to acknowledge the multiple meanings applied to experiences of violence, but also to explore the specificity of these in relation to young people. This must also be done through the tangible impacts of political discourse relating to youth and violence and victimisation. It is therefore necessary to look in far greater detail at young people's experiences of violence and victimisation within the context of the complex meanings they attribute to these experiences.

**Conceptualising Youth Violence and Victimisation**

Theorizations of structural pressures linked to poverty, inequality and unemployment commonly focus upon the direct impact these have on adult citizens seeking employment. However, structural inequality undoubtedly has profound direct and indirect impacts upon children and young people growing up in poverty (Lister, 2003; Pain, 2003; Ridge, 2002). Another difficulty with theories of violence is that children and young people are often excluded simply due to definition. Young people's experiences of
violence and victimisation can become naturalised and normalised if bullying and fighting are considered a 'phase' that will be grown out of. Reducing young people's experiences to developmental issues and delinquency serves also to reduce the agency of young people. But young people's understandings and experiences of structural violence and its relation to mundane everyday violence and victimisation are complex and must be explored and understood.

The violence and victimisation that I refer to seeks to encapsulate a wide range of behaviours perpetrated and experienced by young people themselves. Such a definition necessarily includes the political and moral panics surrounding gang behaviours and 'anti-social behaviour'. 'Anti-social behaviour' in this context refers to street groupings, weapon carrying and clothing style (such as hoodies) and so on, but it seeks to understand these from a young person's perspective. 'Anti-social behaviour' in political discourse has created new links between young people and (responsible) public behaviour, but it is commonly recognised that the school also plays a vital role within the community and within young people's violent imaginations. The school is particularly associated with incidences of bullying, but more recently it has been viewed as a site of low level indiscipline and extreme violence and victimisation, reflecting US school shootings, and high profile murders within the UK (Aitken, 2001; Twemlow and Cohen, 2003; Vernberg and Gamm, 2003). Once again there are movements to increase surveillance of young people's behaviours both on the streets and within the school. This, in addition to the complex ways in which young people police their own and peer behaviours, highlights the significance of peer pressure, image and status in the meaning and experience of violence and victimisation.

In short, in the current research, I conceptualise violence and victimisation as a multi-faceted process. It incorporates extreme violence such as
stabbings/ shootings\textsuperscript{16} as well as the everyday experiences of verbal bullying, social isolation and general unease regarding peer pressure. These dynamics themselves are part of a wider process and understanding of structural pressures and inequality. In order to understand young people’s experiences from an holistic perspective it is imperative to explore the issues of peer pressure, image and status within this wider context. These are frames of reference, through which young people understand their experiences, negotiate their identities and forge their self-esteem. A young person’s violent imagination is shaped by these factors. However from a practical political and policy perspective it is often these intricacies that are overlooked or dismissed. It is important to review these theoretical considerations from an empirically based perspective. What young people themselves conceptualise as violence and victimisation may not correspond with academic theory or political discourse. Rather than place my own understanding of violence and victimisation upon the young people, I seek to facilitate their articulation of their own experiences (see chapter four for more detail).

\textbf{Frameworks of Youth Violence and Victimization}

I am not simply seeking to decipher the causes of violence, but rather to place centre stage, an exploration of how young people experience violence and victimisation, and how they apply meaning to such experiences. This will seek to draw upon both structure and agency approaches to theorising violence in order to better understand the views of young people. Central to this framework is an exploration of how young people understand the dynamics and links between violence and victimisation and their citizenship. Also significant is how young people understand violence and victimisation as a consequence of their reduced citizenship status (as set out in chapter two). As such, the frames of reference through which young people experience and apply meaning to violence and victimisation both

\textsuperscript{6} One could argue here that stabbings and shootings are themselves examples of everyday experiences of violence and victimisation in the lives of inner-city young people. However, even if these experiences are everyday, they still, I argue, represent more serious aspects of the violence and victimisation process.
within the school and on the streets are gender, sexuality, ethnicity and class. In this context, the intersection between structural factors and individual agency is significant. For young people, bullying and street violence are the two most commonly experienced areas of violent interaction (Anderson, 1999; DfES, 2002; MacLeod, 1995; Olweus, 1993; Smith, 2000). Bullying and street violence are also interactions shaped by complex and often visible peer dynamics; the negotiation of friendships through bullying and street violence are commonplace.

The Dynamics of Bullying
Bullying occurs through social interaction and the negotiation of peer dynamics. Although bullying occurs within the workplace, it is most commonly associated with the site of the school. As such, bullying can represent a form of normalised violence and victimisation in the eyes of young people and teachers alike. Coretta Phillips has drawn attention to the gendered importance of this type of 'normalised violence':

"Young women’s accounts, which drew on personal, direct and vicarious experiences, revealed that fighting by girls (and boys) was a regular occurrence in school, and as such, constituted 'normal' behaviour" (2003: 719).

A great deal of research has emerged within the field of bullying which highlights the mundane, pervasive and 'normal' nature of bullying (for overviews see Olweus, 1993; Smith and Sharp, 1994). This in many ways perpetuates the problem. When violence and victimisation behaviours such as bullying become accepted as 'normal', they become embedded within the culture of the school, of teachers and of students. However, much of the bullying literature has outlined the complexity of bullying and the significant meanings young people attach to it.
Definitions of bullying are varied, but most agree that bullying relates to a repetitive victimisation. According to one definition, the process of bullying:

"Typically involves physical aggression towards the child and/or their possessions, and/or social and relational aggression, such as rumour mongering or verbal assaults." (Fonagy, 2003: 224).

Bullying, as sub-section of violence and victimisation is clearly part of a wider process. There is little debate that those children and young people who engage in bullying have themselves been victimised during their childhood (Fonagy, 2003; Smith and Ananiadou, 2003). Equally uncontested is the link between victimisation and mental health difficulties in adolescence and throughout adulthood: "Victims of bullying often experience anxiety and depression, low self-esteem, physical and psychosomatic complaints" (Smith and Ananiadou, 2003: 193; see also Jennett et al. 2004; Fonagy, 2003; Rivers, 1995; Roland, 2002). It is also significant that some young people are at greater risk from victimisation and the subsequent impacts of damagingly low-self esteem (Jennett et al. 2004; Smith and Ananiadou, 2003; Smith, 2004). Young people from ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience a greater degree of victimisation (Siann et al. 1994). Racist bullying has also been found to have overtly (hetero)sexual undertones:

"Asian boys ... were constructed as not powerful or sexually attractive and so were liable to be subjected to homophobic name-calling. By way of contrast, Black boys of African-Caribbean descent were less likely to be called “gay”..."

---

17 Although the notion of repetition is problematic as research has shown significant gender differences in the nature of bullying. Girls are more likely to repeat victimisation through verbal abuse and social isolation, whereas boys are more likely to engage in one off physical attacks (Phillips, 2003; Siann et al. 1994).
because they were seen as strongly heterosexual." (Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003: 190).

Ian Rivers (2001) has also importantly outlined that young people face significant bullying in relation to their perceived sexual orientation. The implications of victimisation for the emotional wellbeing of this group are stark, with over half of young lesbian and gay students bullied at school reporting suicidal ideation (see also Carr, 2005; Laukkanen et al. 2005; Rivers, 2001). Bullying and victimisation is commonly linked to challenges to sexual orientation (Carr, 2005; Clarke et al. 2004; Plummer, 2000; Rivers, 2001). These challenges are intricately linked to gender and to racialised norms and appropriate behaviours.

Gilligan (2001) has outlined the importance of gender and sexuality roles and norms for understanding respect in relation to violence and victimisation. He asks how it is that men and women’s respect is challenged, through showing how men’s and women’s construction of respect differs. For men, physical challenges to respect involve shows of superior aggression: a spectacle of violence (see also Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 2004b; Greig, 2000). While these can incorporate physical and verbal victimisation, their symbolic meaning is clear. These reflect challenges to masculinity through doubting the physical prowess of the other, or undermining their (hetero)sexual dominance18 (see Frosh et al. 2002; Gilligan, 2001).

Heterosexual young men within the school setting, who fail to engage in heterosexual practices, become challenged both physically and psychologically in relation to their masculinity. Same sex attraction is not necessary: “in other words, the ‘heterosexual sissy’ is like the gay male, positioned within homosexual oppression” (Messerschmidt, 2000: 95, drawing on Hunter, 1993). Similar findings have emerged through a range of

---

18 This can be achieved through overt challenges of heterosexuality i.e. ‘faggot’, ‘queer’ etc. or indirectly through challenges to (adult) masculine sexual prowess i.e. ‘boy’.
school-based studies (Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Nayak and Kehily, 1996; Philips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003; Plummer, 2000). Homosexuality often is not understood as 'same-sex desire', rather it is understood as a framework through which young men and young women negotiate their self-esteem, image and status (Connell, 1995, 2000; Kaufman and Raphael, 1996; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Messerschmidt, 2000; Epstein and Johnson, 1998). For many young people it is necessary to position one’s self in opposition to homosexual identities. One effective way of doing this is through the spectacle of violence (Messerschmidt, 2000). To fail to acknowledge this within the site of the school can perpetuate a damaging and unregulated ‘heterosexualised surveillance’ (see Aitkin, 2001b; Gilligan, 2001; Kimmel and Mahler, 2003 on homophobia and school shootings).

Negotiations of identities within the context of gender, sexuality, ethnicity and class are crucial aspects of the formation of a social structure within the school. Self-esteem, status and respect are played out through the school and violence and victimisation is the tool by which this is achieved (see Ahmed and Braithwaite, 2004, on links between bullying and shame). In this sense, as Phillips outlines:

"The pecking order of the school was maintained through the use of physical aggression and violence whereby physical strength and dominance were regarded as desirable qualities by many girls. Seemingly, many of the girls aspired to power, status and reputation within social hierarchies..." (2003: 714).

In this sense, violence and victimisation is by no means the domain of young men. But there do appear to be significant differences in the experiences of young men and young women within the school. While victimisation rates are similar, young men appear more likely to engage in bullying behaviours than young women (Whitney and Smith, 1993). This may also reflect the
intertwined nature of violence and masculinity. Young men may gain respect and status through openly expressing their engagement in violence or bullying, whereas this relationship for young women is less clear cut (see Campbell, 1993). This also links to the gendered nature of appropriate bullying; thus, while young men are more likely to be subjected to direct bullying or open attacks of violence, girls are more susceptible to social isolation and exclusion (Siann et al. 1994). In turn, Thorne (1993) has also shown how these differences are reflected in peer-group relationships: girls are more likely to bond through disclosing intimacies, whereas boys bond through aggression. Clearly therefore, young people’s meanings and experiences of violence and victimisation are linked to peer groupings, peer pressure and the negotiation of friendships (Hey, 1997; Phillips, 2003). These group dynamics are not confined to the school they are reproduced and enacted on the street.

The Dynamics of Street Violence, Groups and Gangs
The perceived problem of youth gangs has long dominated academic understandings of youth violence (see for example, Thrasher, 1927; Whyte, 1943). While early studies drew upon an urban ecology perspective, more recent attempts to understand young people’s street and gang violence has focussed upon the intersection between structure and agency (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995, 2004b; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Chesney-Lind, 1993; Decker and Van Winkle, 1996; MacLeod, 1995).

A number of studies have drawn upon structural inequality and social reproduction theory to explore their impacts upon inner city young people (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Kotlowitz, 1991; MacLeod, 1995). The most interesting issue to emerge from all these accounts is the assault on young people’s self-esteem and respect experienced through structural inequality - and how this influences young people’s street behaviours. From the perspective of MacLeod (1995), the mismatch of achievement ideology and social reproduction of socio-economic class is central to young people’s acceptance or rejection of ‘conventional norms’. For MacLeod, the levelling
of young people’s aspirations reflects their interpretation of achievement ideology:

"By internalising the blame for failure, students lose their self-esteem and then accept their eventual placement in low-status jobs as the natural outcome of their own shortcomings.” (1995: 113).

Macleod (1995), like Bourgois (1995), views the internalisation of structural inequality to be particularly debilitating and sees the significance of this in the protection of self-esteem. Anderson also places great significance on self-esteem and the negotiation of respect:

"An existential link has been created between manhood and one’s self-esteem, so that it has become hard to say which is primary. For many inner-city youths, manhood and respect are two sides of the same coin; physical and psychological well-being are inseparable, and both require a sense of control, of being in charge.” (1999: 91).

For the 'Hallway Hangers' and the 'Brothers' depicted in MacLeod's (1995) US study, the Harlem crack dealers of Bourgois's (1995) ethnography and the young people in Anderson's (1999) 'Germantown slum' there is one common goal: self-esteem and respect. The 'fight' to negotiate respect is critical to understanding the dynamics of public peer groupings, gang relations and the street economy. In the case of the Hallway Hangers, their, at times violent, behaviour:

"...must be understood as an attempt by its members to insulate themselves from... negative judgements and to provide a context in which some semblance of self-respect and d’gnity can be maintained... providing a realm in which to be bad and tough are the main criteria for respect, the
peer group of the Hallway Hangers reverses conventional cultural norms.” (1995: 117)

Whilst gang behaviours do exist, they act as a tool for respect negotiation. The gang is one peer group formation that facilitates the violent negotiation of respect. For young people who consider themselves undermined by conventional norms of self-esteem and respect, the gang can serve this one critical function. If violence is necessarily a spectacle for so many young people, an audience is crucial (Goffman, 1969; Greig, 2000). The gang is not only an interested audience, it is one that shares the subversion of cultural norms and embraces violence as a form of respect negotiation.

For Philipe Bourgois’ East Harlem crack dealers, the need to generate respect is more tangible, but no less significant:

“Caesar’s braggadocio celebration of masculine violence is good public relations. Periodic public displays of aggression are crucial to his professional credibility [as a crack dealer]... Caesar’s reputation for violence ensures his long-term job security. When Caesar shouted his violent story out the door of the crackhouse for everyone in the vicinity to hear, he was not bragging idly or dangerously.” (2004a: 302).

For 19 year old Caesar, the spectacle of violence is necessary for his professional competence; in East Harlem, masculine violence and the public enactment of respected masculinity are inseparable.

Anderson (1999) too outlines the importance of respect, and its strategic importance in the negotiation of street politics and welfare:

"Respect becomes critical for staying out of harm’s way. In public the person whose very appearance - including his or
her clothing, demeanour, and way of moving, as well as "the crowd" he or she runs with... [are considered]... a measure of respect. Much of the code has to do with achieving and holding respect. And children learn its rules early.” (1999: 66-67).

Respect in the inner-city is inscribed in a range of 'codes of the street'. Demanding respect from the other requires a presentation of oneself as 'tough', 'fearless' and 'potentially dangerous' (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 2004a; Goffman, 1969; MacLeod, 1995). As such, respect is presented through symbols: clothing, hairstyle, graffiti and style of walking all become symbols that state individually and/or collectively, one is 'not to be messed with' (Anderson, 1990, 1999; McDonald, 2003; MacDonald, 2002; Phillips, 1999).

It is clear then that experiences of and responses to structural inequality are varied, and shaped by individual agency. The maintenance of self-esteem underpins the ways in which a reduced citizenship status is understood, accepted and resisted by these young people. The importance of self-esteem and respect for young people as they grow-up also fits well with many approaches to theorising gang activities. Gangs are often considered to be a symptom of community disorder, of social, family and moral breakdown. The gang in this context becomes a significant 'surrogate family', providing social, economic and emotional support amongst peers let down by adult institutions of care. Many gang activities are positive, not only for the community, but also in the supporting of gang members themselves (Venkatesh, 1998). The function (and potential function) of gangs is emerging from a more nuanced understanding of the psychological pressures manifested from structural inequality (Bourgois, 1995, 2004a; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; McDonald, 2003; MacLeod, 1995; Marquez, 1999; Nurge, 2003). Such research has highlighted the role of gangs not only in offering young people social stability in often volatile political and economic conditions, but also the role of youth gangs acting as protection
and informal community police (Moser and McIlwaine, 2004). Gangs, peer groupings and public behaviours must not therefore be theorised in strictly negative terms. Many of these behaviours are a result of the structural, social and psychological pressures of inequality. In a society that all too often shames its citizens, the fight for respect becomes more pressing and more immediate.

Shame and Respect in the Violence Process

The importance of shame within the violence and victimisation process has been outlined implicitly throughout this chapter. My aim here is to explore why, in talking of respect and self-esteem, we must first talk of shame. Self-esteem represents a fluid, but favourable opinion of the self (Emler, 2001). Shame and the infliction of shame can cause an individual to reassess their self-esteem. The existing literature on violence and victimisation has outlined how engagement in bullying, gang violence and other forms of violent victimisation is linked to an individual's desire to be respected by peers, often in the context of poverty, exclusion and family breakdown (Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; MacLeod, 1995; Phillips, 1999). The existing literature is much less clear however on what it is that young people feel and experience so negatively prior to engagement in violence and victimisation, or what it is that engagement in violence and victimisation can offer that other forms of social interaction cannot (see however Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Gilligan, 1996 2001; Katz, 1988; MacLeod, 1995). While self-esteem and respect explore feelings that can be gained from violence and victimisation, the concept of shame allows an acknowledgement and exploration of what it is that young people are trying to move away from.

According to Sennett, respect is accrued through three main ways: first, though self-development, and the development of abilities and skills. Second, respect can be achieved through care of the self; and third, through the giving of respect back to others (2004: 63-64). But if respect can be accrued, it is also important to consider how it can be removed or
lost, and here it is shame that appears most significant. Shame is a primary affect\(^{19}\) (Tomkins, 1963). It can be incited through a range of cultural, economic, political and social factors (Sayer, 2004). Shame is the primary affect of self-esteem, self-worth and respect; it is also the primary affect of fear, distress and rage (Kaufman and Raphael, 1996). Shame underpins a sense of self, and in turn, the presentation of self (Goffman, 1969).

A shamed individual can respond with fear, rage, distress and contempt (or a combination). The way in which an individual responds to shame is exactly that, individual. Yet, shame for all individuals whether incited by experiences of poverty, racism, youth, homophobia, the undermining of gender identity and so on, is experienced first in relation to the eyes of whomever is inflicting shame (for example, the government, religious groups, majority ethnic groups, adults, peers, family and so on). Secondly, through repeat experience the shaming eyes turn inward, an individual shames themselves, without the need for the presence of others (Kaufman, 1993; Tomkins, 1963). In this context, structural inequality focuses societal shame upon individuals living in poverty. Importantly, this can soon become internalised, and shame is not a reflection of social injustice, but a reflection of personal failure (see Bourgois, 1995; MacLeod, 1995). As Tomkins explains:

"If distress is the affect of suffering, shame is the affect of indignity, of defeat, of transgression and of alienation ... It does not matter whether the humiliated one has been shamed by derisive laughter or whether he (sic) mocks himself. In either event he feels himself naked, defeated, alienated, lacking in dignity or worth" (1963: 118).

Shame can trigger a range of emotions, most notably, fear, distress, rage and contempt. These feelings can be directed towards the self, or towards

\(^{19}\) Shame is an innate reaction, provoking physiological mechanisms that underlie all emotion. For Tomkins (1963), ‘affect’ is the innate biological reaction, and only when this has been combined with the memory of previous experience, is ‘emotion’ experienced.
others. When rage and contempt are directed towards the self, self-harming behaviours are likely, when directed towards others, violence and victimisation are the likely outcomes. Nathanson (2000) outlines the two main ways in which unacknowledged shame is managed. Firstly, through withdrawal and attack of the self, and secondly, though avoidance and attack of others. 'Avoidance' is understood through behaviours such as self-medicating drug and alcohol use and withdrawal. 'Attack other' behaviour is described as:

"Insulting disrespect that 'must' be handled by compensatory attack lest the individual suffer further shame. Attack other behaviour includes insults, verbal or physical attack, bullying of any kind, sexual sadism, or anything that seems to prevent the momentary sense of inferiority by (for only that moment) feeling bigger and better than the other guy" (Nathanson, 2000: 7).

The way in which an individual manages their experiences of shame is thus likely to have a direct impact both upon their propensity for violence and the ways in which meanings are applied to their experiences.

James Gilligan (1996; 2001) developed a shame-based risk factor approach in order to account for the variations in incidences of violence within, for example, areas of poverty. In his theory of violence, devised from detailed and prolonged psychiatric and psychotherapeutic work in high security male prisons, Gilligan (2001) explores shame as the key initial trigger of violence and victimisation. He suggests that social forces of poverty, inequality, (hetero)sexism, racism, age and so on do not themselves correlate with violence and victimisation. Instead, he suggests, these factors correlate with increasing feelings of shame:

"The cause of violence is not, for example poverty as such, but rather, that there is a correlation between poverty and
violence, because both are correlated, statistically (but only statistically) with the real cause of violence, which is overwhelming and otherwise inescapable and ineradicable shame” (Gilligan, 2001: 67).

When 'failure' of aspiration, achievement and material gain is individualised, the likelihood increases that blame too will be individualised, and subsequently internalised (Bourgois, 1995; Lister, 2001b; MacLeod, 1995). These dynamics are reproduced through peer relations both within the school and on the streets. Within the school, achievement ideology must be either supported or rejected, but often for those suffering at the hands of structural inequality the decision is clear:

"Lacking in nearly every category that defines success in America, the Hallways Hangers latch onto and inflate the one quality they still have: their masculinity.” (MacLeod, 1995: 141).

For the Hallway Hangers, their violent protest masculinity becomes a defence against what they 'lack' within American defined success.

It is proposed that the shame approach to conceptualising violence can therefore go some way to bridging the theoretical gap between structural-social and social-psychological approaches to violence and victimisation. It can move towards accounting for increased violence and victimisation rates amongst children and young people. This can be understood through their greater experiences of poverty, inequality, and marginalisation. Lacking control over their experiences of poverty, young people also suffer from a lack of agency and voice, their citizenship status being effectively reduced (Gaskell, 2003, 2005; Such and Walker, 2004; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). Young people are continually pressured to engage with a consumer society

---

2 Aside from generating incomes through criminal activities, there are minimal opportunities for children and young people alone to relieve their experiences of poverty.
(McDonald, 2003), yet they do not have the capacity to legitimately generate an income to allow them to do so. Adolescence is also a period of physical and mental upheaval, change and development. Such upheaval exposes young people to situations which are potentially shaming experiences. If these shaming situations are repeated, and routes out of shame are blocked\(^2\), violence can then be seen as an increasingly viable route to self-esteem and respect.

Shame it seems is inextricably linked to structural factors such as poverty, exclusion, inequality and failures in state welfare, and it is also critical to the meanings an individual applies to the nature of their citizenship (Gilligan, 1996, 2001; Kaufman, 1993; Scheff and Retzinger, 1991). Shame is itself a form of structural violence. These structural factors are also and importantly cross-cut with the issues of gender, age, ethnicity and sexuality (Gilligan, 2001). By exploring experiences of violence and victimisation with an appreciation of shame and its tangible outcomes of self-esteem, respect and disrespect, a more intimate understanding of the process of violence and victimisation can be achieved.

Concluding Comments
One factor to emerge from both structure and agency approaches to theorising young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation is the importance of self-esteem and respect. As McDonald explains:

"The phenomenon of respect is universal in the cultures of marginal young people, and is the key to understanding a new social reality" (2003: 69).

Self-esteem and respect are central to experiences of the victimisation and to causation for perpetrators of violence. Self-esteem and respect are

\(^2\) Routes out of shame are in many cases blocked because of the lack of acknowledgement of negative feelings. Shame itself is a shaming feeling, which makes it only more likely to go unacknowledged. Acknowledging shame only add humiliation (itself a heightened form of shame) to shame (Sayer, 2004).
integral to a young person’s sense of self. While these are not bounded within space, they are understood and experienced through the spaces of the school and the street. The school and the street are themselves fluid spaces. The meaning applied to schools impacts upon their local communities. Even more importantly in this context, the school becomes a staging area for violence, where disputes can become part of the culture of the school. When achievement ideology, in which the school is seeped is rejected, young people find a new meaning for the school; the school then becomes an extension of the street (Anderson, 1999).

Schools are spaces where young people are educated for the workplace. They are also spaces where young people are ‘endowed’ with the ‘moral values of society’. The significance of school surveillance is clearly set out by New Labour public service reform:

“One indication of the tightening of the new of social control around children and childhood can be seen in the variety of mechanisms, established in recent years, which reflect explicit educational objectives while concealing some more implicit ones of regulation and surveillance.” (James and James, 2001: 215).

Through a range of political reforms and initiatives, the school is being reinforced as both a site and ideology of mental, physical and spatial regulation.

Both the school and the street are sites of regulation and surveillance. Children and young people’s behaviours are controlled through education, welfare and criminal justice reform, with the political aim of creating ‘responsible citizens’. However, from the range of theoretical and empirical arguments set out in this chapter, young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation are more complex than can be understood through a discourse of control. Young people apply meaning to their experiences of
structural violence and attempt to negotiate their self-esteem and respect through everyday violence. Understanding experiences of structural inequality such as poverty, racism, gender inequality and (hetero)sexism are crucial to an holistic exploration of young people's experiences of violence and victimisation, within the context of their perceived citizenship. Building upon these theoretical debates, the current research will explore young people's experiences of violence and victimisation within both the school and the street. It will, however, maintain a fluid notion of both school and street and explore young people's experiences of the division. This research will also seek to contribute to the debates on experiences of structural inequality and on the formation of violent identities in order to protect a sense of self-esteem and generate respect. It will also explore the extent to which young people forge their experiences of reduced citizenship status into violent presentations of self.
Methodological Approaches

"It ain't what you do it's the way that you do it
It ain't what you do it's the time that you do it
It ain't what you do it's the place that you do it
And that's what gets results."

(Bananarama, 1982. It ain't what you do)

How childhood is understood, whether as a pre-social developmental phase, as a transitionary period, or as a qualitatively different but equal stage of the life course, shapes every stage of the research process (Harden et al. 2000). The most significant factors underpinning the practice of youth research are the beliefs and assumptions a researcher harbours about the nature of childhood (ibid, 2000). These beliefs are brought into the research process and have direct implications as regards epistemology and methodological tools. Recent calls within academic and policy literature to 'give youth a voice' reflect a changing conceptualisation of childhood and youth, but one still very much grounded in a Piagetian approach to an age based development of child competence (Harden et al. 2000; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Piaget, 1950; Valentine, Butler, and Skelton, 2001).

The most widely accepted approach to childhood and youth is currently understood through the discourse of the 'new social studies of childhood' (Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Qvortrup, 1994). This encompasses disciplines of sociology, anthropology, geography, youth work, social care and so on. The 'new social studies of childhood' is an interdisciplinary approach to working with, rather than on, children and young people. Underpinning this is a theoretical move away from conceptualising children and young people as 'adults in waiting' to understanding childhood as a pre-adult phase of developmental competence (Goldson, 1997; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998). A child or young person is
now 'understood' not simply as a future person, but as a feeling, thinking, behaving individual of the present (Harden et al. 2000; Valentine, Butler and Skelton, 2001). Children and young people are understood not as a homogenous group, but as a group impacted by age, gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality and other 'markers of difference' (Matthews, 2001; Matthews et al. 2000; Young and Barrett, 2001). At the same time, children and young people's experience is shaped by their minority status. They experience a lack of agency and voice in a society where a hierarchy of knowledge places adult understandings of childhood above children's understandings of childhood (Gaskell, 2005; Qvortrup, 1994). Because of these considerations, it seems important to acknowledge childhood and youth as a qualitatively different, yet equally important, experiences to those of adulthood.

Giving Youth a Voice

The comprehensive calls to 'give youth a voice' through academic and policy research, whilst being welcomed, must also raise a number of questions: Why is youth voice necessary or desirable, and what kind of voice are young people enacting? Any consideration of why a voice might be necessary or desirable must incorporate an understanding of the nature of research. Firstly, research can be a predominantly scholarly endeavour which seeks to enhance a knowledge based around children and young people. The second category could be described as 'service driven'; it is research that asks how services to young people can be better delivered (Curtis et al. 2004). Neither approach to research is, I would argue, more significant than the other, but the underlying reasons for study, and therefore the reasons why a 'youth voice' might be considered necessary or desirable, do differ.

Again of course, these questions cannot be approached without thinking through epistemological approaches to youth research. These questions are heavily influenced by a researcher's understanding of childhood and youth (Harden et al. 2000). Before embarking on these debates, it seems
appropriate to position myself within the current research. Having stated that the views a researcher brings into the research process regarding their understanding of childhood and youth are imperative to any such endeavour, the following seems necessary.

**Personally Speaking**

My motivations when approaching, designing and conducting youth research are undoubtedly shaped by my own personal experiences and beliefs. I argue also that theoretically and empirically my choices and designs cannot be separated, nor should they be. Theoretically, the way that I approach childhood and youth, is in many ways, akin to that of the 'new social studies of childhood' (Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Qvortrup, 1994). I believe that childhood and youth does *not* represent a 'pre-social' stage of development and that children and young people must *not* be considered primarily as 'adults in the making'. This leads me to what I believe to be one of the main drawbacks of much of the literature to emerge from this 'new social studies' approach. It seems that whilst academics and researchers are keen to state what they believe childhood is *not*, they are less inclined to outline how they themselves are conceptualising childhood in their own workings. For this reason it seems significant to outline my own beliefs of the 'meaning' of childhood.

I consider childhood to be primarily a period of development. This, however, I do not understand in a rigid Piagetian sense of competence development through stages. Rather, childhood is a period of steep mental and physical development, characterised by a fluidity of change and upheaval. It seems to me unsatisfactory to suggest simply that childhood and adulthood ought to be considered as 'equal'. I do consider childhood and adulthood to be equal in many ways, especially in that the importance of childhood experiences must carry an equal weight to the experiences of adults. At the same time however, the inequality I see between children and adults is that children *do* require protection when their wellbeing is placed at risk. I do believe that when adult carers fail to protect their
children, there must be statutory obligations of protection in place. Such a belief, I am aware, is at odds with some socialisation views of childhood.

As previously stated, my views of childhood are undoubtedly shaped by my experiences, and I am wary that terms such as ‘protection’ might incite the types of binary knowledge of welfare and control I argued against in chapter two. However, I feel privileged that many children and young people have previously (and during the current research) allowed me access to their life experiences, life experiences often scarred to varying degrees by abuse, neglect and suffering (Gaskell, 2002; 2003; 2005). From this privileged standpoint, I will always argue that children both need and should be entitled to welfare and protection. But within this, they need to be listened to and acknowledged and respected for themselves. Youth voice therefore is central to all my research endeavours. I seek to listen to, understand, and reproduce young people’s experiences to the best of my ability and in the most honest and meaningful way possible.

This leads me to what I consider to be the second personal motivation in my research endeavours. I see childhood and youth as a qualitatively different experience to adulthood (due in the main to the oppressive and hierarchical nature of ‘adult knowledge’). I see childhood also as an experience that needs to be protected and supported, but first and foremost, understood. I strongly believe in engaging in politically meaningful and academically rigorous research. Children and young people’s individual and collective experiences need to be understood before they can be protected and supported through policy intervention.

Finally, these personal beliefs heavily influence my approach and practical engagement within the research process. As such, my research work seeks to work with young people as individuals, as individuals whose experiences are significant, and whose personal interpretations of, and meanings applied to, such experiences are imperative. I therefore seek to work with young people ‘in the present’ and ‘where they are’, not where they might
be in the future. Therefore, the environment I seek to provide young people with is a research encounter that is non-judgemental and non-threatening.22

The personal experiences and beliefs set out here will emerge throughout the research process. I do not believe that research can be or indeed ought to be objective. When two (or more) individuals are brought together in a research encounter, it is inevitably an emotional one. It will evoke feelings, thoughts and behaviours within both participants and researcher. These are not undesirable, yet they must be acknowledged. I believe when emotional reactions exist, but are not acknowledged, problems within the research encounter and process can arise. When these reactions are acknowledged and incorporated within the research process, it can become a far more intimate and meaningful endeavour.

Youth Voice and Youth Geography
Within the area of youth geography, 'youth voice' takes centre stage (see for example, Aitken, 2001; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Matthews, Limb and Percy-Smith, 1998; Pain, 2003; Skelton, 2001; Valentine, 1999). The desire to give youth a voice seems to be based upon the assumption that children and young people have gone unheard within policy and academic forums (Barron, 2000). This lack of youth voice is a cause for concern on two fronts. Firstly, young people have simply been ignored by policy makers and academics alike. Secondly, and more pervasive, children and young people, have not simply been excluded from academic research, but their voices and experiences have been overtly and covertly controlled throughout the research process (James and Prout, 1990; James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Qvortrup, 1994). This control is often unacknowledged, and emerges from

22 This will be discussed in greater detail when outlining the methodological tools employed.
23 There is a convincing argument that until recently, children and young people have been excluded from formal government policy consultation (Sinclair, 2004; Stafford et al. 2003; Tisdall and Dav's, 2004). From the perspective of this research, children and young people under the age of 16 years have been excluded from formal statistical and other forms of data (such as the British Crime Survey), while at the same time, they have been hit hardest by punitive policies to reduce crime, violence and offending (through Anti-Social Behaviour Orders). This reflects, the importance I place upon the need to understand young people's experience, before interventions such as protection and control can be implemented.
those beliefs that a researcher brings into the research process (Harden et al. 2000). If childhood and youth is considered to be a period of reduced developmental competence, the resulting ‘findings’ will reflect this incompetence (Qvortrup, 1994). Young people’s views will not be reproduced for what they are. Rather, they will be reproduced as a reflection of what a researcher thinks they are. This is a subtle, but fundamental difference based upon the conceptualisation of childhood.

Within youth geography literature, a great deal has been made - in relation to the need for youth voice - regarding a necessary shift towards re-conceptualising young people as active agents (Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999b; Matthews, 2001; Holloway and Valentine, 2000). Young people are increasingly conceptualised as different but equal to adults in many ways: most notably equal regarding their ability to impact upon their environments and their lives (Holloway and Valentine, 2000). This epistemological shift has led to a qualitatively different way of practically working with, rather than on children and young people (McDowell, 2001; Matthews, 2001; Pain and Francis, 2003; Valentine, 1999, 2000). Many convincing arguments have been made suggesting that children and young people need to be included more intimately within the research design, analysis and dissemination in order to redistribute power inequalities (Kesby, Kindon and Pain, 2005; Morrow and Richards, 1996; Punch, 2002; Valentine, 1999).

The second theoretical shift, upon which the desire for ‘youth voice’ is based, seems to be the challenge to binary knowledge. The developmental approach to child and youth competence is underpinned by a binary knowledge, segregating adult and youth knowledge, and significantly, placing greater importance upon the knowledge of adults. This binary knowledge not only maintains all children and young people in a subordinate position to that of adults, but also and significantly for this research, further subordinates particular groups of children and young people as less knowledgeable and less deserving. The binary knowledges of ‘innocent-
delinquent', 'victim-perpetrator' and 'welfare-control' organise children and young people along the lines of deserving and undeserving (Stainton-Rogers, 2001). Importantly, these binaries are based upon adult imposed 'ideals of appropriate youth behaviour' (see for example Bondi, 1993; Rose, 1993 for wider debates of dualistic knowledge).

Power in the Research Process
The distribution of power within youth research, and the assumptions upon which the nature of the power relationship is based is central to my theoretical and practical approach to research. Assumptions of power are also central to research conducted under the umbrella of youth geography (see for example, Curtis et al. 2004; Harden et al. 2000; McDowell, 2001; Matthews and Limb, 1999; Matthews, 2001; Morrow and Richards, 1996; Skelton, Valentine and Butler, 2001). However, my assumptions of power in the research encounter, I believe, place me at odds with some of the existing youth geography literature. Many of the existing concerns are attributed to adult 'power over' a research participant (Alderson and Goodey, 1996; Harden et al. 2000; Morris-Roberts, 2001; Valentine, 1999).

In terms of the research encounter, the redistribution of power has been attempted through the use of innovative methodological tools (Harden et al. 2000; Hill et al. 1996; Morrow, 1998; Pain and Francis, 2003; Punch, 2002; Valentine, 1999).

The notion of 'power over' is highlighted by Hugh Matthews: "Not only is there a gap in age and often a difference in bodily size; there is also an undeniable difference in status within society" (Matthews, 2001: 117). This view seems to draw upon that of Gill Valentine, who suggests also that there is an "obvious power imbalance between adults and children in terms of biological age, bodily size, lack of knowledge, experience and social and economic status..." (Valentine, 1999: 149 emphasis added). My experience during the current and my previous research encounters leads me to distance myself and my research practice from this viewpoint (Gaskell, 2002; 2003; 2005).
Theoretically, I approach research as a forum to enable and explore young people’s own articulated experiences. From this perspective, I don’t need to feign ignorance; I can claim no knowledge of their experience. By bringing this assumption into the research process, I always view the individuals or groups with whom I am speaking, or to whom I am listening, to be of great significance. I would therefore, always assume myself to be in a position of powerlessness, derived from my own ‘lack of knowledge’.

My research participants have, in many ways, power over me as the researcher. They first and foremost have the power to speak or not. They also have the power over their own experiences and the ways in which they articulate them. It is their experience and knowledge that I am privileged to be allowed access to. By viewing the research process as an enabling one, whereby participants can, if they wish, articulate their own experiences and the meanings they attach to their experiences, the research encounter itself, I believe, cannot be one of researcher power over the participant.

This enabling nature of the research process was further confirmed by other factors. Firstly, the current research asks young people, if they feel comfortable to do so, to explore their experiences of violence and victimisation, within their broader socio-political context. This topic in itself offers an environment for young people to become aware of and articulate their physicality. Being slight of frame, and not looking a great deal older than the young people with whom I work, made a lack of my own power starkly obvious to the young people and to myself. In addition to this, I spoke to all the young people in environments in which they were familiar - their school or youth group. I was the outsider. On their territory, there was no way that I could force a young person to talk if they didn’t want to (nor would I ever try to force anyone into talking to me). They were undoubtedly in control of what they articulated.

I will not argue however, that as a researcher, I have no power over the complete research process. On the contrary, I have extensive power over the analysis of my participant’s experiences and the ways in which I
disseminate them. In this sense, once again the experiences and beliefs I bring into the research process impact upon my analysis and dissemination. I believe that when I listen to young people’s experiences, intently, non-judgementally, and from a position lacking in knowledge, my interpretation and analysis of findings will reflect, as closely as I can, the experiences of the young people themselves. Approaching research from this perspective, the power a researcher has to (mis)represent a young person’s views can be minimised.

A Framework for Youth Research

A sophisticated methodological framework is required in order to engage meaningfully with both young people and policy makers. To fully understand young people’s experience of violence, victimisation and citizenship, it is necessary to bring together both the rhetoric of youth, and the experiences of real youth. In order to engage with each aspect of this framework however it is necessary to bring together various different methodological approaches. To gain an intimate and meaningful insight into young people’s experiences of violence and citizenship, an extensive-intensive approach is also required (see figure 4.1). In the case of the current research there is a clear two-fold need to develop an extensive data set relating to young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation (their victimisation rates, perpetration rates, coping strategies and so on). Firstly, this is needed to create a body of information in order to understand the experiences of a marginalised group who have been written out of national scale surveying. Secondly, before embarking on intensive research, the nature of young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation is needed. As I stated previously, I claim no knowledge of these young people’s experiences, so this approach will prevent the researcher placing his/her own preconceived ideas onto the expectations of the research.
In addition, in order to interact and understand the experiences of young people, intensive, qualitative, academically rigorous research is required. This stage of the research allows information gathered from an extensive stage of research to be developed in the detail required for a sophisticated understanding of young people's experiences. For this reason, I place great emphasis on the qualitative nature of the current research. These two phases of the research process clearly require very different methodological tools in order to fulfil the aims of engaging with academic and policy discourses as well as young people's own experiences.

Methodological tools chosen for work with young people should not be based upon binary knowledge placing adults and young people in opposition. Although I remain open minded to all types of methodological approaches, I do not believe that there are rigid categories of adult methodologies (interviews, focus groups and so on) and children's methodologies (for example, drawing and mapping). For this reason, I felt it was necessary to engage with a mixed method approach. This would enable me to work with the largest possible group of young people and to gain the most sophisticated information possible. I therefore use methodological tools that rely upon a range of verbal, written and artistic forms of articulation from the participants. I use techniques that have been traditionally associated with both adults and with children. At the same time, I do not argue in favour of using this approach simply because I am working with
children and young people. On the contrary, I argue that using mixed methods can gain the most meaningful information from any research encounter, regardless of the characteristics of the participant group.

Locating the Research

Before outlining the specific nature of the methodological tools employed during the process of this research it seems important to locate the research site. I draw in part upon ethnographic thinking in terms of living and working within a research field site. I am asking young people to explore their experiences of violence and victimisation within the context of their day to day experiences and of their citizenship. As such, I have found it both important and useful to be familiar with the areas in which these young people live out their lives. A familiar geographical point of reference is important when relating to young people over issues of their experience. For example, I can quite honestly and openly say: "I know the area that you are talking about, but I've never had that experience there. Why do you think that might be?" This importantly places me, through familiarity, within the community, but places the young person's knowledge and experiences of the area as greatest significance.

In addition to this, the particular characteristics of Tower Hamlets were important in the choice of research site and in the formulation of the aims of the research. Tower Hamlets has a large young population, with nearly a quarter of the population aged under 16 years (see table 4.1).

Tower Hamlets is one of the UK's most deprived wards. Minority ethnic groups across London experience greatest levels of deprivation, and ethnic minority children experience high rates of material poverty:

"41 per cent of children in London are living in income poverty, the highest rate in Great Britain. In Inner London, this rises to one in two children... 36 per cent of London's children belong to an ethnic minority group. Seven out of
ten Bangladeshi and Pakistani children in London are living in poverty, and more than half of Black children.” (Mayor of London: ix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (total)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100799</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>65553</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>6596</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>98178</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>97928</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 0-15 years</td>
<td>44891</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 16-74 years</td>
<td>143429</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 75 years and over</td>
<td>7786</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (per hectare)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Population Characteristics of Tower Hamlets (Source: Office of National Statistics, Census 2001)

The issue of overcrowding is particularly pervasive amongst Tower Hamlets' Bangladeshi population, which makes up the largest minority ethnic group within the borough (see table 4.1):

"In Tower Hamlets 13% of all households are overcrowded. This is twice the rate for London and by far the highest in the country as a whole. Overcrowding is highest amongst the Bangladeshi community, of whom 42% are estimated to be living in overcrowded conditions.” (Corporate Community Safety Unit, 2002).

Tower Hamlets also has one of the highest rates of crime and violence in the country: with a considerably higher rate of violence against the person24 compared to other inner London boroughs.

---

24 Murder, Grievous Bodily Harm, Actual Bodily Harm, Common Assault, Harassment, Offensive Weapons and other violence. (The Tower Hamlets Partnership, 2004)
Table 4.2 Violent offences per 1000 residents (Source: The Tower Hamlets Partnership, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>37.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>27.87</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>31.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>25.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As such, within east London, young people are required to negotiate experiences of violence and victimisation on a daily basis and these negotiations impact upon the experiences of and meanings applied to their individual geographies. Despite the popular media focus on youth criminality, young people are arrested for only 5% of crimes. Of those accused of violent offences, and of those accused of street crime (robbery and theft snatch), 23% and 45% respectively were aged between 15-19 years (The Tower Hamlets Partnership, 2004).

In general, young people living in Tower Hamlets who experience high levels of poverty (reflected in 65% of students being eligible for free school meals), have relatively poor educational status and poor job prospects. Only 35% of students leave school in Tower Hamlets with 5 GCSE's or more (Mayor of London, 2002: 145-146). In addition to this, deprived boroughs are also often deprived of youth facilities. Since 2001 and the creation of the Children’s Fund, more funding and facilities have been created through early intervention strategies. However, the Children’s Fund aims to combat the effects of poverty and social exclusion in children only aged between 5-13 years and as such, the sample group in the current research will have been largely unaffected by these changes to the provision of youth services.

A lack of youth facilities often means young people are highly visible in spending leisure time in public places. These young people, who are most at risk from being caught in the circle of violence and victimisation, are yet most likely to be formally considered to be 'the problem'.
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Researching in Schools

One of my research aims was to conduct extensive research with a group of young people who had been written out of large scale census data. In order to work with such large numbers of young people, it was necessary to work within the education system. In addition, the school is a common site of mundane violence and victimisation, often overlooked and dismissed as 'natural' or 'normal'. Young people's experiences of violence and victimisation within school, as well as travelling to and from school, must not be underestimated. It was clear therefore that the school institution was central to understanding young people's experiences and negotiations of violence and victimisation in their daily lives. I was additionally interested in the way in which the citizenship curriculum was designed to deal with the problem of crime, violence and disengagement with society, and how far this reflected young people's own experiences. The research was conducted through the citizenship curriculum (see below) which gave an insight into the nature of the course, as well as student and teacher views and opinions of this new curriculum. From a practical perspective, I did not want my research to detract from the students' education. The citizenship curriculum is a non-examined space where my research could be undertaken with minimal disruption. The issues that my research addressed made up an element of the citizenship curriculum and teachers are encouraged to work with outside agencies in order to deliver the curriculum. From the school's perspective this research could therefore be included in their education programme.

The schools included in the research were all located within the London borough of Tower Hamlets and were all part of the state sector, thus making the citizenship curriculum a compulsory, yet non-examined course. Three schools were mixed-sex, and one was a boys' comprehensive. The students who took part in the research were in years 7 to 11 (aged 11 to 16 years) over the two academic years in which the project was conducted. Citizenship lessons (or their equivalent - Personal, Social and Health Education - where the citizenship curriculum had not been formally
institutionalised) were used to carry out the research. Citizenship lessons are the only lessons where students of all year groups are not streamed according to ability. This ensured that, regardless of the number of classes I worked with in each school, I was assured a wide range of formal 'educational ability'. To create as little inconvenience as possible for the teachers, I left it to the school to choose which classes took part in the research. As such, in one school I worked with one class from each year group (7 to 11). In two schools I worked only with year 9 as it was thought this age group were most vulnerable from violence and victimisation, and would therefore benefit most from thinking through the issues. In the other, I worked only with years 7 and 10 as they were the only years not to have already taken part in academic research previously. This school-centred sampling resulted in working with a broad spread of students across all age groups.

All schools draw the majority of their students from within the borough of Tower Hamlets, although some students do travel from nearby boroughs of Newham, Hackney, and Southwark. All the schools had a coordinated system with other nearby schools in an attempt to reduce acts of violence and victimisation before and after school. The most common strategy was to stagger the start and end times of the school day to avoid students from different schools leaving at the same time. All the schools had locked perimeter gates to avoid non-students entering the school. However, a number of teachers reported that this was not always successful. One school additionally placed security guards on the school gates during lunch and break times. A further method of avoiding violent incidents within schools was to ban students from wearing hooded tops and caps, as these were thought to imply aggression. Also they made it more difficult to identify whether the individuals were members of the school or not.

Violence, victimisation and gang/group activities were immediately apparent in many of the schools. Weapon carrying is considered an issue in inner city schools, but stop and search is not carried out in all schools. Drug
taking and dealing within and around the schools were also visible problems, as was a range of large and small scale incidences of violence and victimisation.

All the schools were teaching some form of the citizenship curriculum, either in formal citizenship lessons, adapted PSHE (Personal, Social and Health Education) or tutorial periods. Only one of the schools had fully adopted the curriculum and was offering a GCSE in the subject.

**Researching in Youth Groups**

Conducting research within a youth group setting aimed to broaden the participant group with which I could work. A small, yet significant group of young people do not engage with formal education. By only working within schools these young people would be excluded from my sample. It is also the case that those young people outside of formal education are most likely to be affected by violence and victimisation and lack what the New Labour government would describe as social capital and citizenship.

I also wanted to work with informal methodological tools, which was either not possible, or from my perspective, not desirable in schools. Informal discussions and participant observation are not appropriate for logistical and legal reasons within schools. Yet, there are greater possibilities within the informal institution of a youth group. The youth group with which I worked was also located within Tower Hamlets and it aimed to provide services to young people within education and to offer more substantial support for vulnerable young people no longer engaged with education.

**Sampling and the Participant Group**

The schools were initially sampled according to their geographical location within the borough of Tower Hamlets. I chose state schools which were located in areas I was most familiar with. In addition, I wanted to work in schools in close proximity to one another. Before embarking on the research it was clear that territoriality was significant in the meaning applied to
violence in Tower Hamlets, and I was keen to investigate the role school institutions played within this. Of the five schools I approached, three agreed to participate in the extensive stage of the research. Two of these schools further agreed to participate in all stages of the research. This rate of participation provided me with an extensive data set and a significant number of young people with whom intensive methodological techniques could be used.

The school sample was made up of 400 young people, aged between 11 and 16 years. Because the research took part within state secondary schools, the characteristics of the sample only partially reflect the characteristics of the borough as a whole. Within the sample there was a much higher proportion of minority ethnic young people (see table 4.1 for the borough profile) with 56% of the sample coming from British Bangladeshi backgrounds and only 11% coming from White British backgrounds. Black British young people (7%) within the sample broadly reflected the borough as a whole. The sample was made up of 154 young women, and 246 young men (see table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Research sample breakdown, according to gender and school year
"To overcome adult-centred interpretations... it is essential to employ a methodology that allows youth to speak from, and be appreciated for, their own perspective" (Barron, 2000: 45).

In order to conduct truly youth-centred research, I believe that a non-judgemental environment is required. An environment where I, as the researcher, desire to understand young people's experiences and meanings applied to these experiences in the fullest possible way. This, I suggest, is achieved from my perspective by being honest and open about my motivations for conducting the research, and not by challenging any views regardless of whether I personally find them offensive. All views, offensive or not, are, I believe, based upon a young person's experience. As such these views and particularly the experiences behind them, are of interest and are explored as fully as possible.

Any challenges to the young person will cause a research relationship based upon acceptance to break-down. And in my view, it is the research relationship, rather than the methodological tools, that is of greatest significance when conducting research. However, after providing a safe and non-judgemental environment in which a young person feels comfortable articulating their experiences, the methodological choices made can impact upon the quality of the research conducted. With this in mind, the methodological framework I employed is broad-based, youth-centred, and most importantly, flexible.

Extensive Research: The Questionnaire Survey
Before embarking on intensive data collection regarding young people's experiences of violence and victimisation in east London, questionnaire

---

23 It must also be noted that some of the schools were situated in wards of the borough with considerably higher Bangladeshi populations, and this also influences the nature of the sample.
survey data was required. This highlighted the main issues of priority facing young people and acted as a reference point from which intensive, qualitative methodological tools could be developed and employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Tool</th>
<th>Total Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of male participants in year</th>
<th>Number of female participants in year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Survey</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.4 Number and characteristics of questionnaire participants*

A 10-page questionnaire survey was conducted with 400 secondary school students within four state secondary schools in Tower Hamlets (see appendix 1). The students were aged between 11 years and 16 years (school years 7 to 10), and the sample was made up of 246 young men and 154 young women (see table 4.4). The questionnaire was made up of twenty five closed questions. Ten open questions were offered to give those who wanted to, the space to elaborate on their answers. This choice was made on a number of grounds. Firstly, the age range of participants was relatively large, and a questionnaire had to be designed that enabled the whole range of students to complete it within the allotted time of a lesson period (between 45 minutes and 1 hour depending on the individual school). In addition, many of the students had low reading ages, made more acute for those for whom English was a second language. This made for a greater necessity for the questionnaires to be straight forward to answer, yet capable of generating a large amount of data.

I chose to administer the questionnaires personally to the whole class where possible. This not only enabled me to answer any questions students had about the questionnaire but it also provided a safer environment for young people who may have been reluctant to approach their teacher for help in answering sensitive questions. In addition, this approach enabled greatest anonymity for the students, as they could witness me placing completed
questionnaires into an envelope and sealing it in front of them before leaving the class. Administering the questionnaires myself allowed me to build up a relationship with the students for the subsequent intensive stages of the research. This approach ensured a much higher questionnaire return rate than would otherwise be expected (100% of the questionnaires were returned for analysis, although some were unfinished). Finally, self-administration of the questionnaires importantly decreased the workload and inconvenience of the teachers and as such was significant in building up relationships with the teaching staff.

Intensively Extensive: Classroom Based Activities
A number of different techniques were also employed within the classroom setting to add greater depth to the information gathered from the questionnaire survey. These techniques took place after the questionnaire had been filled in during the same lesson period. The approach that was taken varied according to the age of the students and the school in which the research took place.

Class Discussion
In the majority of classes when the questionnaire had been completed a class discussion took place around one of two self-prepared handouts (see appendix 2). The first exercise, conducted with four classes (96 students in total, see table 4.5), was directed towards the younger students in mixed sex schools26 and focussed on the headline “Girls Are Now Bigger Bullies than Boys” (The Observer, 10/11/02). The second handout used with ten classes (284 students) asked questions around the headline “Fear Drives One in Six Teenagers to Join Gangs” (The Independent on Sunday, 15/09/02). These discussions were designed for a number of practical and theoretical reasons.

26 I consulted the teacher regarding which class discussion to use with each class. Only the year 7s in one school took part in this discussion as the teacher believed they would have more opinions on bullying than gangs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Tool</th>
<th>Total Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of male participants in year</th>
<th>Number of female participants in year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Number and characteristics of class discussion participants

On a practical note, different schools have different lesson lengths. In order to avoid placing any unnecessary pressure on the teachers, I created these exercises to ‘fill’ the remainder of the lesson. In the event, however, these discussions were highly valuable methodological tools. They acted as ways to uncover young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation both within and outside the school. The bullying discussion outlined quite starkly the gendered nature of bullying, peer pressure and classroom dynamics. The gang discussion enabled young people to discuss their relationship with fear and the different coping strategies they personally drew upon. Importantly these discussions could be observed in terms of group dynamics and classroom politics. All the discussions were recorded using extensive note taking after the lesson had ended. These exercises were discussion based, but were distributed to the students as handouts. Many students chose to write their thoughts before speaking, and these sheets were also handed to me at the end of the lesson. This afforded me the opportunity to explore the differences between ‘private thoughts’ and ‘public articulation’ of the young people’s views.

A second set of classroom based discussions were used towards the end of the research period (see appendix 3). These worksheets asked young people to agree or disagree with statements and to offer a reason for this. The questions asked were purposefully provocative, in order to incite discussion. Again this method was used to enable those less comfortable with verbal discussion to articulate their views. Encouraging young people to first write down their views before discussing them with the class also facilitates a
more structured debate, often necessary with a large group. Finally, this approach also enabled me to walk around the class and talk to people about their views on an individual basis to clarify any unclear points before facilitating group discussion.

These discussions were employed to further explore some of the significant issues raised within the empirical research. The discussions focussed upon: 'acting tough', 'bullying, fighting and drugs' and 'trust and the government' and each sheet provided 7 statements to comment upon. These discussions were conducted only in one school and with year 9s (see table 4.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Tool</th>
<th>Total Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of male participants in year</th>
<th>Number of female participants in year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class worksheet and discussion</td>
<td>- - 15 - -</td>
<td>- - 16 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting tough</td>
<td>12 - 8 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, fighting and drugs</td>
<td>9 - 4 -</td>
<td>5 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and the government</td>
<td>10 - 3 -</td>
<td>- 7 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Number and characteristics of class worksheet and discussion participants

Classroom-based Activities

The classroom based activities used in this methodology are derived in part from Participatory Appraisal techniques (PA). Participatory techniques (diagramming, drawing, mapping and so on) originated out of the desire to increase participation and to 'empower' marginalised groups, commonly excluded from decision-making processes. The range of methodological tools employed under the umbrella of PA is aimed at individuals, groups and communities to facilitate them to identify problems. The participatory epistemology then seeks to develop ways to address issues in a practical way through the formation of an action plan (see Chambers, 1994c; Kesby, Kindon and Pain, 2005). While PA originated within the development
context in the global south, it has more recently been developed within the UK context:

"... partly from frustration with the continuing tendency even among many ‘radical’ scholars to identify problems and theorize rather than engage with solutions” (Pain and Francis, 2003: 47).

Although in this research, I draw upon PA techniques, I did not employ a PA epistemological approach. Although I aimed to facilitate young people’s own thoughts around solutions to the problems they identified, working alone I did not have the capacity to help them put these thoughts into practice. The tools I used are derived from an alternative practical logic. Despite my lack of adherence to participatory epistemology, diagramming techniques do have a range of advantages for working with children and young people, particularly within a school setting. The Classroom-based Activities (CBA) took place with small groups of students within citizenship classes themselves (see table 4.7). While groups completed their exercises I was able to walk around the classroom talking to the groups about what they had written and why. Although PA techniques suggest that researchers work with only one group at time, in the context of working in schools with young people it was not practical or desirable (See McIlwaine and Datta, 2004).

As stated earlier, different people respond differently to various methodological tools. This CBA approach enables both verbal and non-verbal information to be gathered. Many young people responded more favourably to one of either verbal or non-verbal articulation. This was accepted, and no value-judgements were made as to one form of articulation being more appropriate. Some groups would engage verbally, but did not want to write or draw. Other groups drew highly detailed diagrams, but were less inclined to engage verbally. These are fundamental issues when attempting to gain full and frank information about young
people's experiences. For overcoming some of these issues, diagramming techniques can be highly effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Tool</th>
<th>Number of male participants in year</th>
<th>Number of female participants in year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a good citizen</td>
<td>- - - - 21</td>
<td>- - - - 17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship lessons</td>
<td>- - - - 21</td>
<td>- - - - 17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Circles</td>
<td>- - 9 - 26</td>
<td>- - 2 - 30</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and victimisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of violence and victimisation</td>
<td>- - - - 18</td>
<td>- - - - 22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is violence</td>
<td>- - 12 - 4</td>
<td>- - - - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of violence and victimisation</td>
<td>- - 12 - 4</td>
<td>- - - - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of violence and victimisation</td>
<td>- - 12 - 4</td>
<td>- - - - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems and solutions</td>
<td>- - 12 - 4</td>
<td>- - - - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal flow diagrams</td>
<td>- - 8 - 18</td>
<td>- - 11 - 22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety timelines</td>
<td>- - - - 11</td>
<td>- - - - 7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping safety</td>
<td>- - 10 - 10</td>
<td>- - 7 - 4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and disrespect</td>
<td>- - - - 6</td>
<td>- - - - 17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal image</td>
<td>- - - - 6</td>
<td>- - - - 17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Number and characteristics classroom-based activities (CBA) participants

I worked with a variety of CBA techniques in order to follow up and explore three main themes from the questionnaire survey: 'politics and citizenship', 'violence and victimisation' and 'image and respect'. These exercises were conducted with eight year 11 classes (100 students worked with on two
occasions), and one year 9 class (30 students). The 'politics and citizenship' exercises involved diagramming: "being a good citizen means..."; "citizenship lessons should teach..."; and colouring in 'trust circles' describing the reciprocal nature of trust between young people and the police, the government and teachers.

'Violence and victimisation' exercises involved diagramming: "types of violence and victimisation affecting young people in east London"; and flow charts outlining the 'causes', 'effects', 'coping strategies', 'long term solutions', and 'agencies to help'. Individuals were also asked to annotate maps of the local area, identifying areas that were 'safe, unsafe, differences during the day and night, and what made the areas safe or otherwise'. Finally, individuals were asked to create annotated graphs to show 'changes in safety over time' (throughout a 24 hour period, a year, and their lifetime).

Exercises exploring 'image and respect' involved listings of 'things you get respected for' and 'things you get disrespected for', as well as identifying characteristics of 'ideal lifestyles'.

While in the classroom, the behaviours and reaction of the students were observed. I spoke to all the students as they worked, asking them to expand on points that I felt were not clear and encouraging them to express whatever they felt they wanted to. All conversations with the groups were written up at the end of the lessons in the form of a field diary and were analysed with the group's corresponding diagrams.

**Intensive Techniques: Small Group Discussions**
I decided not to follow-up this work with additional small group discussions within the school. It became apparent that the students were losing interest in participation after up to three meetings with me; I felt it was not appropriate to continue working with the same young people when this stage had been reached. I therefore decided to conduct all my discussions
within a youth group setting. The youth group in which I worked, provided services for young men within Tower Hamlets. In many instances, the young men had been referred to the group for support by Social Services. A significant proportion of the young men were no longer engaged with education. All the young men were aged between 14 and 20 years. A core group of 10 young men attended regularly every week, with a small number of other young men attending more sporadically. The young men came from a range of ethnic backgrounds, including British Bangladeshi, White British and Afro-Caribbean.

I decided, after discussion with the youth group leader and based upon my own feelings when working with the young men, that diagramming would not be ideal. The young men would have not responded favourably to being asked to write, in what they felt to be a non-school setting. In many cases it became clear that the young men had been out of education for some time, and it was therefore quite likely that their writing skills would have been limited. Out of respect for this, all interactions in this context were conducted verbally.

In order to build up trust with this new group of participants, I volunteered over a period of 6 months. Through this period, I engaged in a range of activities with the young men, including playing football, pool, and on the Playstation. In addition, I offered to teach the young men some boxing skills, an activity many took up. I have found, through this research and previous projects, that engaging in informal activities with the young people to be highly beneficial (Gaskell, 2003). This creates a relaxed relationship, based upon shared interests and participation in leisure activities. Using this technique, the young people who felt at ease with me, could then approach me to talk to me, rather than the other way around. The discussions that emerged with these young people were youth-centred, and focussed on issues of identity, interaction with the police, and the emotions evoked by these experiences. I facilitated very flexible and open discussions led by the young people themselves (see appendix 4). I initiated discussion with a very
broad question: “Tell me what it’s like growing up around here” for example and allowed the discussions to flow in any way the young men wished. The discussions were, like the rest of my research, not recorded. I have found, in this research and previous experiences (Gaskell, 2002; 2003; 2005) that young people feel uncomfortable with and indeed threatened by the prospect of having their voices recorded. My experience has been that in order to provide a non-threatening, research environment for young people to talk freely, it is important to not record the encounter. These discussions and participant observations were recorded in the form of a field diary after leaving the youth group.

I also conducted a number of informal discussions with the teachers in the classes in which I worked. This usually took place during the lesson, while the students were completing the questionnaires. This provided a time for the teachers to find out more about the nature of the research. When I explained more fully the work I was conducting, many of the teachers were keen to discuss the topics I was exploring. During these discussions, I was offered a number of very interesting anecdotes regarding incidences of violence and victimisation. These discussions were also recorded within a field diary.

Field Diary
Through the course of the research, I kept a field diary noting down observations from the formal research process, as well as (not directly research related) experiences I had living in my field area. This was used to take notes of participant observation in schools and in the youth group. Detailed notes were made of all social interactions within the school.

This field diary was also used to make detailed notes of informal discussions with teachers. While in many cases teachers were too busy to commit to taking part in in-depth interviews, whereas they had time for informal discussions after classes or in the staffroom. These impromptu, informal discussions, I feel are often more insightful than rigidly planned interview
techniques. Although these discussions were not formally tape-recorded or structured, they provided highly valuable background information regarding, for example, school policy on violence, school and students relations with the police and teachers’ views of the citizenship curriculum.

The field diary was used in a similar way to record interesting interactions between young people and youth workers. It was also used to make detailed notes of young people’s reflections on their own experiences of school.

The final site of observation was broadly ‘the street’. As I live in my field site I was able to take notes of incidents I became aware of as I simply walked around the area. This enabled me to make written commentaries on the changing nature of gang graffiti, as well as simply walking around in order to familiarise myself with the area to the best of my ability. When young people described parks, estates, roads and schools that posed threats of violence and victimisation I would visit the places to see the area for myself. I would then make detailed notes in my field diary. In short, the field diary was used to make notes of all discussions and observations. This diary was then read alongside all other methodological tools in the analysis.

**Visual Methodologies**

Visual methodologies were used to document my own experiences of the east London area. The images I documented were predominantly graffiti. Territorial and confrontational graffiti was prevalent in most of the schools in which I worked. Indeed, schools were the most likely site for performing gang and group activities, as this was where young people from different geographical areas came together regularly. The way in which graffiti was written and where it was written provides invaluable insight into the dynamics of gang and group activities of the time (Phillips, 1998). Graffiti is used to incite violence, to show disrespect of other groups, and to stamp authority on an area. Recording the changes in the graffiti of the area helps to keep in touch with the more subtle dynamics of the area. Also
Data Analysis and Interpretation
Because the research took a mixed-method approach, the data analysis and interpretation drew upon quantitative and qualitative techniques.

Questionnaire Survey
The questionnaire data generated from this stage of the research was coded and input into the SPSS statistical package where descriptive statistics could be run. As this stage of the research was mainly to provide context, raise issues for the following stages of research and to provide information to feedback to the schools, complex statistical procedures were not considered appropriate. Closed questions were easily coded numerically (e.g. 1= yes 2= no) so descriptive statistical analysis could be undertaken (Lovett, 2005). Open ended questions initially required discourse analysis rather than statistical analysis. Due to the large number of questionnaires, I was able to quantify the responses to open ended questions where this was useful. The findings were addressed thematically (such as respect, and role of the government and so on), and were drawn upon for development and further exploration in later intensive stages of the research process.

Classroom-based Activities
The lists, diagrams and maps produced through the CBA stage of the research, were initially analysed alongside others from the same category (for example, looking at all the causal flow diagrams together). This enabled similarities, differences and themes to be noted. All diagrams were coded thematically, using an 'open coding' system to identify and formulate thinking along main thematic routes (Crang, 2005). Once this stage had been completed for all diagram categories it was then possible to analyse the themes that had emerged across diagrams (for instance, looking at being a good citizen alongside respect and disrespect) which allowed for interrogation of the contradictions facing these young people. In order to
achieve this, the themes identified through the initial 'open coding' were split further into 'axial codes' (ibid, 2005) These diagrams were used both for illustrative purposes and to gain a more sophisticated understanding of themes emerging from the extensive phase of the research. In addition, group and individual diagrams were then analysed along side the field notes taken of any discussions that took place.

**Class, Small Group and Informal Discussions**

All discussions took place without being tape-recorded and were thus recorded through detailed field notes. The analysis was broadly similar for all these methods, but there were also some fundamental differences.

The class discussions were analysed in two ways. When leading the discussion I was observing the class and listening to their arguments. This was later written up in the form of a field diary. In addition, many of the students wrote their answers on the handouts and returned them to me at the end of the lesson. This enabled textual analysis of the answers. Importantly however, many written answers diverged significantly from the direction of the open discussion. I was then able to compare the written and verbal responses to the same questions, revealing further interesting trends and themes in peer pressure and classroom dynamics within the context of violence and victimisation.

The small group discussions and informal discussions were reliant on my taking detailed notes shortly after the discussion took place. These notes were then analysed in the way an interview transcript would be. I read through the notes looking for themes that were emerging across the different discussions. Once these themes were identified (such as safety) the notes were re-read and different themes were highlighted and coded. Notes were also taken after the discussion with regard to group dynamics, verbal tone, body-language and so on, in order to gain the fullest understanding of the nature of the discussion. These were then read alongside the themed field notes.
Visual Methodologies

My own photography was gathered throughout the research period and focussed on the (changing) dynamics of graffiti around the field site. These pictures were simply used alongside extensive and intensive methods to visually highlight the nature of, for example, violent presentation within and around the school grounds. Where gangs and group activities were discussed within classrooms, group discussions or informal discussions, this approach was used to evaluate the nature of territoriality expressed through graffiti. The graffiti was therefore analysed to identify respect and status between local gangs, groups and individuals.

The size of the graffiti 'piece' or 'tag', and its position in relation to other graffiti is crucial to understanding its meaning. Where graffiti is placed directly above another piece for example, it is seen as a direct challenge. The greatest challenge of all however, is when graffiti is crossed out or directly written over. Additionally, solidarity and respect can be shown by writing beside or in smaller text than other existing pieces (see for example, Cooper and Chalfant, 1984; MacDonald, 2001; Phillips, 1999). This knowledge along with the photographic diaries of these changes, simply add greater depth to the understanding of the territorial dynamics of the area.

Field Diary

My field diary held accounts of classroom based activities, of discussions and of informal work within the youth group. As well as this, I wrote up experiences I had had working within the schools and youth group, and any informal events and discussions I was witness to as I went about my research. My field diary therefore held detailed accounts of discussions and interviews, alongside informal and personal accounts of my own experience. This prose was then analysed thematically, through open and axial coding, in the way outlined above.
Interpretation and Write-up
As I have previously outlined, I believe that through listening non-judgementally to young people’s experiences, the problems of misrepresentation are reduced\(^{27}\). This might sound a somewhat intangible argument, but I genuinely feel it has proved an effective one in both previous and the current research (Gaskell, 2005). Where possible I aim to explore my interpretation and write-up of young people’s experiences with those who participated. This means that I attempt to meet with participants at a later date to discuss what was articulated. It has been suggested that including young people within the dissemination process might involve providing short accessible, but written overviews for comment (Morrow and Richards, 1996). Through my research experience, I have found this not to be ideal. Many of the young people with whom I have worked do not respond well to written prose. This is due, either to associations with this and school institutions, or in the case of some, their literacy levels meant they could not engage with written work. In both these instances young people often respond with avoidance in order to escape the shame of not being able to read fluently. In these situations, I have therefore opted to read my work back to young people who participated, and who wanted to be further involved. This process enabled me to clarify some of the points that the young people made and to explore my interpretation of their views within a broader theoretical framework. Although this did not take place with all the young people who participated, it has been my experience that young people value this process, as it validates their views and shows the importance I place upon their knowledge.

In the context of schools, I found this to be extremely difficult to put into practice. Because of the less flexible nature of working in schools, I opted to clarify points as I was working with the groups. When in the classroom, I spoke with each group, picking up areas of interest for further clarification. While this was not as desirable as being able to talk to the students after I

\(^{27}\) I would not argue however, that the problems of misrepresentation can be eliminated, and I don’t believe that the process of research should begin to attempt such a thing.
had completed formal analysis, it remained a significant aspect of the interpretation process.

It is through the writing and disseminating process that I believe a researcher has the greatest power 'over' their participants. For this reason, I place great personal emphasis on including young people within the interpretation process, as outlined above. I view my approach to writing-up as following on from this. After the quantitative stage of the research, I provided each school with a short overview of my findings. This focused on themes emerging from the questionnaire survey, and was written in a way that could be used as a teaching tool (see Appendix 5). I felt this was the most effective way of feeding back to the schools and to the students. However, I clearly had no power over whether these findings were ever used as the basis for further discussion within the classroom, or for the formulation of school policy. Finally, I am also providing all participating institutions with a broad overview of the findings from the complete study. Whilst this research was an academic endeavour I found it particularly useful to write-up the work for a range of audiences. I also consider this to be an integral part of my research practice.

Reflections on ‘Doing’ the Research
Youth methodology literature gives significant weight to issues of informed consent and ethics (Harden et al. 2000 for a critique). These issues are also quite crucially bound with issues of power (McDowell, 2001; Matthews, 2001; Valentine, Butler and Skelton, 2001). Whilst not wanting to revisit my thoughts on the assumptions of power within the youth research process, it is important to understand the issues of ethics and consent within the context of power. I shall briefly reiterate my basic viewpoint. I strongly believe that the binary knowledge placing adult knowledge above that of child knowledge must be challenged. I also believe that engaging in research that prioritises young peoples' 'experience' allows this challenge to be effective.
Rather than make intangible theoretical arguments regarding the practicalities of consent, ethics and ultimately power, it feels appropriate to make these arguments through an honest reflection on my own research experience. It is difficult for me to understand how, as an outsider entering a school institution I might have any form of power over the student participants in my research. As an unfamiliar visitor, a researcher in a school is clearly out of place. I was not a teacher and thus had no authoritative powers within the classroom. At the same time I was clearly not a student. From the perspective of the students, I was simply ‘out of place’; I became a teacher’s sister or girlfriend as students struggled to understand my presence.

I was introduced in different ways in different schools. Some teachers were keen and interested in their students and the research; others had no interest. In many cases I was left to introduce myself, which I did by explaining the purpose of research followed by what I was doing and how it might relate to their lives. I explained that the work was confidential, that I would take all questionnaires and handouts away with me (in a sealed envelope) when I left the school, and significantly that no teachers would see them. I also made it clear that if students did not feel comfortable with any of the questions, they could simply leave them blank, and must not feel obliged to participate.

I had no ‘power’ to ensure students completed the work within the classroom (and nor did I want such power), but I never approach research from this standpoint. Within the schools I adopted an ‘opting out’ approach for simple reasons. I do not believe within the classroom setting it is appropriate or practical to give students such options. All were given copies of the questionnaire, if they didn’t want to complete it, they did not. The ‘opting in/ opting out’ debate (see Valentine, 1996) I believe is further flawed in that it is placing an adult notion of informed participation onto the research process. The familiar mode of non-participation for school students is ‘opting out’ not ‘opting in’. However, it is adult notions of
'appropriate behaviour' which attach negative connotations to 'opting out'. In addition, students are more than capable of not 'engaging' with work whilst in the classroom. By asking the students if they wanted to 'opt into' their lesson would have undermined the teacher and would have undoubtedly caused chaos.

Much has been made of power over youthful participants due to physical size (Valentine, 1996). This view emerges mainly from research with much younger children, and not teenagers. It also seems a somewhat simplistic view (see also Morris-Roberts, 2001). In the current research, I was physically smaller or similar in stature to many of the students, but this was not the most important factor. As I have previously alluded to, the topic of the research plays an important role in the research relationship. Talking about their experiences of violence young people had an opportunity to become aware of and show their own power - their power over me. My position as an outsider was confirmed as my accent clearly demarcates, I am not from London. Despite being young, I was marked apart from the students by my clothes. The students in many cases treated me as an 'in-between', certainly not as a teacher and certainly not as an individual in a position of power.

The reasons for my 'in-between' status I believe is in part due to my research practice. I enter the research encounter honestly, wanting to understand young people's experiences. I do not challenge any views, behaviours or non-compliance. I simply explore it where possible. Young people can swear at me and even threaten me, if they wish and I do not pass judgement on their actions. Interestingly, many of the young people soon came to their own conclusions. The conclusion that I could, in some way (perhaps in only a superficial way) be trusted, and that they could articulate their views and experiences to me honestly and openly.
Ch  t  r 5

Violence and Victimisation:
Young People’s Experiences of the Violence Process

“The hood holds loyalty
The hood holds faith
The hood holds struggle
And the hood holds rage”
(Shystie, 2004. One Wish)

While current political and media attention is focussed upon young people’s perpetration of violence, very little is known about the nature, extent and importantly, the meaning of young people’s experiences of victimisation (Blunkett, 2001; Thompson, 2002; Travis, 2002; Ward, 2002 for popular media responses on perpetration of violence). This is particularly true as regards young people’s victimisation outside of the home. Whilst the ‘welfare child’ is (in theory) protected within the domestic sphere, on entering the public sphere, many children and young people become demonised as criminal perpetrators (see for example, Goldson, 2001; Matthews, Limb and Taylor 1999a). This however, is based upon an adult articulation and understanding of young people’s physical presence within public space (Jeffs and Smith, 1995; Matthews, Limb an Taylor, 1999a). Young people are therefore understood less in terms of being potential victims in need of welfare and protection, and more as potential perpetrators in need of control and punishment.

In an attempt to overcome an ‘adultist’ approach, this chapter aims to provide a youth-centred insight and account of young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation within east London. It will argue that the extent of violence and victimisation is significant for all young people, but that important variations exist according to indicators of difference, such as gender and age. Significant findings also emerged to suggest that while
victimisation rates varied according to ethnicity, ethnicity was less significant in the meanings attached to these experiences. Importantly, this chapter highlights the need to explore experiences and meanings of violence and victimisation beyond quantitative analyses of 'rates'. The chapter will therefore progress to argue, through young people’s articulation of experiences of gangs and bullying, that violence and victimisation are a multiple, complex, spatial and temporal experiences. An examination of the nature of this complexity provides a deeper appreciation of the interrelations between different, seemingly unrelated violent experiences. Young people’s views of the structural-social-psychological causes of violence and victimisation will be explored in order to outline violence and victimisation as process.

It is also suggested here that the range of experiences and the different approaches to negotiating the potential threat of violence and victimisation can only be understood holistically. Young people only understand and articulate experiences of violence and victimisation when their own structural-social-psychological meanings have been applied and attached.

Finally it is acknowledged that young people’s experiences of, and meanings applied to, violence and victimisation shape their negotiation of their lived experience. Drawing in part from the emotional reactions to violence and victimisation in different spaces of perceived danger, young people negotiate their personal safety through strategies of 'avoidance', 'management' and 'engagement'. These negotiation mechanisms are clearly thought out, understood and spatially influenced. This chapter will finally explore both young people’s own and school imposed mechanisms for coping with violence and victimisation.

The Extent of Violence and Victimisation in Young People’s Lives
It must first be stated that experiences of violence and of victimisation within Tower Hamlets are significant for all young people. Regardless of the actual rates of violence and victimisation experienced by young people, the
perceptions of local dangers in the current research were significant for all. It is the different ways in which these feed into the day-to-day lives of young people that is of great importance. Drawing upon extensive quantitative surveying of 400 young people between the ages of 11 and 16 years (see chapter four for a more detailed breakdown of the sample), 67% felt the area posed significant danger to them directly and to the enactment of their daily lives. While this broad-based experience of locality held no significant gender difference, age on the other hand, did prove to be significant. Just under half (48%) of young people in year 7 (aged 11-12 years) considered that the experience of their locality was shaped by danger, as one 11 year old white British young man explained:

"If you're little there are gangs that will mug you. People who are young and might get lost or get kidnapped, they should go out with a parent or older brother who is over 15, who can defend you (protect you)."

Yet the perceptions of significant danger rose to a rate of 75% of young people in year 10 (aged 15-16 years). This can partly be accounted broadly by older young people’s increased use of public space, but these differences might also reflect an increase in 'risk-taking' behaviours amongst the older sections of the sample. It is interesting however that a very high proportion of 15 and 16 year olds described the area as being dangerous to them; implies an acceptance of vulnerability on the part of the young people (see also Goodey, 1997). The nature of this danger was explained by one 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man:

"Nowadays many crimes are taking place here. People are getting murdered and no solutions have been found. I think people are getting more harsh."

Ethnicity, along with age, was also shown to be important in shaping young people’s experiences of their locality. Over 80% of white British and Black
Caribbean young people felt the area to be dangerous, reflecting the most negative experiences of violence and victimisation. Just over half (51%) of British Bangladeshi young people considered the area dangerous.

These negative experiences of danger and risk to personal safety were shaped by two main areas of concern within their communities. The problem of weapons (and related violence and victimisation), and of drugs (and related social breakdown and violence) had the greatest significance for the majority of young people, regardless of gender, age or ethnicity:

"It's all the negative things like drugs, cigarettes [that make it dangerous around here]. There are lots of gangs with weapons just waiting to get up to no good". (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

These views were shaped by experiences of violence and victimisation both inside and outside of school:

"Drug taking and possession has risen, young boys hang out till late abusing and vandalising people and people's things. I think it's dangerous because people don't know how to trust. Basically the community and environment is not strong enough." (Black British Young woman aged 15)

Reporting on experiences within the public sphere, 28% of the young people said they had been victims of violence on one or more occasion. The violence experienced varied both in extent and nature. Physical assault was most commonly reported, representing 22% of all types of victimisation, while mugging and verbal racism were experienced by 16% of the sample. This was followed by mobile phone theft (experienced by 13%), and a further 12% who had experienced theft more broadly. These patterns again varied according to gender, age and ethnicity. Thirty one percent of all young men had been victimised in the public sphere, in contrast to 23% of
young women. As regards age, young people in the upper years of school (aged 14 to 16 years) were significantly more likely to have experienced some form of victimisation. Interestingly, there was a significant increase when this was assessed along with gender (see table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victimisation rate % Male</th>
<th>Victimisation rate % Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1 School and street victimisation according to gender and age (Source: Questionnaire Survey)*

Young men’s experiences highlighted a significant age related increase in violence and victimisation (see later and chapter 7 for a more detailed discussion). The young men within this research at the age of 15-16 year reported a highly significant 50% rate of violence and victimisation (see table 5.1). It also seems important to note that 16% of young women and 20% of young men aged 11 and 12 years (those in year 7) reporting violence and victimisation is also alarmingly high. In terms of ethnic variations, Black British (58%) followed by White British (48%) young people cited the greatest levels of victimisation. British Bangladeshi young people experienced a 22% rate of victimisation. There was no significant

---

28 I am loathe to make strong statements as regards ethnicity. The high rates of victimisation amongst Black British young people reflected a territorial aspect occurring in neighbouring boroughs. Most of the Black British young people attending school in Tower Hamlets, lived in neigbouring Southwark or Hackney. These young people were targeted both by fellow students, for not living in the local area, and by young people in their local area for not attending school where they lived.

29 The reason for the lower rate of victimisation amongst British Bangladeshi young people is less clear. One possible reason reflects the nature of the sample. One school in which questionnaire data was collected was an all boys’ school and predominantly British Bangladeshi. These young people reported a much lower rate of victimisation (13% compared to 29% and 31% in other schools). I felt neither students nor teachers were forthcoming with their views or experiences of victimisation (see chapter eight on the importance of a postive school environment). This lower rate could also be accounted for in part by young British Bangladeshi women reporting a significantly lower rate of victimisation than young Black British or White British women (14% compared to 50% of Black British young women and 42% of White British young women). This difference of victimisation is most likely linked to different ways of socialising within public space.
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difference in the above level of victimisation reporting when gender was assessed.

In addition to young people’s experiences in the public sphere, violence and victimisation within schools was also addressed. Within the school, victimisation for the total sample was 27%, only 1% below the rate on the streets. The types of victimisation experienced within this space were similar to those on the streets, with physical assault the most common problem (see figure 5.1).

Both young men (27%) and young women (25%) experienced similar rates of victimisation with assault, verbal racism and theft dominating the victimisation trends for both. Older students (both male and female) were more likely to have experienced victimisation within the school. This however, would be expected simply on the grounds that older students had spent more years within the school environment and were thus, over time, exposed to greater chance of victimisation. Black British young people reported the highest rates of victimisation with a rate of just over half,
while white British reported a rate of 38% and British Bangladeshi a rate of 22%.

This overview outlines a number of points important for understanding the subsequent analysis. Firstly, that violence and victimisation rates amongst this group of young people are very high. Secondly, and as might be expected, perceptions of 'danger' associated with the area increase with age, mirroring an increase in actual experiences of violence and victimisation. How this danger impacts upon young people's day-to-day lives is less clear. While there are differences in the rates of violence and victimisation within the school and on the street, until the meanings young people attach to their experiences is explored, the differences and conflation of school and street experiences cannot be fully understood. The remainder of the chapter will therefore aim to dismantle the school-street divide, in order to fully understand young people's complex experiences of violence and victimisation.

**Violence and Victimisation as a Multiple and Complex Process**

The violence and victimisation experienced by young people is undoubtedly both multiple and complex, and as such it is necessarily an experience of process (Moser and McIlwaine, 2004). Even before addressing the significance of spatiality and temporality within the violence and victimisation process, one clear factor must be outlined. Young people's feelings of danger and the negotiation of personal safety within Tower Hamlets are based upon the perception of potential victimisation from wide-ranging, diverse and multiple sources. This multiplicity can be divided broadly into 'low level' and 'high profile' violence and victimisation. 'Low level' violence is everyday and pervasive, and includes presence and experiences of bullying, racism, homophobia, mugging, theft, gangs,

---

This again I believe to be influenced by the sample schools. One school reported a 34 victimisation rate, of which 30% were British Bangladeshi and 30% were White British. Another school however reported a victimisation rate of 25, with British Bangladeshi representing 22 and White British 40. Such school differences are inevitable, and cannot necessarily be accounted for (see chapter eight on the importance of school environment and disclosure).
weapons and substance related violence. The second category of violence and victimisation is 'high profile' in nature. Highly visible incidents occurring in the area that sometimes (but not necessarily) physically affect an individual. These include gun crime, rape, murder and kidnapping. While these 'high profile' incidents might not directly and physically impact an individual, they are adopted on a conscious level and incorporated into a young person's understanding of their experience of their daily life.

Figure 5.2 'Violence and victimisation affecting young people'. Drawn by four 15 year old young women, two British Bangladeshi, one Black African and one White British

Figure 5.2 outlines the importance of both low level and high profile violence and victimisation in the formation of four young women's experiences. For these young women, factors such as child abuse, murder and rape, whilst not widespread across the whole community, were still significant factors in shaping their and other young people's everyday experiences (Baskin and Sommers, 1998; Fonagy, 2003; Smith and Ananiadou, 2003). The threat of murder, they suggest in their diagram, causes young people to 'stay in/hang around in groups', but outline the
complexity by also showing that murder itself may result from being 'in
trouble with a gang'. These experiences, can lead to the increased
formation of gangs. Gangs themselves they considered to be significant
elements in incidents of murder. The complexity of gang/ group formation
is clear: these groupings can be simultaneously both a strategy of peer
protection from the fear of violence and victimisation, and a pleasurable
space of friendship, play and support (see also Alexander, 2000; Anderson,
1990, 1999; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Decker and Van Winkle, 1996;
Katz, 1988; McDonald, 2003; MacLeod, 1995).

Street Gangs and School Bullies

Gangs and groupings can also be deeply divisive. They provide security,
support and protection for the members themselves, but for those non
members they represent the potential for unpredictable and unscripted
violence and victimisation (Brotherton and Salazar-Atias, 2003; Decker and
Van Winkle, 1996; Nurge, 2003; Vigil, 2002). It is clear from discussions with
both young men and young women that young men are more likely to be
involved in gang activities, and therefore appear to pose the more obvious
threat. This, however, was contradicted in part, by the questionnaire
survey, where there was no significant difference between boys (41%) and
girls (38%) regarding the time spent in groups, gangs or crews when on the
streets. Differences were apparent regarding the proportion whose
group/gang/crew was formalised enough to have a name, with 42% of boys
claiming their gang had a name (for example, Brick Lane Massive, Cannon
Street Massive, Shadwell Massive, Stepney Thug Passion, Kingsmead Boys
Crew, Lil' Outlaws, Lil' Rascals), compared to only 24% of girls (for example
Lady Riderz, Untouchables, Buff Ryders). This suggests that, while groupings
are important for both young men and young women, for young men these
groups held a different and perhaps more strategic purpose. In addition, of
the 50 young people (13% of the total sample) who admitted to carrying
weapons, 83 were male.
This relationship between young people and gangs/groupings is not striking enough to go any way to explaining the starkly different and gendered emotions evoked by the threat of violence (particularly gang-related violence) and victimisation on the streets. One way of explaining this may be to address the purpose of these different gangs. For young women, the main purpose of groupings, gangs and crews was defined as protection. Young women within public spaces often feel unsafe and uncomfortable (see figure 5.3), which is particularly marked during hours of darkness.

![Figure 5.3 Graph to show young people's feelings when on the streets](image)

Fifty six percent of the young women stated they avoided going out after dark as a strategy for keeping safe, contrasted to only 35% of young men saying the same. For young women, being in a group is critical to reducing the perceived dangers of night-time. Thus, the group, from the perspective of the young women in this research offers protection when it is necessary to walk around after dark.
For young men, on the other hand, the gang provides a more complex purpose than simply protection. Young men articulated their capacity to feel simultaneously unsafe yet comfortable and part of a group. Protection is an important aspect of young men’s groupings, as outlined by this thirteen year old British Bangladeshi young man:

"It's dangerous if you're not in a cru, if you're young and gull ble
and if you can't defend yourself"

However, gangs also provide more fundamental social networks. These social networks are based upon power, respect, trust, and violence (see also Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Decker and Van Winkle, 1996; McDonald, 2003; MacLeod, 1995).

A gang member’s use of violence is central to the establishment of power over others, whether this violence is through actual attacks, overt threats, and weapon carrying, or indirectly through symbols such as graffiti and the posturing of fearlessness. The domination of territory for drug sales is another way in which gangs can exert their power over both an area and other rival gangs. Control over an area’s drugs sale provides considerable financial power, which requires its defence through violence:

"I'm speaking from experience of the fights down there. Last year we [Brick Lane Massive] fought Hackney over drugs areas, over where to sell drugs". (16 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

Finally, notoriety in the area can be achieved simply through association with large gangs. Such notoriety can be used to serve either or both of two purposes. Firstly, notoriety can protect an individual from attacks, as indicated by this British Bangladeshi thirteen-year-old boy:
"Some kids have tough brothers or sisters, or they are well known and they can protect the younger ones. But the others are in danger."

The second purpose of reputation is to increase one's role within the gang activities of an area. This can also be furthered through gaining a reputation for, for example, ruthless violent acts, or having a role in the areas' drugs sales (see also Bourgois, 1995; 2004a).

Closely linked to power is the phenomenon of 'respect'. It was commonly acknowledged that gang membership would provide respect from the majority of peers - gang members and non-gang members alike. Gang membership empowers young people: "To be respected from other people and to make other people fear" (14 year old young man). This respect is transferable within (and to a degree between) communities, schools, gangs and peer groups, but it must be earned and defended at all times. Violence, and especially the ability to both portray a violent image and act up to such an image underpins much of the dynamics of power and respect (see also Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; MacDonald, 2003). The easiest and safest way of achieving this violent image is through gang membership. By simply being associated with a gang a young person becomes part of a gang image whereby, as this 13-year-old young man explained: "they [young people] show they're rough and no one's going to mess with them". An individual cannot easily instil this type of fear in others alone. For many young people then, gangs represent a threat: a danger that is unpredictable and to an extent unknown. To others, gangs represent social networks whereby power, respect and status can be negotiated and fought for. In this context gangs represent both a threat and a danger but very much within dynamics of violence that are understood.

These dynamics of violence are also replicated within the school and are not restricted to gang behaviours. When discussing the nature of bullying within the school a more overtly gendered causation of violence emerged,
but one that appears to be in part replicated through gang and group activities. Very different and gendered ways in which young men and young women understood and participated in bullying emerged from discussions (see also Phillips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003; Siann et al. 1994). Whilst initially the discussions took a simplistic, and rather predictable, 'boys against girls' approach, as indicated by one 11 year old young man: "Girls don't bully, they can't fight, they just pull hair!", it soon became clear that the group dynamics of bullying were highly gendered in far more complex ways. Both young men and young women placed important emphasis on fighting, or physical violence, within the bullying process. A number of the young women drew attention to the importance young men place on fighting, and the role it plays in the formation of their masculine identity within and beyond the school (Connell, 1995, 2000; Macan Ghaill, 1994). According to one 12 year old young woman: "boys talk about their fights, going on about good punches and all that". Fighting, for the young men, was a highly visible and celebratory 'spectacle', and one that young men themselves placed great importance on (Anderson, 1900, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Connell, 2000; Greig, 2000; MacLeod, 1995).

"Most thought boys bullied more than girls, as boys were more visible with their bullying. Boys seem to bully in groups more than girls, and also placed greater emphasis on the role of fighting. It was generally agreed that boys fought more and girls were more verbal in their attacks. Boys however only considered physical bullying to be 'real' bullying."

Field diary entry, 4 June, 2003)

The construction of a particular type of masculinity shaped the gendered dynamics and boundaries of acceptability when it came to bullying and fighting (Phillips, 1999; Rivers, 2001; Smith, 2000; Thorne, 1993). There was

---

31 The newspaper headline used in this exercise referred to boys and girls. For this reason that in this section I refer to boys and girls rather than young men and young women.
a disagreement over whether boys could bully girls, with young women claiming they were victimised by young men, and young men claiming this simply could not be the case. The reason for this was that young men believed their masculinity would be compromised if they bullied (i.e. fought with) young women. For them, bullying was a highly visible expression of their masculinity: an attempt to gain physical dominance over other young men, and this stamp of masculinity would be undermined should they hit a young woman.

British Bangladeshi Young man aged 11: If a boy hits a girl it means they’re a sissy
[Class guffaw]
British Bangladeshi Young man aged 11: Miss, do you know what a sissy is?
Carolyn: Go on, tell me
British Bangladeshi Young man aged 11: A sissy is a boy acting like a girl
Carolyn: So boys don’t hit girls?
[Disquiet amongst the girls in the class]
A number of girls shout out: Yes, they do!
White British Young man aged 12: Boys don’t hit girls, it’s not right
Carolyn: How come it’s not right?
White British Young man aged 12: It’s just not, girls can hit boys, but we can’t hit them back
[Again disquiet amongst the girls in the class]
Carolyn: But I thought girls couldn’t fight, that they just pulled hair?
White British Young man aged 12: Well, they don’t hit properly, they just go...[impersonates a girl fighting by flapping his hands around, without purpose]
Field diary entry 6th June, 2003

A second significant dimension to bullying within the school was the group nature of boys’ bullying (see also Phillips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and
Both the young men and the young women agreed that young men bullied in groups rather than individually. One reason for this group nature of bullying is connected to the importance of visibility. In order for young men to increase their status, regard and respect in relation to their masculinity, they need to gain power over another by challenging their masculine status, but significantly they require an audience (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Goffman, 1969; McDonald, 2003). It is only through an audience viewing a fight (in this case peers) that an increase in masculine status can be assured. Thus, for young men to bully purposefully, it is necessary they do so alongside their peer group:

Teacher, mixed comprehensive: “You can’t deal with boys who bully singly or in pairs, it always involves a big group. You’re trying to discipline one boy and there’s always a whole group of them waiting around the corner!”
(Field diary entry, 6th June, 2003)

The importance of group solidarity and young male peer support was also apparent in group discussion. It was noticeable that young men grouped together in a way young women did not:

Carolyn: So, do boys and girls bully in different ways?
White British Young woman aged 12: Boys all stick together when they bully
[Disquiet amongst the boys, many throw verbal abuse in response to this point]
Carolyn: Really?
White British Young woman aged 12: Yeah, they ALL turn on you, like that!
[Pointing at the group of boys who shouted abuse]
Field diary entry 6th June, 2003
The importance of an audience in boys' behaviours was also apparent in their denial of bullying or hitting girls. Admitting hitting young women publicly would undermine their masculine status, despite suggestions that this type of bullying did occur. The dynamics of masculine identity in relation to peers is clearly a complex and delicate negotiation:

*Teacher, mixed comprehensive:* "We have a lot of problems with boys bullying girls, that's why that girl reacted the way she did [in the discussion outlined above], some of the boys are just awful".
(Field diary entry 6th June, 2003)

An audience of peers for young men legitimises their fighting: fighting becomes purposeful. The same purpose can be applied to gangs fighting and gang membership. A gang is a ready made audience of peers, who can watch someone fighting and negotiate masculine status accordingly.

Fighting is one reason given by young men for wanting to join a gang. As this 12 year old young man stated simply: "People join gangs to start fights". There are two main reasons why someone *needs* to be part of a gang to start fights. Firstly, there is the issue of audience. Secondly, is the issue of safety. Gangs, like weapons, are equalisers of physical strength: "gangs mean you have people to back you up when you're fighting" (14 year old young man).

**The Spatiality of Violence and Victimisation**

The spaces identified by young people where violence and victimisation are staged included schools (both within the school grounds during the school day and outside the grounds out of hours), underground stations, parks, graveyards, estates, stairwells and individual streets (see figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.10). Schools figure prominently in young people's spatial experiences of violence and victimisation (Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Nayak and Kehily, 1996; Olweus, 1993; Phillips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003; Plummer, 2000; Smith and Sharp, 1994). They were identified as sites of
safety, as sites of internal conflict and as representations of community
difficulties. The school, it appears, is central to understanding young
people's experiences of violence and victimisation.

Where some talked in terms of school rivalry, such as this 14 year old boy:
"Staying around after school when * are out is very dangerous". It was clear
from others that this violence was more complex than school rivalry:

"The Cannon Street Boys go to *, and they fight with the Brick
Lane Massive, and the boys from *, sometimes they fight on
Cannon Street, I've seen them, they come out with weapons to
fight". (13 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

Schools were often the 'staging areas' of violence and victimisation, and
therefore central to experiences (Anderson, 1990, 1999); they were not
presented as the underlying cause of the violence. Different territorial
gangs were represented by the students in individual schools. Gang
members from rival gangs attended the same and neighbouring schools. But
even this territorial challenge was not presented as the real cause of
violence and victimisation (in groups or as individuals). Young people
themselves saw gangs as a symptom, not of territory, but of boredom, peer
pressure and the need to develop a powerful image (figure 5.2). The issue
of territory is not insignificant, but young people considered territory to be
a reflection of gangs, a space in which violence and victimisation could be
acted out, but not so much a place over which fights would be instigated.
The real cause as articulated by young people tends towards disrespect,
shame and inescapable disenfranchisement, or a lack of meaningful
citizenship (see later on causality).

Territory is significant when used as a tool of violence and victimisation
through the negotiation of respect. Territory and therefore spatiality is
embedded in young people's expression of the need to generate a respected
image. One of the most obvious ways in which this negotiation of a respected image is acted out is through the marking of space with graffiti.


The dynamics of respect were represented visually and most significantly by graffiti in and around the school (see plates 5.1 and 5.2; and below for a detailed analysis of graffiti as an exercise of power).

"This school is full of gang graffiti! In every classroom I have been into there are tags of individual gang members and of gang names. This seems to be a huge (and even normal?) part of the school. I found gang graffiti on teacher's desks, filing cabinets, classroom walls, etched into windows and most noticeably on internal and perimeter walls."

Field diary entry, 9th June, 2003

Violence and victimisation are experienced through the space of the school, and are quite literally inscribed onto the school. The significance of the
school itself, as an institution embedded within young people's experiences of violence and victimisation and within young people's experiences of their communities, ought to also be outlined.

Plate 5.2 Axe B.L.M vs S.T.P vs Shadwell Massiv. Photo taken June 2003 on the perimeter of the school

Key:
B.L.M - Brick Lane Massive
S.T P - Stepney Thug Passion

Community difficulties and tensions are staged and acted out in school. Tensions at times erupted within the school and this is represented through antagonistic graffiti on the school premises (see plates 5.1 and 5.2).

Figure 5.4 also highlights the role of vandalism, such as graffiti, in the complexity of violence and victimisation. Gangs were linked by the two young women (figure 5.4) to vandalism\(^{32}\), boredom and the desire to show

\(^{32}\) This was explained to mean graffiti in a discussion of the diagram.
These actions do not simply reflect 'mindless' criminal damage; they are far more intimately linked to, and reflect the importance of, power within the linkages of violence and victimisation.

Figure 5.4 'Violence and victimisation affecting young people'. Drawn by two mixed race 15 year old young women

These experiences can also evoke a range of emotional responses, linked to the perception of an area, an individual's resourcefulness and ability to manage their personal safety, and previous experiences of violence and victimisation (see also Pain, 2000 on the expression of fear). For instance, where young people see vandalism, in the form of graffiti and tagging, the meanings applied to previous experiences become important (see plate 5.3). On seeing graffiti, associations will be made between that and, for example, gang fights and muggings. Depending on the social situational contexts of the young people viewing graffiti, they will interpret and experience these situations very differently (Decker and Van Winkle, 1996; Phillips, 1999; Valdez, 2003).
The spatiality of violence and victimisation is significant. Graffiti is produced for two different audiences: firstly, other rival gang members for whom gang tagging can be a direct challenge of power and respect; secondly those young people who may not have any direct or indirect links to gangs, but because they live in an area where gangs exist they are familiar with the signs (Cresswell, 1992; Phillips, 1999; Valdez, 2003). The signs suggest an area where gang activities take place. Put more simply, it is not graffiti in and of itself that produces feelings of insecurity. Graffiti must be interpreted and understood if it is to be a generator of both fear and respect (see MacDonald, 2001; Phillips, 1999). The emotions of violence and victimisation therefore are not linear and they are also highly gendered.
Knowing and Not-knowing: An Example of Spatiality of Experience

The different experiences of violence and victimisation in east London were made clear through mapping exercises to identify, not only safe and unsafe areas, but also the causes of this (in)security. The interpretations of these experiences varied markedly between young men and young women. By far the most commonly articulated source of potential violence and victimisation emanated from gangs. Gangs were associated, by both young women and young men, with specific streets and neighbouring schools. The threat of gangs was apparent during the day, but was heightened at night. The threat of gangs was most widely identified by young men, who were also more specific as regards the spatiality and nature of the threat posed. The threat of gangs for young men was associated with very specific streets (such as Stepney Way, Cannon Street, Brick Lane) and parks (such as Weavers Field, Haggerston Park, Mile End Park, and Victoria Park, see plates 5.3 and 5.4).

The nature of this threat was outlined by the following discussion with a 16 year old young man:

British Bangladeshi Young man aged 16: There’s fights down Brick Lane all the time
Carolyn: and who are they fighting?
British Bangladeshi Young man aged 16: Cannon Street, Brady Street, Stepney Boys
Carolyn: and what’s it about?
British Bangladeshi Young man aged 16: It’s mostly about territory and area, but sometimes it’s over drugs, where drugs can be sold
Field diary entry, 20th January, 2004

Gang violence was identified as taking place in particular ‘staging areas’, and commonly at specific times (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Goffman, 1969). For example, a number of the mapping exercises undertaken, particularly by older young men (aged 15 and 16), showed that a small park away from the
gang streets was a common site for gang violence. Figure 5.5 shows the very specific staging areas of different types of violence.

Figure 5.5 'Mapping local security and insecurity'. Drawn by a 16 year old British Bangladeshi young man

This young man differentiates stages of 'gangs', 'people looking for trouble', 'muggings', and 'fights'. Weavers Field was a commonly
referenced area of danger, particularly amongst older participants (see plates 5.4 and 5.5).

Plate 5.4 Entrance to Weavers Field, BLM (Brick Lane Massive) graffiti. Photo taken October 23rd, 2004

After dark, Weavers Field represented an area of known danger for young people like this 15 year old young man: "[It’s unsafe] in weavers after dark ‘cos fights, stabbing and killing goes on”.

This knowledge enabled young people involved in gang violence and victimisation (either integrally or peripherally) to negotiate their personal safety through both 'management' and 'engagement'. Those people who were not involved in gangs, however, did not visit this park at night; their strategy for promoting personal safety therefore was 'avoidance' (see later for a full discussion of coping mechanisms).
For young women, and to a degree for younger men, the threat of gangs posed both known and unknown threats. They knew of the presence of gangs, made clear from simply attending a school in a gang area (see plates 5.1 and 5.2 of gang graffiti on school premises). Many young people can read the signs of gangs (clothing, jewellery, graffiti and so on). Gang graffiti is specifically positioned around schools, in order to engage with a wide potential audience of peers. For some young people, the threat of gangs is ‘known’, just enough that it impinges on their daily lives, but not to the extent that they fully understand the ‘code of the street’ (Anderson, 1999). For this reason gang activities impact directly upon young people’s lives in east London, regardless of their level of engagement with them. This seems particularly true for young women who, despite being aware that they are less ‘at risk’ from gangs and groups challenging others for respect and power, remain highly fearful of gang activities on the streets.

Plate 5.5 Inside Weavers Field, CSM (Cannon Street Massive) graffiti. Photo taken October 23rd 2004
Gendered Nature of Knowing and Not-knowing

The mapping exercises also indicated interesting gender differences in the meanings applied and attached to different experiences, and subsequently the different emotions of violence evoked on the streets. Young women's experiences of violence and victimisation, as noted previously, appear to be strongly influenced by the media and other stories of local violence, rather than first hand experiences. This is also reflected in young women's mapping of the area.

Figure 5.6 'Mapping local security and insecurity'. Drawn by a 13-year-old British Bangladeshi young woman

As highlighted by the British Bangladeshi young woman who drew figure 5.6, danger was characterised by one of three things: gangs, drunkenness and murders. This was reflected in many areas considered to be unsafe during both the day and night. Murders were associated mostly with parks and this young woman’s fear of parks was such that she simply would not enter the local Mile End Park:
Carolyn: Do you go to Mile End Park?

British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 13: No! It’s not safe

Carolyn: Not ever?

British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 13: No, it’s not safe during the day, it’s full of bad people

Carolyn: So, would you feel safe if you were with your friends, during the day?

British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 13: No, I’d never go there!

(Field diary entry, 19th January 2004)

Although references to murders were often based on second-hand information and experiences often mediated through popular press and television, this was not always the sole source of information. This 15 year old Black British young woman explains the type of violence that informed her disliked aspects of the area:

"I don’t like the violence... like the woman in Victoria Park, and the person who lives in the block next to me who got shot".

The different ways in which young men and young women source and apply meaning to the violence in their area is important as it has a direct impact upon their day to day lives. Even though most young men know they are at a higher risk of violence and crime, the meaning they are able to apply to this is such that it reduces their fear (see figures 5.2, 5.4 and 5.7). For many young men, fear associated with victimisation, is also bound to the positive effects of interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy, and the capacity to relieve boredom (see figures 5.2, 5.4 and 5.7 identifying theft, gangs, muggings and vandalism as linked to boredom and the need to generate interest, enjoyment or excitement).
I believe the key to this lies in the complexity of '(dis)respect'. When shame-humiliation also becomes attributed and attached to violence and victimisation, excitement and joy can be derived from shaming others and thus gaining self-respect. This 'knowing' is then translated into a range of sophisticated strategies for increasing personal safety. Young women, on the other hand, tended to attach a purely negative meaning to violence and victimisation that they cannot understand or fully explain (for example, random acts such as murder). Because of this, their fear is amplified and attached to feelings of not-knowing; their coping strategies are therefore less specifically directed towards understood risks.

In order to understand young people's relationship with 'knowing', it is important to place this knowledge within the 'code of the street'. Why and when violent events take place are crucial to understanding the meanings applied to violence and victimisation. The temporality of violence and
victimisation also significantly shapes young people's experiences and their tendency to apply knowledge and meaning to such experiences.

**Temporality of Violence**

Without wanting to be restricted by the dangerous (dark) - safe (light) binary outlined earlier, it is nevertheless important to address the temporality of violent experience. Young people's experiences of violence, and the meanings applied to violent events vary according to the time of day and year. Much of the fear literature simplistically correlates increased fear with increased darkness (see Herbert and Davidson, 1995 on street lighting, and Pain, 2000 for a critique). For these young people however, darkness was not considered the most dangerous of times during a 24 hour period. Instead, reflecting the embedded nature of the school, the most dangerous times of the day were linked to the role of the school. Before school and during lunch breaks were considered potentially dangerous times. However, as with previous findings above, after school was the time that concerned most young people: "It's most dangerous] at 3.30pm when the other schools come out" (15 year old young man).

Temporally-specific violence and victimisation were most commonly identified by young men, as this period, particularly after school was a time when other young people were "looking for trouble". It was a time when young men were therefore at risk from muggings and assaults (see figure 5.8). Interestingly, young women were most likely to identify darkness as the most dangerous time of day. The reasoning behind this was that there were few people around to offer protection and as one 15 year old young woman explained: "No one can see you, so anything can happen".
Interestingly, young women were more likely to identify broader fears, exemplified by 'anything' happening. Young men, on the other hand, were far more specific with their understanding of the potential violence and victimisation they faced, in that they were able to both pin point threats to personal safety within a specific time frame, as well as the specific nature of the violence and victimisation from which they were most at risk, such as mugging immediately before and after school (see figure 5.8).

The majority of young people suggested the summer held the greatest potential for violence and victimisation because of the lack of school, jobs and activities for young people to take part in. The result was that people became bored, and then would engage in violence and crime. During the summer then, it was considered more likely that boredom would be
transferred into positive affect-binds to violence (e.g. excitement, see figures 5.2, 5.4 and 5.6), therefore making feelings of insecurity more common during the summer months.

When young people were asked to reflect on their lifetimes as to the changing nature of local violence and victimisation all but one said that the area had become less safe. Figure 5.9 highlights the increasing levels of crime such as shootings and killings.

![Figure 5.9 'Safety time line over participant’s lifetime'. Drawn by a British Bangladeshi young man aged 15](image)

Key:
- I don’t know we wasn’t born
- Days go on I have learnt that TWHMLTS (Tower Hamlets) is increase in violence
- The present time I live in, I have experienced crime, shooting, killing has increased. I lived in TWH (Tower Hamlets) all my life and I will know

Reasons given for this change in violence and victimisation were highly varied: some believed the increase in material goods, particularly mobile phones, created potential victims. Others suggested that when they were younger they were more likely to be protected from violence and
victimisation by their parents and relatives. Another view was that when people became older they spent more time in public places. This increased visibility again made young people a potential target for violence and victimisation. Only one person suggested the area had become more secure. His reasoning for this, however, was that now he now felt safer as he had greater protection from his peer group, not that the area itself had become safer.

Meanings of Violence and Victimisation
Violence and victimisation are spatial experiences, in that the actions themselves and the meanings applied to the experience cannot be detached from the setting or stage (Anderson, 1999; Burman, Brown and Batchelor, 2003; Goffman, 1969; Pain, 2000, 2001, 2003; Valentine, 1989, 1992, 1997). It was clear from diagramming and discussions with the young people in this research that they developed particular types of spatial attachments. By this it was meant that various meanings were applied to their experiences of space and place within Tower Hamlets and its surrounding boroughs. Spatial attachments are always made between individuals and their communities, but real and perceived threat to personal safety is one clear way in which these types of attachments are formed and understood. The links between experience and the different types of emotions, thoughts and behaviours are by no means simple, and they are clearly linked to the different ways in which young people experience violence and victimisation (see for example, Burman, Brown and Batchelor, 2003; Koskela, 1997; Pain, 2003).

'Fear' is undoubtedly one emotional response that is grounded within space and place (see Pain, 2000 for a review). Fear is referred to as: "an emotional response to a threat... and an expression of one’s sense of danger and anxiety at the prospect of being harmed" (ibid: 367). It is also known from research on fear, that different people have different levels of emotional response to the threat of harm, and these do not necessarily correlate with 'actual risk'. These emotional responses are spatially and
temporally embedded and are interlinked with various other markers of difference such as gender, age, ethnicity, sexuality and so on, as well as previous victimisation (Koskela, 1997; Madriz, 1997; Nayak, 2003; Pain, 2000, 2003). Finally, it is also accepted that levels of fear do not correspond to actual levels of victimisation or actual levels of risk (Goodey, 1997 on youth; Pain, 1997 on the elderly; Stanko and Hobdell, 1993 on male victimisation). This is yet another reason to approach violence and victimisation in a more holistic way. It is the meaning applied to experience within a broad social and political context that can go some way to accounting for the differences in fear and a range of other emotional responses to violence and victimisation.

From a psychological perspective, the different fear responses outlined above would reflect a toxic amplification of affect. Fear itself aims to remove an individual from a fearful situation. When the affect is amplified, the situation itself would not need to be a dangerous one: "fear is an affect designed to rapidly minimise acquaintance with its source" (Tomkins, 1963: 14). The aspect of affect theory that has most significance for this research is the concept of affect binding (Kaufman, 1996). Fear-terror can be bound with shame-humiliation when greater meaning is applied to the experience of violence and victimisation. The complexity of this affect combination seems to be consciously articulated by many young people within this research. For this reason and in the context of this group of young people, I seek to explore experiences of violence and victimisation beyond 'fear'.

It is interesting that when young people describe the types of violence and victimisation facing them within their daily lives, they talk in terms of both positive and negative emotions. Boredom is considered a cause of a range of violence and victimisation (see figures 5.2, 5.4 and 5.6). Significantly, figure 5.4, drawn by two young men and a young woman links boredom with causing problems of gangs, mugging and vandalism. In this sense, boredom itself is then translated, through violence and victimisation, into positive emotions of interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy. The holistic experience
of violence and victimisation therefore is associated not only with negative emotions of fear-terror, distress-anguish and anger-rage as often thought, but instead it is far more complex. There remains also one significant emotion that can become associated with other emotions (negative or positive) in the experience of violence and victimisation; it is the emotion reflected in self-esteem, peer pressure, and respect.

Shame-humiliation is central to understanding young people’s conscious and articulated experiences of violence and victimisation. It seems important here to note that this approach to understanding violence and victimisation, whilst drawing upon some ideas found within psychology, is not in itself a psychological interpretation. I attempt only to understand those emotions and thoughts that are conscious and can be articulated readily. Respect for instance, derives from the primary emotion shame in that it has been understood, interpreted and can therefore be (re)articulated by young people themselves as (dis)respect. These emotions are understood and articulated by young people themselves through a range of frames of reference: these are social, political and economic, as well as being spatial and temporal. These articulations however, are far more complex than those outlined by a situational approach, which simply positions quiet and dark (dangerous) spaces in opposition to busy and light (safe) spaces (see Koskela, 1998 for a critique).

**Gender and the Importance of ‘Boys’ and Violence**

While the threat of violence was outlined by all young people, the perpetrators were almost solely thought to be ‘gangs of boys’. One 13 year old White British young woman explained the nature of threat in the area:

"Boys hanging out, boys making noise at night and boys threatening people for money. [that's the problem]"

While there was little gender difference in the likelihood of initially identifying school-centred violence, there were significant variations
according to perceived threat of victimisation. Young women understood that they could get 'caught up' in this type of violence, because it was unpredictable and to a degree unscripted:

"Big groups of thugs sometimes beat you up for no reason. Around here thugs threaten you for all your money and valuables." (12 year old British Bangladeshi young woman)

They were also aware however, that as young women, they were not the main focus of attack. As one 13 year old British Bangladeshi young woman said:

"All the boys from *(a school next to ours)* always beat up boys from our school (or try to) or theft [sic] something from them."

Young men, on the other hand, felt that simply because of their gender alone they were a target for attack. This fifteen year old young man explained the gendered problem of mugging to be simply: "Because thieves target young men".

This is a subtle yet highly significant difference as regards the meanings applied to violence and victimisation. Young women should, based upon their own interpretation of their potential risk, feel less negatively about the school as a violent staging area than young men, who by their own admission are potential victims. However, this is not the case, and this highlights the significance of the social dynamics of violence and victimisation and the different meanings applied to violence and emotional responses to it. Young men were clear that the process of violence and victimisation was intricately linked to peer pressure, an image of respect and ultimately to a particular type of masculinity (Connell, 1995, 2000; Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Mac an Ghaill, 1994). Young women were less
specific, but no less adamant about the meanings they attached to their own experiences of violence and victimisation.

A number of contradictions run throughout these young people’s interpretations of their communities. Young women, and more specifically the youngest in the sample, saw danger in wide ranging areas and for wide ranging reasons. For instance, it was young women who most commonly referred to the dangers of high profile violence and victimisation such as murders in the area. In the mapping exercises of those who referred to murder, 77% were young women. Young women were also far more likely than young men to be influenced by high profile incidents that received attention from the national media. As such young women more regularly cited Victoria Park as a dangerous place due to the murder of a female jogger in 2003.

One reason for this could be the media focus on women as being in most danger and specifically being warned to focus on their safety (Bowcott, 2003). This approach to women and safety has been widely criticised within academia for implying that women are inherently weak, passive and ‘born victims’ rather than addressing the underlying masculine nature of violence (see Pain, 2000; Stanko, 1985, 1990). Within the popular media however, this remains the dominant approach. Young women therefore reinterpreted the dangers associated with violence that they saw through the media. As a result of this, many young women amplified their fear, attaching their own meaning to danger and therefore transferring it into their own personal fears (see Madriz, 1997, for similar findings with adult women).

Based on the mapping exercises conducted, young men drew most of their meanings of violence and victimisation from personal experiences or directly from the experiences of friends, peers or family members. Young men therefore were far more likely to identify very specific spatial locations of violence and victimisation. In turn, their understandings of the violence and victimisation that took place in these areas were also very
specific. Figure 5.10 shows the spatial and racialised meanings of violence and victimisation as outlined by one 16 year old young man. His interpretation of the area was divided into dangers from 'Black people' (drug related), 'white people' (alcohol related) and 'Bengalis' (causing [gang related] trouble). These threats were also very specific to small areas. He was able to locate them around parks, pubs and streets.

Figure 5.10  Mapping local security and insecurity'. Drawn by a British Bangladeshi young man aged 15
These dangers are not high profile ones, or ones that would be reported in the media. They reflect experiences of low level violence and victimisation which are acted out within very specific 'staging areas'. This young man's experiences, understood in this detail could be used to negotiate his own personal safety through techniques of 'avoidance', 'management' and 'engagement'. Depending on the meaning applied to the spatial threat, the 'appropriate' coping strategy could be drawn upon.

Further specific details identified by young men relate to gang activities and territoriality. Where young women identified the dangers of 'big boy gangs' they did not in the main, associate these dangers with particular areas. Young men, on the other hand, were far better able to identify very specific spatial and temporal dimensions to the negotiation of their personal safety.

**Negotiating Violence and Victimisation**

It has been shown that there are significant differences between the quantitative rates of experience, and qualitative meanings of experience. The ways young people attempt to negotiate violence is a reflection of the varied nature and extent of their victimisation, the perception of their personal safety and the meanings applied to their experiences and perceptions.

This was most starkly reflected in young people’s strategies for negotiating potential threat of violence and victimisation. Their choices of 'avoidance', 'management' and 'engagement' were influenced by rates of victimisation. However, they reflected a more complex dynamic of emotion, thought and behaviour than can be accounted for through simple analysis of victimisation rates alone. Strategies for negotiating personal safety varied considerably between spaces of violence, even when rates of actual victimisation did not vary significantly. This reflects a significant difference in the emotional responses to the spaces of the school and the street. While actual rates of violence and victimisation did not vary between the two
sites, emotional responses to the sites varied markedly. For instance, the school was broadly considered a safe space, where positive emotions were more often experienced. The street, on the other hand, evoked a range of negative feelings experienced as, for example, discomfort and insecurity (regardless of the same actual rate of violence and victimisation). These emotional attachments to place are then transferred into different behaviours. Through the negotiation strategies for personal safety and meanings applied to experiences of violence and victimisation, gender and age were significant factors.

To understand the different strategies for negotiating violence and victimisation it is necessary to define the meanings of 'avoidance', 'management' and 'engagement'. These have slightly different meanings depending on the context of violence and victimisation, but the ideas behind the terms remain the same (See also Moser and McIlwaine, 2004). 'Avoidance' refers to strategies that remove an individual from a situation of perceived danger. Within a street context, this would include: not going out after dark, only visiting familiar areas and respecting others. Within a school context this type of avoidance is more difficult, and in the context of this research only incorporates respecting others. 'Management' refers to actions whereby violence can be managed and thus the likelihood of victimisation and its significant effects can be reduced. Within a street context this refers to walking in groups or with friends. Within a school context spending time in groups and with friends is one option, along with telling a teacher if problems and the likelihood of victimisation arise. The final category 'engagement' refers to actions that interact directly and physically with the likelihood of victimisation, or when potential threats arise. These activities can be thought of as the same on the streets and within schools, and include fighting back, and carrying weapons either as individuals or as groups of friends.

33 This would also incorporate more subtle negotiations of 'playground politics', but these were not explored within the current research (Factor, 2004; Goodwin, 2002; Karsten, 2003).
These are all valid and effective strategies that young people utilised for negotiating the real or perceived threat of victimisation. First, addressing the public sphere as a space that must be negotiated, significant gender and age differences emerged. Avoiding unfamiliar areas was the most popular strategy for negotiating victimisation, offered by 61% of the sample (see table 5.2). Respecting others was also seen as a valuable strategy, and one acted upon by 26% of the young people. Avoiding going out after dark was also taken-up by 45% of the sample. A more 'management' focus was adopted by 42% of the sample, who spent time in groups or with friends to manage and reduce the threat of victimisation if problems arose. Finally, a significant proportion stated that if necessary they would 'engage' with a violent incident; 32% said that they would fight back, and 11% said that either they or their friends 'protected' themselves through carrying weapons (see table 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Strategies for the negotiation of street violence (Source: Questionnaire Survey)

34 Respecting others was commonly described in this context as not 'screwing' or 'screw-facing' (i.e. giving 'dirty looks' to) others.
When these figures are analysed according to gender, a significant difference in the negotiating strategies emerges. The negotiation of violence and victimisation must be considered as a continuum of strategies that young people can draw upon according to the individual situation faced, ranging from absolute avoidance to absolute engagement. In this context, young women emerge as more likely to opt for 'avoidance' and 'management' strategies, whereas young men tend to favour 'management' and 'engagement' strategies. There seem to be three aspects of interest with these strategies. Most noticeable differences existed between young women's and young men's approaches to avoiding going out after dark. This may be a reflection of a societal acceptance that women can express fears, whereas for men it is less acceptable. Or this may be a reflection of a difference in experiences between young women and young men. It might be that for young men, their experiences and interpretations are such that the dark does not harbour any great threat. On the contrary, young male interpretations appear to point towards territory as an issue over which personal safety must be negotiated. Territory creates a significant degree of anxiety, so much so, that it is consciously negotiated through daily avoidance of unfamiliar areas. The reason for this is as yet unclear. Finally, young men are significantly more likely to engage with the threat of violence and victimisation through fighting back and carrying weapons. Despite insignificant gender differences between actual victimisation rates, it appears at this stage to be far more necessary for young men to engage with violence.

It emerged that the continuum of 'avoidance', 'management' and 'engagement' was taken-up in significantly different ways according to age. The youngest children who took part in the research, those in year 7 (aged 11 and 12 years) were more likely to 'avoid' situations of potential violence and victimisation. This contrasted with the 'negotiation' strategies of the older participants in the research, a significant proportion of whom opted for 'engagement' strategies. Again the interesting point here is that while engagement increased with age, territory continued to have significant
meaning. It might be expected that as young people get older and become more confident about their physicality, engagement strategies would become effective options. The issue of territory however, clearly has strategic and symbolic meaning for it to be consistently highlighted as a strategy for avoidance.

In the school context, the more rigid structure of surveillance within the school enabled more young people to ‘avoid’ and ‘manage’ their experiences of violence and victimisation. It must be remembered however, that this surveillance does not stop victimisation, rather it merely impacts upon the meaning applied to such experience. Although only 26% of young people ‘respected others’ as an avoidance mechanism, ‘management’, especially through telling friends, was a far more common strategy (see table 5.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell teacher</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight back</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Strategies for the negotiation of violence and victimisation in schools (Source: Questionnaire Survey)

Within a school context therefore, young people could negotiate the threat of violence and victimisation in a markedly different way. Options for ‘management’ were more reliably effective. The surveillance of a school also means that fighting as an engagement strategy could be utilised more
freely without the fear of significant injury\textsuperscript{35}. Interestingly however, reduced weapon carrying could reflect a less threatening environment within the school. In this environment, 'engagement' seems to be a reflection of more complex negotiations of power relations than an immediate surface level survival strategy as on the street. Alternatively, this reduced weapon carrying could also reflect an increased likelihood that young people would be more likely to be caught with their weapons within schools.

What can be stated is that young people’s experiences and interpretations of violence and victimisation shape their approach to negotiating risk and personal safety. The different ways in which violence and victimisation is experienced is not however, a simple cause-effect relationship between victimisation rate and actual or even perceived risk. These negotiation strategies reflect a far more complex dynamic incorporating victimisation rates, but more significantly, the meanings applied to these experiences. Only when meaning has been applied and attached to experience can it then shape a young person’s future experience and negotiation of violence and victimisation.

The Embedding of the School in Mechanisms of Coping

So significant is violence and victimisation within the lives of young people in east London that schools also operated as a coping mechanism and mediator of violence and victimisation. There are many links between the school and the wider community, as one teacher pointed out in relation to the heavy police presence\textsuperscript{36} restricting gang fights in and around the school:

\textsuperscript{35} It must be acknowledged here that there have been and continue to be cases of significant violence within schools (Ward, 2004). There remains the perception that schools are safer spaces and that teachers can be relied upon to offer protection. The same is not true for the streets, where the police are much less trusted to provide support (see chapter 6).

\textsuperscript{36} This incident required a police helicopter above the school, and roughly 50 police officers in the vicinity.
Teacher, mixed comprehensive: ‘You’ve come at a bad time as you can see! We’ve had a lot of problems in the local community.”
(Field diary entry, 7th May, 2003)

Thus, while it may only be a minority who engage first hand with this territorially based violence and victimisation, it is a significant minority, and implications impact upon the whole student body of a school. The dynamics of school-gang violence and victimisation were clearly embedded within the school:

Teacher, mixed comprehensive: "We have trouble with * [a school down the road], but not * [a school across the road] which is just as close. The trouble is not to do with school issues, but things going on outside like people going into other people’s areas. It’s got worse, they’ve all got mobile phones so they can organise it [fights] in minutes... the male members of staff have to go out after school and try and sort things out if there’s any trouble. You just get on with it and hope no one pulls a knife on you”
(Field diary entry, 5th June, 2003).

This goes some way to explaining why both young women and young men highlighted a similarly high rate of negotiating personal safety through avoiding unfamiliar areas. It many cases, it is not the territory itself that is so vehemently fought over, rather territory acts as a trigger. If young people place great emphasis on avoiding violence and victimisation through avoiding unfamiliar areas, the greatest challenge to respect and to power will inevitably come through individuals and groups actively ‘invading’ nearby areas. This is done in order to seek out other young people from whom respect can be negotiated and in many cases, physically removed.
Understanding the spatiality of violence and the spatial variations in the meanings applied to violence and victimisation is therefore integral to creating a sophisticated understanding of young people’s experiences. The role of the school as a staging area for violence is a complex one that evokes different degrees of fear and fearlessness amongst students. The type of violence associated with this staging area was mostly physical assault, fighting, and muggings. It was also often associated with group perpetration, as one 13 year old young man explained: "There are lots of crews around, anyone could get mugged at any time." This type of violence was discussed by teachers from all the participant schools, and was the focus of many school policies. One such policy was staggering the end of school days to ensure students from opposing schools and gangs were not leaving at the same time. The thinking behind this policy was outlined by Judith a teacher at a Mixed Comprehensive:

**Teacher, mixed comprehensive:** “We’ve coordinated with * and we start our day before they start and end 25 minutes before they finish. It means we can get all the students who come from Hackney and Southwark on buses and away from the school before * come out of lessons. This works to a degree, but you can’t stop people hanging around waiting for other schools to finish”

(Field Diary entry, 19\textsuperscript{th} January, 2004)

**Concluding Comments**

This chapter has provided a youth-centred view of experiences of violence and victimisation within east London. From this perspective violence and victimisation was significant for all young people in that they were aware of it, could articulate it, and made allowances for it in the enactment of their daily lives. Self-report rates of victimisation were also high with nearly a third of the sample reporting having been a victim of violence. There was little variation between the extent of violence occurring within the public sphere and that occurring within schools. Young people’s feelings towards
these spaces as violent institutions did vary significantly. Self-report of victimisation increased significantly with age, and a larger proportion of young men were involved within the violence and victimisation process than were young women.

Young people understood and articulated their experiences of violence and victimisation to be both multiple and complex. Young people themselves attached spatial and temporal meanings to their experiences. Young people also outlined the enactment of significant gender differences, played out through the dynamics of bullying and gang interactions. The spatial attachments young people made to their experiences of violence and victimisation enabled the development of a range of coping strategies. Young people engaged in coping strategies that enabled them to 'avoid', 'manage' or 'engage' in the violence process. Based on previous experiences, spatial and temporal attachments and their own desires for respect young people developed different strategies for coping with their daily experiences of violence and victimisation. Through the following three chapters, the themes presented in this chapter will be analysed and developed through a more sophisticated theoretical framework.
The nature of young people’s citizenship - their engagement with society - has become an important focus of government concern (see Blunkett, 2001; Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004; Home Office, 2003) and academic debate (Dean, 1997; France, 1996; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999). Reform to education, welfare and criminal justice policies are increasingly conditional upon moves towards ‘responsible behaviour’ and engagement with the labour market (Blunkett, 2001: 92-93 on the ‘opportunity’ of New Deal as a condition of welfare receipt; Taylor-Gooby, 2000). Punitive approaches to criminal justice require young people’s responsibility towards the state in return for the protection of the state. Non-custodial sentencing such as anti-social behaviour orders and behaviour contracts reinforce the conditions for behaviours of ‘responsibility’ (Grier and Thomas, 2004 on punitive measure where ‘contracts’ are broken; Home Office, 1997, 2003).

From a political perspective, young people’s citizenship is defined by the enactment of ‘responsibilities’, by positive engagement with education, by voluntary work and by involvement in the political process. Central to putting these New Labour ideals into practice is the citizenship curriculum. The citizenship curriculum provides a space through which children and young people will be ‘taught’ what it means to be a ‘good’ citizen, what

\[\text{For those young people under the legal age for voting, school councils and mock general elections within schools are considered appropriate techniques for educating young people for the political process (see DfES, 2003)}\]
the relationship between rights and responsibilities is and how it is to be regulated (Crick, 1998; France, 1996; Kerr 2000; Such and Walker, 2005).

From the perspective of young people, the enactment of citizenship is much more complex (Lister et al. 2001). Citizenship is not a simple linear process whereby responsible behaviours lead to a set of rights provided by the state (Such and Walker, 2004). Citizenship instead is a fluid and inconsistent experience, rather than a top-down government-prescribed set of behaviours (Dwyer, 2002). Experiences of citizenship are undoubtedly influenced (directly and indirectly) by government policy (Giddens, 1998). The meanings applied to government policy and subsequent structural inequality are drawn from and interpreted through lived experience (Dwyer, 2002; Taylor-Gooby, 2000; Tisdall and Davies, 2004; Such and Walker, 2004, 2005).

Young people’s daily lives are therefore central to a working definition of youth citizenship. Young people’s experiences of citizenship, their views and perceptions of their position in society are understood through a balance of structure (social, economic and political inequality) and the agency of social-psychological lived experience (Such and Walker, 2004). From the perspective of the current research, it is the meanings applied to perceptions of societal position that are significant. The links young people make between their position in society and their lived experience are paramount.

This chapter outlines the (inconsistent) nature of citizenship as articulated and explained by young people. The school and the street are spaces where citizenship is experienced, enacted and controlled in many different ways. These spaces however, are not fixed; experiences remain fluid and young people’s citizenship can oscillate between different positions. While these spaces of citizenship are not geographically fixed, the spatiality of social, economic and political constraints is for many, still tangible. Through this
spatial experience, young people shape their own notion of citizenship through their lived experience.

In order to outline this complexity, this chapter will firstly set out young people’s own vision of citizenship - a vision fundamentally marked by the perceived capacity to enact change. It will then proceed to argue that when young people apply a more sophisticated meaning to their lived experience, they can lose hope in (or become more realistic about) their capacity to enact change. Interpreted and internalised as symptomatic of reduced (disrespected) citizen status, young people begin to develop and negotiate their own form of ‘subverted citizenship’. Although citizenship is inconsistent and at times contradictory, it is argued that there are three 'positions'\(^{38}\) of citizenship negotiation: citizenship interpreted through the concepts of ‘trusting’, ‘protecting’, and ‘respecting’. This is not necessarily a linear process; young people may experience only one position, or experience all three positions simultaneously. However, when a perceived inability to enact change is interpreted and internalised as a lack of societal respect, violence and victimisation becomes a legitimised form of generating respect and self-esteem. When violence and respect become conflated, the impacts touch all young people’s lives. In this form of youth citizenship, ‘conventional norms’ of citizenship are subverted in an attempt to generate self-esteem and salvage dignity.

Finally, not all young people will experience their reduced citizenship status through the need to engage with the violence and victimisation process. This chapter will outline how all young people’s citizenship is influenced by their experience of violence and victimisation, and in turn, young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation affect the meaning applied to their citizenship. This chapter will therefore conclude by seeking to interpret young people’s experiences of citizenship through the extent/content/depth framework set out in chapter two (Sin and Wood,

\(^{38}\) I have chosen to use the term ‘position’ rather than ‘phase’ or ‘stage’ in an attempt to reflect the fluctuating nature of these experiences. The term ‘position’ does not reflect a rigid sequence of experiences through which an individual must pass.
As young people increasingly view their citizenship in terms of constraint (rather than extent), the content of rights and responsibilities becomes reconfigured by young people themselves as they begin to experience their citizenship through a lack of trust and a lack of protection. Therefore, while the New Labour government attempts to reconfigure the content of citizenship by increasing the 'responsible behaviour' expected, young people are subverting their citizenship to one understood through exclusion and a distrusting relationship with the state.

The 'Capacity to Change': A Vision of Citizenship

In order to explore the inconsistent nature of youth citizenship and the different ways in which young people position themselves in relation to the state, an understanding of young people's own vision of citizenship is necessary. This information is based upon a range of CBA diagramming techniques, worksheet tasks and informal discussions in schools and youth groups within Tower Hamlets. Through these forums, young people articulated their vision of citizenship and three broad categories emerged; 'reduced violence and victimisation', 'participation in the community' and 'respect'.

There are two important ways of reading these aspects of 'good' citizenship. Firstly, these categories undoubtedly reflect the marginalised and victimised positions of these inner-city young people. A vision of citizenship necessarily draws upon lived experience as a marker against which improvements could be measured. At this stage therefore, tentative suggestions can be made that many of these young people feel that actual or perceived levels of violence and victimisation are too high, that participation within their communities is too low, and that the level of respect that they are afforded is also limited. Secondly, it is important to note that these aspects of a vision of citizenship reflect young people's hope in, and desire for, the capacity to enact change. For an individual to feel they have the capacity to enact change, that their position within
Being a Good Citizen means...

- Get a good education
- Clean after your pets
- Don't pervert the course of justice
- Care about each other's belongings
- No child abuse
- Respect each other
- Treat people with equality
- Reporting crimes
- No taking or selling drugs
- Look out for one another
- Help those in need
- Don't steal
- Not making racist or sexist comments
- Not making litter, etc.
- Give charity
- Not making drugs
- Not vandalising or graffiti
- Not carrying weapons
- Not bullying or fighting
- Helping and supporting one another
- Help people to practise their religion, e.g., wear religious clothing
- Do voluntary work
- Help those who need e.g., old people

Figure 6.1 'Being a Good Citizen'. Drawn by two 16 year old young women, one British Bangladeshi, one Somali

For many young people, violence and victimisation is so widespread that it has become normalised within everyday life: "when someone pulls out a weapon you just run... it's a bit of exercise" (15 year old Black British young man). Due to the extent of normalisation, a reduction in violence and victimisation would reflect two important changes. Firstly, it would reduce...
feelings of threat to personal security and the subsequent impacts of insecurity. This would reduce levels of stress in individuals as they attempt to avoid, manage or engage with the violence process. Linked to this reduction in stress levels would be the decreased need to (mis)use substances such as alcohol and drugs as self-sedation (see figure 6.7).

Secondly, the desire for a reduction in violence and victimisation reflects a broader political desire for a more just society. In reality, the creation of a just society is reflected in the need articulated by young people for an increased and effective system of policing. However, as the 16 year old young man who drew figure 6.2 notes, while effective policing is an important immediate strategy, the long term solutions must incorporate political and economic change. For this young man, a greater range of youth welfare services and better opportunities for employment are seen as solutions to stopping people from wanting and needing to engage in gang behaviours. This contrasts with the role of the police, who are seen as necessary simply for controlling people’s negative behaviours within the context of structural inequality, poor services and few opportunities for employment.

Figure 6.2 'Causal flow diagram' of gang related violence and victimisation. Drawn by a 16 year-old British Bangladeshi young man

The emphasis on the role of the police in reducing violence and victimisation is important. It reflects two possible factors. Firstly, young people maintain hope in the ‘idea’ of the police as a protective institution. Secondly, it may reflect young people’s jaded views on the capacity for broader structural change.
Young people undoubtedly expressed a desire to enact a trusting and protecting citizenship, where the police as an institution would support young people (as equally respected citizens) and provide help when necessary. This view also sees the role of the government as central to providing security, through opportunities of employment and through the provision of youth services. These views of reducing violence and victimisation do incorporate the New Labour punitive approach to controlling the behaviour of 'irresponsible' citizens (Giddens, 1998; Home Office, 2003). But these young people also construct a more complex meaning of the violence process. They clearly see the importance of welfare and poverty reduction as underlying causes and therefore as being central to generating solutions to the problems of violence and victimisation.

**Participation in the Community**

The second aspect of young people’s vision of citizenship reflects the perceived need for greater engagement within an individual’s community.

![Diagram of 'Being a Good Citizen'](image_url)

**Figure 6.3 'Being a Good Citizen'. Drawn by two British Bangladeshi young women, aged 15 and 16 and one 16 year old mixed race young man**
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This incorporated behaviour ranging from formalised voluntary work to less formal actions such as alerting the police to ‘anti-social behaviour’ and helping the elderly to cross the road (see figure 6.3).

There were some disagreements regarding who had the greatest responsibility to be most engaged with the community. Some considered it unfair that older people were expected to participate in voluntary work. This was expressed by one 16 year old British Bangladeshi young man (in discussion over figure 6.3):

"I think younger people should have more responsibility to do voluntary work and things. Older people have done enough for the community throughout their lifetime, they should be able to retire and enjoy their lives before they die."

It was also noted that older people had less spare time to take part in voluntary work because they were required to spend more time in paid employment and supporting families. As one 16 year old White British young woman explained:

"I suppose it [voluntary work] is something young people should do more of, older people do have less time, when they're working and have families to support, but I don't think many young people want to do it!"

This group explained how the meaning of citizenship was different for different people, dependant on an individual’s stage in the life course. As an individual became older and their time became more valuable, it was thought that the responsibility of citizenship should decrease. This interpretation is important in understanding young people’s own experiences of citizenship. Many young people considered that citizenship was enacted differently according to age. In this sense, citizenship is seen
as a fluid individual experience, and one that relates directly to lived experiences and circumstances (see also Such and Walker, 2004). Interestingly again, these young people’s views of citizenship are in many ways not dissimilar to those outlined by New Labour. Citizenship, it was thought, should include some form of positive engagement within a community. This was considered in some way ‘good’ for a citizen’s wellbeing.

However, these young people again express a more sophisticated understanding of the complexity of lived experience. To these young people, individual circumstances impact upon the enactment of an individual’s citizenship. It is unlikely that this is a result of not wanting to engage within a community, but it might be symptomatic of an individual’s other commitments to, for example, supporting the wellbeing of their families. Yet, the discussion around figure 6.3 highlighted a strong degree of political cynicism. This group saw becoming a ‘productive asset’ as being part of good citizenship. However, they were more cynical about voluntary work:

“Well this is what the government wants. They want us all to do voluntary work because that means work gets done for free, and the government don’t have to pay for things!” (16 year old mixed race young man)

So while this group believed that to be able to work was a positive thing for personal wellbeing, they were also aware that the government had more strategic objectives for encouraging citizens to enter the workplace, whether on a paid or voluntary basis.

Respect
The final important aspect of a vision of citizenship was ‘respect’. Respect was expressed in many forms, explicitly through demanding respect for themselves and others, and implicitly, through the meaning applied to many
of their own (disrespected) experiences. Respect then, underpinned the reduction of violence and victimisation and an improved positive engagement within a community. Figure 6.4 highlights the multiplicity of the meanings of respect, as particularly reflected in the need to respect individual difference. In figure 6.4 it is considered important to respect all people, regardless of age. However, for many young people in this research, their experience was one of disrespect, interpreted through their youthful age. As the following discussion with a British Bangladeshi young woman shows, reduced citizen status can be seen and felt; aged-based disrespect is tangible:

**British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 15:** If we’re just walking down the street people think we’re doing something wrong.  
**Carolyn:** How do you know that?  
**British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 15:** Well, just the way people look at you. And sometimes people even cross over the road to avoid walking past young people.  
**Carolyn:** Really? Even if it’s a group of girls?  
**British Bangladeshi Young woman aged 15:** Yes! They think we’re going to cause trouble and be violent, something like that

*Field Diary Entry 14th January, 2004*

Many agreed with the essence of these sentiments and felt they too were disrespected simply based upon their age. Some interpreted this lack of respect more specifically through their gender and ethnicity, or through their public behaviours. One 15 year old Black British young man highlighted the problems of being young and spending time with friends on the streets:

"When there is a huge number of us walking down the streets people think we are a gang, and that we will start a fight with another gang."
Another 15 year old White British young man, thought this was also related to being young and male:

"Adults do think we are making trouble because we walk in a group. When they see boys in a group they think we are up to no good and call the police."

For other young people, these negative feelings of societal disrespect were also understood through adult expectations of ethnicity. As one 13 year old Black British young man explained:

"Adults see a group of Black children who are making noise and having fun so people are threatened. Because we are Black, people think we are going to shoot, steal or make a racket."

Many young people also admitted that they sometimes felt they could be considered intimidating. But for the vast majority this was not their intention and was simply a symptom of adult anxieties. If intimidation was intentional, it was very rarely directed against adults; other young people were most commonly the target. This 16 year old White British young woman explained the link between alcohol and drug use as disinhibitors and behaviour that could be construed as disrespectful:

"Sometimes when my friends are under the influence of alcohol or drugs, they become lairy and generally disrespect outsiders of their group. But my close friends aren't like that at all because they have respect. As do I, most of the time."
The politicised theme of respecting difference was particularly important and related to two significant political issues occurring at time of the research. One major issue related to the 'war on terrorism', and more specifically, the nature of the UK's involvement in the war with Iraq. The second, a less high profile issue, was over the right to wear religious dress. These two issues were undoubtedly influencing both young people's views of citizenship and the way in which they understood their own citizenship. The war with Iraq, and particularly the protests against the war with Iraq had instilled a degree of mistrust in a large number of the students. Many of the students had taken part in the anti-war demonstrations and they were aware of the proportion of the population who had taken to the streets to protest. Despite this, they felt that the government did not respond. For the majority of these school students the anti-war demonstration was their only experience of street protest and it had failed. This, in turn, influenced both their feelings towards the government and their views regarding the
nature of their own citizenship (see Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004). The experience of being incapable of creating change, and particularly the inability of young people to create change, was illustrated by one group of British Bangladeshi young women aged 15.

Carolyn: So, how could you do something about the problem of drugs around here?
British Bangladeshi Young woman 1: How can we do anything about it?
Carolyn: Yeah, so how could you tell the government if you wanted something doing about the drug problem?
British Bangladeshi Young woman 1: I don’t know, I have no idea
British Bangladeshi Young woman 2: You could demonstrate
British Bangladeshi Young woman 1: But that doesn’t work, we did that about the war. The whole world did that about the war, and they didn’t listen!
British Bangladeshi Young woman 2: But this is more important, they would have to listen
British Bangladeshi Young woman 3: It’s NOT more important! Nothing is more important than war! Who would really demonstrate about drugs?
British Bangladeshi Young woman 2: But they have to do something about drugs... sometime
British Bangladeshi Young woman 1: War is the most important thing. We were all against it, and they didn’t listen. Demonstrating doesn’t work. I don’t know what you could do
British Bangladeshi Young woman 3: It’s like in France, people demonstrating about banning the Hijab, and no one is listening

39 The research was conducted between January 2003 and June 2005.
Carolyn: Ok, so what would you do if the government here tried to ban the Hijab? [All these girls were wearing the Hijab]

British Bangladeshi Young woman 3: I don’t think we could do anything. They d n’t listen.

Field dairy entry, 28th January, 2004

This highlights both the importance placed by many young people on 'difference' and the right to enact 'difference' through in this case, religious dress. As significantly, it highlights young people's perception of their reduced citizen status in society. This suggests that contrary to popular media and government perceptions of a 'disengaged youth' (Fahmy, 2004), these young people are knowledgeable and engaged with political processes. They are however, disillusioned by their inability to be heard, or to make change.

These feelings are critical to young people’s experiences of respect and their desire that respect be a central aspect of a vision of citizenship. These young people’s direct experience of not being listened to and of feeling incapable of making change is understood quite simply as a lack of respect (Gaskell, 2005). It was their interpretation that citizens who are not listened to within a democratic process must hold a reduced and therefore disrespected citizen status. For these young people, without societal respect, the capacity to create change becomes an increasingly distant hope.

These young people experience their vision of citizenship through three key factors: the insecurity of the school and the streets; a lack of meaningful interaction with society; and most importantly (and underpinning the complete vision of citizenship) through a lack of the societal respect that makes possible the enactment of change. Unlike many political and academic opinions that consider young people as politically disengaged (Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004; Fahmy, 2004; Home Office, 2003), these research participants showed themselves to be very political. However, a
significant number of young people were resigned to the fact that they were unable to influence political decisions. While this research showed a high degree of political interest, it also highlighted that a disengagement from formal politics, symptomatic of low turnout amongst young voters, is not due to a lack of interest, but perhaps a lack of hope.

The Concerns of 'Lived Citizenship'
In many ways, the difficulties identified through lived citizenship, were the same as those that would ideally be overcome though a vision of citizenship. But the vision of citizenship described by these young people was further restricted by specific perceived difficulties in enacting adult citizenship. Drawing upon young people's views and diagramming of what they believed citizenship lessons should teach, three clear concerns relating to what they might 'lack' when the time came to enact full, adult citizenship became apparent. These related to issues of 'education and employment', 'social skills', and 'health education'. There were clear concerns that the formal education of the school did not address the informal life skills that these young people felt they needed to acquire (Weller, 2003). If citizenship education was going to be meaningful for young people, it needed to relate to their lived experience (Gaskell, 2004).

Education and Employment
Concerns regarding education and employment, along with the wider socio-economic barriers to enacting citizenship were raised by the vast majority of participants in this research. Figure 6.5 highlights the importance placed on higher education and employment. These two young women were clear that they required support in the process of applying and being interviewed for jobs, as well as being educated about higher education itself. The focus on and concern with education and employment suggests that there was a maintained investment in the achievement ideology of education. Concerns over qualifications and job prospects were regularly discussed by all the groups, particularly within the context of the introduction of university top-up tuition fees - another political issue at the time of research.
Many of the students were aware that they may not be able to attend university because of their financial status: "I won't be able to go to university if you have to pay all that, and it ain't fair" (16 year old young woman). This feeling heightened young people's concerns that they must leave compulsory formal education equipped with the capabilities to apply for jobs, and conduct interviews appropriately.

The political issue of tuition fees was again one that informed many young people's views of the government, and more importantly, the meaning they applied to their own enactment of citizenship. Many young people articulated a clear understanding of poverty and structural inequality within the context of their 'making it'. At times, achievement ideology and the immediate pressures of lived experience were in direct opposition (Weller, 2003). The need to gain an education was at times at odds with their experiences of inequality. While MacLeod's Hallway Hangers rejected achievement ideology, these young people continued to accept it, but lowered their expectations. They began to apply an increasingly
sophisticated understanding of structure-agency, with more and more young people understanding their citizenship through a framework of inequality.

British Bangladeshi 16-year-old young man: Do you know about the university thing?
Carolyn: About top up fees?
British Bangladeshi 16-year-old young man: Yeah, they just changed the law about charging people to go to university. He’s making people pay £3000 to go to university, that’s wrong. Tony Blair has lost our vote man, he’s lost the student vote. He ain’t going to get no votes from us.
Carolyn: Would you not vote Labour then?
British Bangladeshi 16-year-old young man: No way man! You can’t trust them innit!
(Field Diary entry, 28th January 2004)

Social Skills

Many of the participants in both the group work and the questionnaire survey referred to their concerns over social skills or verbal communication. There was a concern that verbal skills, English proficiency, accents, slang or not talking ‘appropriately’ would impact upon their ability to gain employment. Like the experiences of Bourgois’ crack dealers as they attempted to enter legal employment, for whom a Puerto Rican accent equated to a deficit of cultural capital (2004), one 13 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained:

“We need to learn about the sort of work we are going to do.
And we will need to learn better English, because if we don’t we can’t get a job innit.”

This is an acknowledgement that the school is required to attribute many inner-city young people with the cultural capital necessary to gain ‘middle class’ employment. For many, social skills incorporate what Anderson (1999)
referred to as 'code switching': the need to know how to speak and behave appropriately in many different social situations and the ability to enact this through speech and behaviour. The enactment of 'appropriate social skills' was strongly linked to the capacity to avoid and/ or cope with violence and victimisation. As two 15 year old young woman discussed, a strictly academic education was not considered adequate:

Carolyn: So what do you reckon you need to know before you leave school?
White British Young woman 1: I think we need to learn about the way of life and need to learn most things so we have an education to get about in life...
Black British Young woman 2: And we need to learn how to be streetwise...
Carolyn: Yeah? And what does being streetwise mean?
Black British Young woman 2: It’s kind of being able to see when trouble is going to happen
(Field Diary Entry 4th June, 2003)

Whether in school or out of school, young people are regularly confronted by violent situations; their ability to negotiate these prevents emotional and physical pain. As outlined in chapter five, schools and streets are understood by young people through different 'codes', of which the presentation of a violent image and negotiation of violence are central. The inevitability of violence, the necessity to negotiate it, and the need to be taught this in school is outlined by one 14 year old British Bangladeshi young man:

"We need to learn that not everyone is perfect or liked by everybody, so we will be involved in some sort of incident, but we have to ignore everything and control ourselves with others".
Also needed were very specific and gendered social skills. These were considered necessary to enable girls to negotiate the streets, as this 13 year old mixed race young woman explained:

"We need to learn about knowing how to protect ourselves especially young females out on the street, I mean, what can we do when we're attacked by strangers, what [weapons and force] can we use?".

**Health Education**

The final aspect regularly referred to as a necessary part of young people's citizenship was that of health education. Figure 6.6 below highlights that some believe there is a need to teach young people more about health issues, such as smoking, alcohol and drugs.

![Citizenship Lessons Should Teach Diagram](image)

*Figure 6.6 'Citizenship lessons should teach'. Drawn by two 16 year old young women, one Bangladeshi and one Somalian*

Again, however, the issues of drinking, smoking and drugs are not simply health related; many young people had a more sophisticated understanding
of their implications. In many cases these were referred to in the context of high levels of crime and violence in the area. Some substances were used as a form of self-sedation, in order to manage overwhelming negative emotions or high levels of stress. As figure 6.7 highlights, (mis)using drugs in this way can lead to more significant social and psychological problems of increased violence and victimisation and mental health difficulties.

![Causal Flow Diagram](image-url)

Figure 6.7 'Causal Flow Diagram' of the problem of drugs. Drawn by two 16 year old white British young women and one 15 year old white British young man

It was suggested by both students and teachers that alcohol and drugs (particularly those associated with increased violence such as crack) played an important role in young people's lives and their participation in violent acts. Teachers described how drugs were a significant issue within the school grounds:

**Teacher, boys' comprehensive:** "Drugs are a very serious problem. We have students this age [year 7] completely obsessed with drugs, obsessed with cannabis... we have a police officer working within the school, he mainly deals with gangs, and drugs. Drugs is a real issue".

Field diary entry, 24 June, 2003

Of greater concern for the schools was the use of other, harder drugs:

**Teacher, mixed comprehensive:** "Drugs are definitely a bit of an issue. Weed is smoked at
school, you can smell it, and I suspect there’s some crack being used”.

Field Diary Entry, 28\textsuperscript{t} January, 2004)

Young people were also keen to establish the links between alcohol and drug (mis)use and increased levels of violence. As this 14 year old young woman explains, drugs are thought to be related to the underlying causes of violence: "Gangs go around, some with weapons; they try to mug you so they can get money to buy drugs or pay off the drugs related departments". While the issue of alcohol and drug (mis)use was raised in relation to increasing the likelihood of violence and victimisation (as a disinhibitor), the dynamics were more complex. Many young people understood alcohol and drug (mis)use as a reflection of structural pressures, as a form of self-sedation when the pressures of inner-city life became too much. Alcohol and drug (mis)use for these young people were undoubtedly both a cause and a symptom of violence and victimisation, and a barrier to enacting a particular vision of citizenship.

**Trust in Citizenship**

So far it has become apparent that young people’s citizenship is broadly experienced through ‘violence and victimisation’, ‘community engagement’ and ‘respect’. These experiences are also cross-cut with feelings that cultural capital\textsuperscript{40} is lacking, that education is restricted by the immediate pressures of lived experience and that education alone, in the context of inequality, might not be enough to ‘make it’. Young people’s vision of citizenship appears to be experienced and interpreted through three frames of reference: ‘trust’, ‘protection’, and ‘respect’ provide three positions through which young people make sense of their experiences.

\textsuperscript{40} Although Bourdieu’s (1977) cultural capital defined as - the general cultural background, knowledge, disposition, and skills that are passed from one generation to the next - is not a concept central to the current research, I feel it is useful to use in this context. It appears that what the young people are describing is their lived experience of cultural capital. This meaning and experience of cultural capital feeds directly into their experiences of their reduced citizenship status. I therefore draw upon cultural capital in the same way that MacLeod (1995) does, in the context of exploring young people’s aspirations and attainment.
As stated earlier, based upon these young people’s articulation of citizenship and its meanings, there appears to be a great deal of hope. Hope that they will be respected as citizens, and that in turn, their views can be an influential basis for change. This hope, it seems, underpins aspects of citizenship understood first, through a framework of trust. ‘Trusting citizenship’ is understood by young people through three main institutions: the school, the police and the government. The most important factor to take into account is that trust is experienced and understood differentially, and it is this that provides young people with a framework to reconfigure the meaning of their citizenship.

According to New Labour, it is social capital that underpins ‘engaged citizenship’ (Hodgson, 2004; National Policy Forum, 2003a). Social capital, the networks of trust and reciprocity between individuals, communities and institutions is in turn, fundamental to the enactment of citizenship (Lister, 2003). As previously set out in chapter two, this notion of social capital can be interpreted as ‘adultist’ in nature. Often the important networks of trust and reciprocity built up between young people go unacknowledged. This, however, is not to say that young people do not have social capital, that they do not have networks of trust, that they do not have relationships with formal institutions of civil society or that they do not enact meaningful citizenship. Most importantly, this does not mean that trust is not crucial to young people’s own articulated experiences of citizenship.

On the contrary, trust is integral to these young people’s interpretations of citizenship. First and foremost, in order for New Labour’s ‘no rights without responsibilities’ model of citizenship to be effective, trust in the institutions of the state must exist (Newton, 2001). In order for young people to enact the responsibilities expected by New Labour, they must have trust in the government itself, in terms of what it stands for and how it operates. Indeed, the ‘no rights without responsibilities’ model of citizenship, is based upon this. Without citizens having trust in the government and the belief in reciprocity of trust that the government will
enact the rights of citizens, the likelihood of people continuing to act 'responsibly' is slim.

**Trust and the Government**

As emerged from the empirical data, young people’s relationship with the government and their views of the position of ‘youth’ in society were informed by their own experiences. Because of this, there were significant differences between the views of the younger and older students. Those students in year 9 (aged 13 and 14), were generally far more trusting of the government than the older students in year 11 (aged 15 and 16). All students however, stated that they trusted the government more than they felt trusted in return (see figures 6.8 and 6.9).

![Figure 6.8 'Trust circles'. Completed by a mixed race young man aged 13](image)

The reasons behind this level of trust however, were uncertain. Most of the younger students were unable to explain why it was that they trusted the government. For the younger participants, it seemed not so much that they trusted the government based upon a specific reason but rather that it was
simply that they had no reason they could call upon to justify distrusting the
government. This vague confusion was expressed by one 14 year old British
Bangladeshi young woman:

"The government just wants to do the better for people and
the community. But I also think that we shouldn't trust them
completely because sometimes they make decisions without
asking for the public opinion. But if people don't trust the
government then they will not be able to communicate and the
government won't make appropriate decisions for society."

There were clear indications therefore that young people wanted to trust
the government and wanted to hope that a trusting citizenship was possible.
It was only when greater experience, and more importantly sophisticated
meanings, were applied to these experiences that hope in trusting
citizenship declined.

For the older students (aged 15-16) there was a far greater distrust of the
government and this was based upon more specific reasoning. The distrust
was mostly based upon their experiences of the war with Iraq, university
top-up fees, or the general lack of assistance given to the local borough.
The war with Iraq did, however, incite some of the strongest reactions in
relation to the government, such as this conversation with a 16 year old
British Bangladeshi young woman (see also figure 6.9 also drawn by her):

Carolyn: So what do you think about the
government?
British Bangladeshi 16 year old young woman: Do I
trust the government? Not at all, they're
conniving thieves!
Carolyn: And what do you think they think about
young people?
British Bangladeshi 16 year old young woman: Do the government trust young people?! Not at all! If they trusted us, they wouldn't have gone to war!

Field Diary entry, 12th January, 2004)

In all the discussions of politics at local, national or international level with young people aged 15 and 16 years, none identified any positive feelings towards the government. This negativity, however, was well informed, and any lack of 'formal' political engagement these young people displayed was not out of ignorance as might be suggested by both the government and the popular press (Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004: Fahmy, 2004). On the contrary, many young people were in touch with tangible political issues impacting upon their communities. This is perhaps best illustrated by the following thoughts of one 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man. While

Figure 6.9 'Trust circles'. Completed by a 16 year old British Bangladeshi young woman

In all the discussions of politics at local, national or international level with young people aged 15 and 16 years, none identified any positive feelings towards the government. This negativity, however, was well informed, and any lack of 'formal' political engagement these young people displayed was not out of ignorance as might be suggested by both the government and the popular press (Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004: Fahmy, 2004). On the contrary, many young people were in touch with tangible political issues impacting upon their communities. This is perhaps best illustrated by the following thoughts of one 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man. While
he may not be politicised in a formal 'party politics' sense, his understanding of Tower Hamlets, is most definitely a jaded politicised one:

"I want to live somewhere safe and secure, but all I see is drugs, stabbings and shootings. I've lived here 15 years, all my life, I know where the bad areas are and what goes on. I know Tower Hamlets is corrupt and it's not going to change, there's no stopping. I know that if I stay here my kids are going to see drugs and killings and it's not right, but no one is doing anything, nobody is trying to stop it, no one is speaking out man."

(Field Diary Entry, 20th January 2004)

It is, I argue, simply too easy to say that young people are 'politically disengaged'. As many of these discussions have shown, young people are very much engaged with the political process, but the nature of that engagement is a negative one. Young people growing up in areas of poverty and inequality, where the negotiation of violence and victimisation are daily events, find it very difficult to visualise how their situation could change. In such a situation, if people have no belief that any type of political engagement be it, for example, voting or street protest, would change the nature of their lives, the networks of trust and reciprocity with the government and state institutions are undermined.

Trust and Schools
The importance of trust and reciprocity with teachers was indicated by the majority of the participants (see figure 6.10). While most young people would claim that they didn't trust all teachers, and not all teachers trusted them in return, most students had at least one teacher that they felt they could trust. This is also reflected in young people's reporting of victimisation within the school. Although friends were the most likely to be told in the event of crime or violence within the school (28% of cases),
teachers were second most likely, being told in 20% of cases. In addition when young people were victimised even in public spaces unrelated to the school, teachers were told of incidents by 6% of young people. This highlights quite high levels of trust in teachers, but also high levels of trust in friends and peers within the site of the school. The school therefore, is an important arena where these networks can flourish and develop both between young people and between young people and key adult figures.

Figure 6.10 'Trust circles'. Completed by a 16 year old Somali young woman

This is not only fundamental to young people’s emotional and physical support within the institution of the school. Schools also form important civic institutions within the community (Craig et al. 2004). The role of the school within the construction of social capital and the enactment of citizenship is clear in many terms. For a significant number of young people, their schools represented safe spaces, contrasting with their immediate, unsafe, localities. For their students, schools offer a space of familiarity within the community, even if students experienced violence and
victimisation within them (see chapter five). This contrasts to the role of other rival schools in the area. For many, these pose significant threats of violence and victimisation and are places to be avoided during the school day, and particularly after the formal school day has finished when the security and surveillance of the school as an institution of control no longer operates. Figure 6.11 for example, clearly shows that the site of the school is considered a safe space within the local community. As one 13 year old British Bangladeshi young woman explains, the role of schools in the community is highly significant to young people's understandings of both their security and freedom of movement:

"Gangs and gang fights happen everywhere, people think they are all it, staying around after school when * school are out is very dangerous".

Figure 6.11 Mapping local security and insecurity. Drawn by a 13 year old British Bangladeshi young man

Trust in institutions does exist and young people do appear to have an underlying desire to enact a trusting citizenship relationship with the state.
However, it appears that as lived experiences take on more sophisticated meanings, trust gradually erodes. When trust erodes, the meaning of citizenship becomes linked more intimately with other interpretative frameworks. When young people begin to lose trust that they have the capacity to enact change, their meaning of citizenship is reconfigured towards the need for individuals to protect themselves.

**Protecting Citizenship**

The role of relationships between young people and the police is central to understanding the nature of these young people’s citizenship. Trust in the police and the protection of the state not only impacts upon the ability of young people to negotiate their daily lives but it also adds meaning to the nature of youth citizenship.

The responsibility-based citizenship of New Labour demands that citizens give up the right to be violent, to protect themselves, in exchange for many forms of state protection: financial protection through welfare benefits, and significantly in this case, physical protection from violence and victimisation (Home Office, 2003). Young people’s relationship with the police is vital to their ability to enact the type of citizenship that New Labour demands (Home Office, 2003; National Policy Forum, 2003b).

Interestingly, as previously outlined, the younger students, aged between 13 and 14 years, were initially trusting of the police. The majority of young people (regardless of age) after further discussion were trusting only of the ‘idea’ of the police; the reality of police ‘protection’ provided a very different experience. Young people spoke negatively about their personal experiences with the police. One group of 13 year old British Bangladeshi young men explained that the relationship between young people and the police was difficult and in their interpretation, understood through identities of gender and ethnicity.
Carolyn: How do you get on with the police?

British Bangladeshi Young man 1: They [the police] don’t like us [British Bangladeshi young men] miss, I was at Canary Wharf and I was accused of stealing something when I didn’t. That was just because the police are racist.

British Bangladeshi Young man 2: Yeah, the police are racist miss; they call the Bengalis Pakis.

British Bangladeshi Young man 3: There are no Bengali policemen. That’s what we need, but there are none, why do you think that is?

(Field Diary entry, 19th January, 2004)

Despite these experiences, these young men maintained their level of trust in the ‘idea’ of the police; the ‘idea’ that a state institution would protect them was maintained through hope. This was particularly apparent when discussing the ways in which violence and victimisation in the area could be reduced. Regardless of these experiences, all of the young people desired to have more police working in their area (see figure 6.12).

![Figure 6.12 'Causal flow diagram' of the problem of stabbings. Drawn by three 13-year-old British Bangladeshi young men](image)

They saw surveillance from police and CCTV as a positive thing for the area. Indeed, many of the young people believed that punitive measures by the state and the police were the only way in which the effects of violence and victimisation could be curbed. For this age group at least, the ‘idea’ of the police, rather than their reality, was that of an institution to be trusted. Despite any negative experiences, many of these young people really
wanted to believe that the police would protect them, and that increased policing would reduce the insecurity of the area.

In addition to the role of age in young people’s relationships with the police, gender also emerges as an important factor. Young men were far more likely to talk about their own experiences of problems with the police. Examples of being stopped and searched, wrongly accused of shoplifting and muggings were almost solely the domain of the young men and many had simply become resigned to this as a part of life. As this 16 year old white British young man explained:

White British Young man: I’ve been stopped and searched all over London. It’s not just here man. It’s everywhere, in the West End, everywhere.
Carolyn: And why do they do it?
White British Young man: They say they think you’ve got drugs or weapons. If you’re young and male and wearing clothes like this [hooded top and tracksuit bottoms] you just get stopped.
(Field Diary entry, 1st February 2005)

Young women talked about their relationships with the police in much more trusting terms and were far less likely to see their behaviours as negative. In short, in this context, young women were also far more likely to perceive the police as their protectors. Young men, on the other hand, had a more antagonistic relationship with the police.

The older students (aged 15 and 16 years) however, had a rather different attitude to the police. These young people had significantly less trust that the police would protect them. Most drew on personal experiences or the experiences of friends as the basis of their views of the police. There appeared to be a significant shift in the experiences of young people as they got older. Much of the negativity expressed was the result, not simply of victimisation by the police, but also of police attitudes when young people...
tried to report incidents. The older the students, the more likely they were to have experienced some form of violence or victimisation. Yet many said that they had faced discrimination in their reporting. As two British Bangladeshi young men explained:

**British Bangladeshi Young man aged 15:** My cousin was attacked yeah, he was assaulted down by Bethnal Green Road, we went up to these cops to get something done yeah, and he said ‘just give me five minutes to go to McDonalds’. So we were hanging around yeah, waiting, and then they just drove off, while we were standing there, innit!

**Carolyn:** Yeah? Have you all had experiences like that?

**British Bangladeshi Young man aged 16:** I got attacked innit, just outside here, because a police officer got beaten up out there two nights before.

(Field diary entry, 20th January, 2004)

Similar experiences of ‘heavy handed’ police approaches were outlined:

**Teacher, mixed comprehensive:** You should see the way the police treat the kids outside the school. You know, we have a few problems outside the school, but we can deal with it. We just shout at them, we’re the teachers and we can deal with it. But the police completely over react and start throwing the kids onto cars and all sorts!

**Carolyn:** Is that how they normally deal with situations outside the school?

**Teacher, mixed comprehensive:** Yeah, but to be honest, I don’t think the police are trained properly. They shout at our kids, so obviously they give them lip back!

(Field diary entry, 5th June, 2003)
For many young people, not only did they feel discriminated against, but their right to protection was also not being honoured. These types of experiences were common place in the majority of young people’s discussions of the police. For the older participants, the police were not afforded any respect. This was based upon experiences of being stopped and searched, being racially abused and being failed when incidences of violence and victimisation were reported. These experiences were interpreted by young people as a lack of respect for them as citizens. This was most clearly articulated by one 16 year old young man:

White British Young man: When the police stop and search you yeah, I think they should do it in an alley, or somewhere, but not in the street.
Carolyn: Yeah? Do they usually stop you in the middle of the street?
White British Young man: Yeah man, but they fucking do it on purpose, I swear! They do it like that to bring humiliation on you in front of your mates.
Carolyn: And does it humiliate people?
White British Young man: No, not really, I don’t think so. Because people are doing things to try and be big, you get me?
(Field diary entry, 18th February, 2005)

When young people’s relationship with the police is defined as one based not on trust or protection but on disrespect and ultimately shame, the implications are two-fold. Firstly, there is a fundamental failure on the part of the state to protect these young people. This can be seen, not only in the reactions of the police to young people, but also in young people’s perceived needs to cope with the daily threat of violence and victimisation through gangs, weapon carrying, the presentation of a violent image and so on. One 14 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained the meaning and function of gang behaviours within a context lacking in formal protection:
"It’s for protection innit. If you’ve got a gang it shows that you are tough and no one’s going to mess with you. If anyone does, then you’ve got your gang to back you anyway."

Gangs and groupings therefore provide a significant function of informal protection (Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; McIlwaine and Moser, 2001). They also hold a deeper personal meaning relating to self-esteem, status and respect. Gangs have become an established part of many young people’s ‘respected’ identity. Group identities are also about the presentation of self; they rely upon the creation of a spectacle of violence:

"Most of the time, boys need to show people that they’re tough. The only way to show people is to join gangs, and this will also help them to gain respect.” (14 year old mixed race young woman)

In this sense, when trust in police protection is eroded so significantly, peer groupings and gangs become the most relied upon form of informal social control (Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Decker and Van-Winkle, 1996; McIlwaine and Moser, 2001). Gangs and groups are therefore a coping strategy, an attempt to manage the implications of a disrespected citizen status. The necessity to cope was clear:

**Teacher, mixed comprehensive:** I mean there were so many muggings last summer, you really can’t blame them for carrying weapons, and behaving the way they do.”

Field diary entry, 5th June, 2003

The second implication is that because young people are not appropriately protected by the state, they’re unable to enact the responsible citizenship that the New Labour government themselves demand. When the state does
attempt to fulfil its protecting role, it is young people again who are targeted, and their citizenship status further reduced to that of 'less than adult'. New anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) directly impact upon young people’s geographies, and their freedom of movement (Grier and Thomas, 2004; Matthews, Limb and Percy-Smith, 1998; Philo and Smith, 2003). The Anti-Social Behaviour act gives power to the police, enabling them to disperse groups of two or more young people under the age of 16. Although this law has only recently come into force, many young people had experienced informal spatial restrictions put in place by the police even before this act was passed. One 16 year old mixed race young woman explains the diverse risks of the area:

“There’s nowhere in this manor [area] that’s safe
man. You’re always at risk from stabbing and muggings. And from the police who arrest you for being in certain areas. I’m not joking man! There’s certain estates, yeah, where you’ll get arrested, for just being there”
(Field diary entry, 20th January 2004)

It appears that central to young people’s experiences of trusting and protecting citizenship is hope. Young people hope they can trust the government and the police to protect them. Experiences of failed political activities and inequality are interpreted as disrespect from the political process. Antagonism and humiliation by the police is interpreted as a disrespected citizen status. Young people’s hope in their being able to trust these institutions decreases. Most significantly for this research, trusting and protecting citizenship is undermined by flawed relationships with the police. Young people begin to invest less and less in formal institutions of trust and protection. They react against their disrespected citizen status by generating respect and self esteem in other ways. The meaning of citizenship itself becomes reconfigured through the framework of ‘respect’.
Concluding Comments
For the majority of inner-city young people, ‘respect’ acted as the main medium through which citizenship was experienced and understood. Although the capacity to enact change was considered to be the most significant aspect of a vision of citizenship, respected citizenship was considered to be the function underpinning this capacity. Many young people experienced their relationship with the government and the police to be one lacking in trust, but significantly, not one lacking in the desire to trust. The citizenship relationship was therefore one where young people themselves felt they were not trusted, not protected and ultimately not respected.

Particularly significant for these young people was the perceived need to reject formal protection provided by the police, in favour of informal networks of protection provided by gangs, groups and weapons. It is becoming clear that while initially these behaviours can provide some young people with physical protection, they increasingly hold a more significant meaning. For a significant number of young people, and young men more commonly, these forms of informal social controls become inextricably linked to self-esteem, respect, status and to gender identity (see chapter seven). Not all young people enact these types of violent and victimising behaviours to generate forms of self-validation. But as this way of thinking becomes more pervasive, all young people begin to operate within this structure. This kind of respect negotiation is present within schools and on the street in East London, and seems to be a reflection of a reconfigured and subverted form of citizenship.

Reflecting upon the extent/content/depth framework of citizenship helps to understand young people’s reconfiguration of their own citizenship. It seems that these young people initially hope they can enact a form of citizenship advocated by New Labour. This citizenship is one where they would be included within the extent of the formal boundaries of citizenship, where they can expect rights in return for responsibilities of education and
lawful behaviour, and finally that this will allow a deep relationship between the citizen and the state to develop, based upon respect, having a voice and the capacity to enact change. However, as young people's lived experiences become negative, and meanings are applied to these negative experiences, young people themselves reconfigure their own citizenship. Young people begin to perceive themselves to be falling outside the boundaries of citizenship. They consider their young age to be just one important factor in their 'less than' citizenship status. Young people consider themselves to be excluded from and therefore a disrespected part of society. This then impacts upon their self-defined understandings of the content of their citizenship, or in other terms, the balance of rights and responsibilities. As young people experience their right to engage in the political process and their right to protection by the police in negative terms, they begin to reject these 'conventional norms' of citizenship and subvert these through self-protection. Many young people then attempt to gain respect through other channels: channels that have greater meaning within young people's lives.

In an area where violence and victimisation must be negotiated on a daily basis, violence itself necessarily develops a significant meaning and function. The function of much of the violence process is to generate respect, its meaning however is multiple and complex. For the majority of young people, the school can offer a site of support and protection, where networks of trust with adults and other young people are both accumulated and can be drawn upon in times of need. Through these networks of trust and reciprocity, this social capital can be, and is, used to various different ends. For some, the bonds of trust with a teacher can provide the resources to, for example, deal with incidences of bullying, achieve high educational standards, develop sporting achievements and so on. For others, a protecting or respecting citizenship will be formed, where experiences with fellow students can enable gang activities, or provide informal protection where trust in state protection has been eroded. Although these are very different 'collective ends', all activities must be understood as the
enactment of citizenship. All these behaviours and relationships reflect an important (but not necessarily positive) relationship between the citizen and the state. The meaning and negotiation of respect through the process of violence and victimisation requires further analytical attention.
Recently proposed New Labour policy reforms have outlined the need to foster a ‘culture of respect’. This respect is seen as critical to renewing the authority of the police and to combating anti-social behaviour: “fundamentally, anti-social behaviour is caused by a lack of respect for other people” (Home Office, 2003: 8). But respect is also part of a wider drive to reform the welfare state. Respect for the state has been linked to the responsibilities of citizenship. The 2003 White Paper ‘Respect and Responsibility’ states: “Our aim is a society where the rights we enjoy are based on the respect and responsibilities we have to other people and to our community.” (Ibid, 2003: 6). This respect and responsibility refers, in the rhetoric of New Labour, to a range of behaviours including volunteering and civic engagement. Respect and responsibility are central to the increasingly conditional nature of welfare.

The perceived lack of a ‘culture of respect’ amongst young people is considered to be particularly important. This is clear through the construction of childhood and youth in often demonised, negative terms. Policies of anti-social behaviour orders, dispersal orders and increasing school discipline appear to present two notions of respect. Firstly, is the assumption that young people lack respect and therefore must be coerced, increasingly punitively, into behaving in a respectful manner. Secondly, these policies themselves are indicative of a societal lack of respect for childhood itself. Yet ‘respect’ can be a very empty word: it can, it seems,
mean all things to all people, and simultaneously mean nothing to anyone. Respect in these policy terms is presented as a linear, and often one way, relationship. Respect however, as described by the young people within this research, is a far more complex, grounded and meaningful term.

The previous two chapters have outlined the complex processes of violence, victimisation and citizenship in the lives of young people. Chapter five has highlighted the significance of violence and victimisation within the lives of all inner-city young people. In chapter six, the different meaning and experiences of citizenship for young people, as underpinned by a desire for the capacity to change, has been explored. Implicit in both these chapters is the notion of respect as a framework through which young people experience the process of violence and victimisation and apply meaning to this within the context of their citizenship. This chapter will therefore seek to employ respect in young people's lives as a lens for understanding the meanings that young people apply to their life experiences.

The appeal of using the notion of respect as an analytical lens for understanding young people's experiences is multiple. Firstly, respect is fundamental to an individual's sense of self. A lack of respect fosters a negative sense of self; increased respect generates a more positive sense of self (Emler, 2001). It is this individualised sense of worth that can be eroded through poverty and structural inequality (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Gilligan, 2001; MacLeod, 1995). The immediacy of the need for respect in young people's lives is reflected in their frequent articulation of its importance. Respect, for example, is integral to all interpersonal relations, to the dynamics of friendship, peer pressure, self esteem, bullying and the presentation of an 'appropriate image'. Respect is also critical to the process of violence and victimisation and it underpins the meaning young people apply to their experiences of citizenship. To be ignored, unheard, or lacking in voice is to be stripped of respect, dignity and worth.
If the notion of respect is so critical to young people’s lives, it also must offer a way of understanding how the process of violence and victimisation is experienced. This includes the causes, effects and the range of coping strategies employed by young people. Respect provides a framework for understanding young people’s meaning and experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship. As such, a detailed understanding of respect facilitates a more meaningful appreciation of the inter-relations between the three.

This chapter therefore seeks to explore in detail the role of respect in young people’s lives. Maintaining a focus upon the process of violence, victimisation and citizenship, the chapter will explore respect within the context of peer pressure, bullying and gang behaviours. It will argue that the meaning of respect, the desire for respect and the negotiation of respect are central to young people’s experiences of the violence and victimisation process. In order to understand why violence and victimisation is so significant within the lives of these young people, it is necessary to understand the routes to respect as defined by young people themselves. The discussion will consequently argue that policy moves towards ‘fostering a culture of respect’ fail to understand the meaning of respect for many young people. A culture of respect is already very much present within the inner-city and within inner-city schools, but it is one that places an emphasis on violence, a violent image and a rejection of ‘conventional norms’ such as achievement ideology.

Respect in Young People’s Lives

"In the inner-city environment respect on the street may be viewed as a form of social capital that is very valuable, especially when various other forms of capital have been denied or are unavailable. Not only is it protective; it often forms the core of the person’s self-esteem, particularly
when alternative avenues of self-expression are closed or sensed to be” (Anderson, 1999: 66).

"You can’t admit fear, because no one will respect you” (13 year old British Bangladeshi young man).

Anderson’s words regarding life in an anonymous East Coast US city ring true with many of the views and experiences of young people in East London. The language of respect is commonly called upon by young people to describe the detailed dynamics not only of the process of violence and victimisation, but also experiences of all types of social interaction (for example, classroom dynamics, sexual relationships, entering the workplace and so on). ‘Respect’ and its opposite ‘disrespect’ (or ‘dis-ing’ as it is often shortened to) and to a lesser extent ‘status’, ‘self-esteem’, and the infliction of ‘shame’, are key words in understanding the processes of violence, victimisation and a reduced citizenship status.

Respect itself is a concept that can seem very intangible, but the frequency of its articulation and the intensity of meaning applied to it by young people, also makes it a highly significant one. To define respect is a difficult task, as Richard Sennett states:

"If behaviour which expresses respect is often scant and unequally distributed in society, what respect itself means is both socially and psychologically complex. As a result, the acts which convey respect - the acts of acknowledging others - are demanding, and obscure.” (2003: 59).

It is thus most meaningful to explore young people’s own experiences of respect in order to understand the meaning of respect. The young people themselves, despite being clear of the importance of respect, were less clear how they could define it. Respect also takes on different roles and manifests itself in different ways according to situation. So for example,
within a broad political context young people may see the capacity to enact change as a signifier of respect (see chapter six). Within the school, respect might be seen as being able to present oneself in a 'tough' manner (see chapter five). Rather than ask participants to define how they understood respect, they were asked to list things they felt they were respected for and those things they were disrespected for. This provides an understanding of the components of respect, but also highlights broader factors underpinning the meaning of respect for young people themselves.

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 highlight two important meanings that respect has in the lives of these young people. Figure 7.1 outlines the very public nature of respect. Even if feeling respected is primarily an internalized emotion (an underpinning of a positive sense of self) it is also reflected as a visual presentation of self. Those who have respect or those who are to be disrespected can be seen: their behaviours cause them to 'stand out'. But these young men (figure 7.1) also highlight another significant component of respect, its complexity. There is a clear (yet fine) distinction between respect for 'being brave' and disrespect for 'acting tough'. Again, despite 'being yourself' representing a respected trait, 'being a sissy' is to be disrespected. From the point of view of these young men therefore, respect is a fragile and fluid experience. Having respect is about being oneself, as long as that self fits within the 'conventional norms' of a heterosexualised, 'tough' masculine image.
Things you get respected for...

- Personality
- Attitude
- Being polite to people
- Being yourself
- Being good at sport
- Loads of friends
- Being smart at school
- Being smart and neat or tidy
- Being brave (standing up for yourself)
- Being active

Things you get disrespected for...

- Getting beat up
- Being a pussy
- Being a dickhead
- Being a coward
- Being a sissy
- Bad attitude
- Acting tough
- Being a scaggie

**Figure 7.1 'Respect and disrespect' listing. Drawn by two British Bangladeshi young men, aged 15 and one mixed race young man aged 16 years**

Similarly, figure 7.2 outlines the complex and contradictory nature of respect. Whilst respect is afforded to young people engaging in education, when on the streets, or in groups, these same young people feel 'out of place'. To be out of place in this way, is to be disrespected. The other significant aspect of these young women’s views is that while they considered they were respected for both their religion and their gender, they felt disrespected for being 'lower class'. These young women have highlighted two significant structural factors contributing to a feeling of disrespect. Outside of their immediate control, they felt disrespected for their youth and their poverty. This factor is significant for thinking about the role of respect in young people’s lives. When they feel disrespected for something out of their own control, they will seek to gain respect through areas of their lives that they do have control over. One of the most fundamental factors one has control over is physicality and the presentation
of oneself as deserving and requiring respect (see also Skeggs, 1997). In this research, and echoing the views of Anderson (1999), respect was found to have become so important in the lives of young people that it can take on a new role. Respect (as highlighted in figures 7.1 and 7.2) becomes much more than an internalised feeling of self-worth; it is translated into a form of capital (Anderson, 1990, 1999). Respect becomes a form of 'street capital' that can be accumulated and drawn upon to negotiate life within the inner-city (Bourgois, 1995).

![Table of things you get respected for and disrespected for](image)

**Figure 7.2 'Respect and disrespect' listing. Drawn by three British Bangladeshi young women, two aged 15 and one 16 years**

In an attempt to return to a definition of respect, it is important to note that any definition must necessarily be broad and flexible. Respect, by its very nature is individual, yet there are a number of important common factors. From the perspective of young people, respect has a practical and strategic function. Respect can be seen, and must be seen; the negotiation of respect, through any means, is expressed through visual, verbal and inter-personal dynamics. Respect aids an individual in negotiating the pressures of inner-city street and school life. For this reason, respect is also a fragile and commonly negotiated resource. Respect is a subtle balance of internal feelings of worth, esteem and external pressures.

The research found that there are three important pressures shaping young people's understanding and utilisation of respect. 'Peer pressure',
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'experiences of violence and victimisation', and a broader 'social and political disrespect for childhood' all shape the ways in which young people understand respect and in turn attempt to accumulate it. Most significantly, people desire respect because it confirms and validates their sense of self. A respected person is seen by others to be worthy of respect. In order to accumulate respect therefore, an audience (who are themselves respected) is necessary, to see and in turn validate respect in the other. But respect can be accumulated through many and varied 'conventional' and 'unconventional' routes.

Peer Pressure and Respect

Peer pressure and the need to accumulate respect amongst peers within school and street contexts is critical to young peoples' self esteem, confidence and meaningful engagement within both settings. The links between respect and peer pressure are crucial. And as young people place greater importance upon the need for respect, so it is that the role of the peer group also increases in significance. The simple reason for this is that a peer group will define and shape the actions and behaviours that are to be afforded greatest respect. Peers are also those individuals who bestow respect on others, and most significantly, can so easily take it away (Phillips, 2003). Peers therefore set the boundaries of acceptable and respected behaviour (Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003). This was illustrated in a conversation with two White British 15 year old girls:

"it's important to be yourse f and be individual, but it's really important to have a big group of friends... the worst thing you can do is try too hard, and copy other people's styles, yeah."

As this comment indicates, the public nature of respect is important; the visibility of style and large groups of friends are integral to the generation and maintenance of respect. With this heightened visibility comes the temptation for young people to copy 'respected styles'. This, however, if
done incorrectly, can also be problematic. Trying too hard can easily be identified, and those trying to be something they’re not are not afforded respect (see figure 7.1). In a context where the desire to be respected coincides with a political context of a lack of respect for youth (see chapter six) a greater emphasis is placed upon the significance of respect. In turn, the ways in which respect is accumulated become more complex, as more and more people vie for the same pools of respect. Young people must understand the dynamics of respect before they can engage with them, as one 15 year old Black British young man explained:

"Well if you work hard at school, the teachers will respect you, but other kids won’t. You’ve got to try and be yourself, copying other people’s styles is a really bad thing to do".
(Field diary entry 28th January, 2004)

For many young people the links between the accumulation of respect and the demands of peer pressure are clear. Peer groups themselves determine that respect can be lost through victimisation and that respect can be gained through engaging in violence. The greatest respect is therefore afforded to violence directed against other young people and made visible to other peers. As one 14 year old Black British young man put it:

"It's true that boys fight to show off to their friends. I've seen it LOADS of times, it's usually related to peer pressure".

If respect is thought of in terms of a limited resource and one that not all individuals can hold equally, respect must be negotiated or removed from others before it can be accumulated by another (MacDonald 2003). For this reason, many of the actions that accrue the greatest respect are those that are directed against other young people, and particularly those holding a high position in what could be considered a 'hierarchy of respect'.
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With muggings, for instance, the theft of material items is in many cases not the sole aim of the action. Instead, the process of this type of violence and victimisation against a fellow peer has a more symbolic meaning. Firstly, the forceful removal of material items, such as a phone, replaces its associated status from the victim to the perpetrator. Secondly, and more importantly, when this is done in public, visible to other young people, the victim is not only stripped of a material item but they are also stripped of their self-respect and publicly shamed as not being capable of defending themselves. In this context, the public shame of the victim is translated into public respect of the perpetrator. As McDonald (2003: 71) suggests, such violence "points to a mode of urban experience that opposes those who have access to consumption and mobility and those who are trapped in poverty and neighbourhood, and it points to the relationships of competition for the scarce resource of respect". These displays of violence are, most significantly, public ones. The process of respect negotiation requires witnesses - other peers - through whom, the dynamics of respect can be seen and redistributed.

Figure 7.3 'Violence and victimisation affecting young people'. Drawn by three, 15 year old British Bangladeshi young women
Figure 7.3 indicates that peer pressure, peer audience and peer acceptance, in relation to 'mobile theft', 'carrying weapons' and 'gang fights' are of great significance. It is significant that the causes of mobile phone theft and weapon carrying were viewed as a desire to be seen engaging in violence and victimisation. Taking a phone off another person commonly occurred to 'impress' others and weapons were carried to 'show power' over other individuals. Thus, the desire for respect amongst peers represents one of the multiple causes underpinning the process of violence and victimisation within the school and on the streets.

Figure 7.4 'Causal flow diagram' of the problem of gangs. Drawn by two 15 year old British Bangladeshi young women, one Black African and one White British young woman aged 16 years

These diagrams also show that engagement in the processes of violence and victimisation in itself is a source of respect. If the processes of violence and victimisation weren't a source of respect, the activities associated with gangs would not be considered 'cool' or an activity that young people may engage in to impress their peers. From this it can be seen that respect can be gained from a range of behaviours included within the processes of violence and victimisation. Also significant is the role of 'showing-off' and the need for peers to legitimise behaviours through the act of witnessing violence and, in turn, affording the individual the appropriate respect.

When the importance of this dynamic is understood, one clear reason for the emergence of gangs and group behaviours emerges. Gangs are ideal units to provide young people with the peer respect that is craved. The
links between violence, respect and peer acceptance are described by this 13 year old British Bangladeshi young man:

"People in gangs, they act tough, so people know who's boss! ...
[gangs], I think they seem interesting, fun and you feel wanted".

This young man clearly outlines the complexity of gang and group behaviours. They are a space of mixed emotions. On the one hand, an individual can express toughness through violence and victimisation. But gangs are also associated with positive emotions of excitement (Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Katz, 1988), and most significantly, they fulfil the need to feel wanted, to have oneself validated through the acceptance of others (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004; Decker and Van-Winkle, 1996; MacLeod, 1995). In this context gang and group behaviours are integral to the formation and maintenance of a respected self. Gangs and groups fulfil a strategic function. Young people are offered a unit in which violence is expected, but most importantly, gangs offer the ideal and ever-present audience of peers (Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; MacLeod, 1995). In this way, young people have a continuous opportunity to prove their worth and make their claims for respect, through violent actions. As one 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained: "If someone treats you badly you can call them [your group of friends] up to help you".

Bullying and Respect
So far, the negotiation of respect has been most clearly linked with the processes of violence and victimisation, and the visible presentation of self as ‘tough’. But respect can be gained through many and varied routes. The negotiation of respect is not necessarily overtly violent. The way in which young people present themselves and negotiate respect is defined through norms of appropriate behaviour and policed by other young people (Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003). This has been found to be particularly
true within schools and children's homes (Renold and Barter, 2003; Phillips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003). The nature of peer dynamics generates a hierarchy of respect, or a pecking order that normalises bullying (Phillips, 2003). The key to understanding respect within the lives of these young people is to note the visible aspect of it. In this sense, bullying can also be understood through the analytical framework of respect, the negotiation of which can be achieved through bullying, both as verbal articulation and social exclusion (Olweus, 1993; Phillips, 2003; Smith and Sharp, 1994). The factors that one could be bullied for, within this research, corresponded with the factors an individual could be disrespected for. To be bullied, from the perspective of these young people, was most definitely to be disrespected.

The young people who took part in this research identified many different sources of (dis)respect, which could be split broadly into 'physical attributes', 'material items/accessories', 'violence and victimisation', and 'personality'. Most significant in this understanding of respect were gender differences. Put simply, many of the activities that gained respect for young men were, in more extreme cases, sources of disrespect for young women (see Campbell, 1991). For many young men, the accumulation of respect can be achieved in three main ways: through violence and violent posturing, through sexual promiscuity, and through the display of material goods and 'appropriate style' (see also Messerschmidt, 2000). For young women, on the other hand, whether violence and violent posturing were considered respected or respectable behaviours, was more complex. In addition, while the need to be seen to be physically attractive was at the core of respect, this respect was to be accumulated through serious or long-term relationships, rather than sexual promiscuity, which would cause a young woman to be labelled a 'slag' (see Epstein and Johnson, 1998).

41 'Appropriate style' was considered to be wearing up to date fashions, but most importantly, not trying too hard to be something one was not.
For many young women, whilst sexual promiscuity was not a respected trait, emphasising the sexualised nature of young femininity was defined as a source of respect. This was highlighted through the names young women gave to their peer groups/ gangs: 'Lady Riderz', 'Buff Riderz' and '14 S. B.\textsuperscript{42}'. As plate 7.1 highlights, the self description of a peer group as: "2 hot 2 handle" is imbued with undertones of sexualised, yet importantly inaccessible, femininity. By writing this on the walls around the school, these young women are visually attempting to command the respect of other young people, using a model of respected femininity as their tool.

Plate 7.1 "2 hot 2 handle" the writing of female respect. Photo taken 15\textsuperscript{th} October 2004

Plate 7.2\textsuperscript{43} however, highlights two important points. Firstly, that the young women's own assumption of respect has been challenged by other peers, and secondly, that the nature of the challenge to their respect is one based around notions of heterosexualised physical attractiveness. An effective way of challenging a young woman's respect is through challenging their

\textsuperscript{42} '14 Sexy Babes'

\textsuperscript{43} Plates 7.1 and 7.2 show two adjacent pieces of graffiti. The young women assuming respect in plate 7.1 are the same young women being disrespected in plate 7.2.
physicality, through their perceived attractiveness rather than their propensity for violence. This finding is supported by the work of Gilligan (2001), who suggested that to understand the dynamics of respect, it was necessary to question how it was that respect was challenged. This he suggested was based within gender identity: men were challenged regarding their capacity for violence, and women regarding their sexual 'morality'. Both these are challenges to hegemonic gender and sexuality norms. If respect for young women is based upon heterosexualised attractiveness, its challenge is through undermining their perceived attractiveness or challenging hegemonic femininity through accusations of sexual promiscuity or homosexuality. One young woman considered the presentation of a particular type of femininity to be linked to her experience of bullying. The controlled negotiation and presentation of her femininity she hoped would relief her of the bullying she was experiencing:

"I’ve tried being a girlie girl, but the boys still beat me up! So I’ve started being a tomboy."

(Field diary entry, 4th June, 2003)
Significantly, and for girls particularly, their perceived attractiveness was linked to the popularity and attractiveness of their boyfriend, and this also commanded greater respect. As one 16-year-old White British young woman explained:

"You get respect if you have a boyfriend who is older than you, and who is known. You also get more respect if they're good looking. I don't know why, it's stupid really, but you do!"

(Field diary entry, 28th January, 2004)

Interestingly again, respect was afforded to boyfriends who were 'known': by which, the young women meant known to the community for being 'tough' and thus respected.

The young women who took part in this research were required to negotiate respect through a less visible form of bullying. The negotiation of respect through fighting and 'cussing' for the majority of girls was not a spectacle in the same way as for young men. Although young women did engage in both activities, they were not public negotiations relying upon an audience of witnesses. As outlined in chapter five, bullying relating to young women was more commonly associated with smaller groups, and was often conducted in a much less high profile manner. For young women therefore it seems that bullying was as effective, if not more effective in the negotiation of respect when it was less visible. When female bullying did become a spectacle, as reflected in plates 7.1 and 7.2, it related more clearly to the subtle undermining of feminine self-esteem and respect. This highlights a significant gender difference in the accumulation and maintenance of respect. For young men, fighting and cussing matches were public displays of external disrespect. For young women, disrespect was attributed much more from within; the subtle dynamics of female bullying encourage an individual's own and internalised erosion of their own self-esteem and respect.
For young men on the other hand, respect is formed through a propensity for violence or the public ability to 'look after' oneself. Challenges to respect are therefore through physical attack, or the undermining of hegemonic masculinity through discourses of homosexuality. For many of these young men, homosexuality was to be disrespected, because it represented an incapacity to fight, and a 'less than' masculinity. For one 14 year old Black British young man, homosexuality equated to a presentation of a flawed form of self-respect:

"It is [homosexuality] totally disgusting and it is out of order...

it's ok to bully them [gay and lesbian young people] because

they should have a little bit of self-respect...”

When respect, and the formation and presentation of a particular type of self-respect is so important in young people's lives, behaviours perceived to be indicative of flawed self-respect are simply to be disrespected further.

Interestingly, just as young women were commonly associated with verbal bullying and social exclusion (Phillips, 2003; Siann et al. 1994), the spectacle of 'cussing' was very important in young men's lives, and in the negotiation of respect within a 'pecking order'. 'Cussing' incorporates name-calling, swearing and verbally insulting another individual or group. As Frosh et al. (2002) have outlined, while boys' relationships are characterized by joking and laughter, they generally do not want to be laughed at, particularly over issues relating to their masculine status. As such, the capacity to 'cuss' was a source of great respect, and could be equated to a 'verbal fight'. As one 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained:

"In an area like this you will be laughed at if you back away from a fight or if you let one cuss go".
'Cussing matches' were significant in the negotiation of respect because they could take place over a more prolonged period, within a classroom for example, where physical fighting would be more quickly stopped. Cussing is also used to draw other young men into physical fighting:

Teacher, mixed comprehensive: "You have to be so careful, and watch them all the time! First time it happened, I couldn't understand what was going on. You know, all someone needs to say is 'yer mum' and the whole class can erupt. And some of the kids do it on purpose, they know which ones will lose it..."
(Field diary entry, 28th May 2003)

Cussing is commonly directed against another person or their mother. In keeping with challenges to hegemonic gender norms, young men will challenge other people’s heterosexual masculinity, and a mother’s sexual promiscuity. An effective cuss will often incorporate the two: for example suggesting that the young man had 'done' the other young man’s mother. The dynamics of cussing was explained by one 14 year old Black British young man:

Black British 14 year old young man: What you have to do yeah, is keep some of your best cusses back, so if the cussing goes on longer than you thought, you’ve got your best stuff saved up!
Carolyn: But what happens if you’re not very good at cussing?
Black British 14 year old young man: Well you lose and you get shamed. People will laugh at you, give you a happy slap or rush you
Carolyn: And what’s rushing?
Black British 14 year old young man: It’s when about 10 people just beat up on someone. If there’s someone on the ground you just give them
Carolyn: And what do the teachers do?
Black British 14 year old young man: Not much, they d n’t like to get involved, they’ll come in at the end and say ‘break it up’. But they don’t really bother. It also depends on whether they like the kid.
Carolyn: And what’s the point of rushing?
Black British 14 year old young man: Oh, it’s just fun!
(Field diary entry, 1st February, 2005)

‘Cussing’ and ‘rushing’ within the school environment provided a safer space in which to negotiate respect. Cussing is (at least initially) a non-violent method of victimisation and respect negotiation. Schools continue to offer a greater degree of surveillance; even though teachers were often considered as passive bystanders, many students did trust teachers to provide a form of protection that the police would not offer.

As is becoming clear, the phenomenon of respect in young people’s lives is highly complex. The two young women in figure 7.5 highlight the contradictions inherent in the concept and practice of respect. The same activities can elicit either respect or disrespect from different parties. The best example of this comes in the form of academic achievement. Young people who reject a conventional approach to school work, to the extent of ‘bunking lessons’, will accumulate respect from their peers, yet the same behaviour will be received less favourably by school teachers. It is important, therefore, for young people who want to gain respect from peers and achieve academically at school to learn how to balance their behaviours: to learn how to present themselves differently in different contexts.
Whether or not young people themselves advocated violence as a trait to be respected, the ability to 'look after oneself' is seen as a characteristic an individual ought to be respected for. This is the link between the importance of respect, and experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship. The ability to look after oneself is crucial to young people growing up in the inner-city, and this cannot be separated from the relationship between respect and violence, as borne out in young people's presentation of self. Even if young people reject violence and victimisation as a source of respect accumulation (as so many do) it is so pervasive within their lives that the framework of violence and victimisation cannot be avoided completely. In addition, the need for respect is so important that no individual will reject respect. Drawing upon young people's understandings of both the nature of the violence process and their relationship with their citizenship, helps to shape the style of their self presentation.
Negotiating Respect

"For men who have lived for a lifetime on a diet of contempt and disdain, the temptation to gain instant respect in this way [the use of weapons] can be worth far more than the cost of going to prison, or even of dying" (Gilligan, 1996: 109).

"Clearly not expecting to have to follow up his actions alone, Faruk hesitated and backed down, to the collective shame of the British Bangladeshi young men present... which was consolidated by a perceived need to defend their reputation, both as a group and as an area" (Alexander, 2000: 115).

As has been outlined in chapter five, young people growing up in East London are faced by significant experiences of violence and victimisation. An understanding of this is vital to a full appreciation of the role of respect in young peoples' lives. As Gilligan (1996) states above, the need for respect is great, yet the need (and, in turn, the desire) for respect in the lives of those who feel they are not afforded the respect they deserve, is greater still. Individuals for whom citizenship is experienced and understood through a 'less than' citizen framework, will in turn, have a heightened desire to gain respect through alternative means. Despite Gilligan’s research drawing upon case studies of male high security prisoners, there are interesting parallels between his analysis and the experiences of many young people in East London. It is Gilligan’s view that shame, and the corresponding search for respect, are the underlying causes of all violence. It is only when an individual experiences such intense feelings of shame, their sense of self being effectively killed, that violence may ensue. Although the young people who took part in this research are not experiencing or engaging in such extreme incidences of violence, the premise behind Gilligan’s argument is significant.
Respect is crucial in these young people’s lives for two important reasons. Firstly, commanding respect from others decreases the likelihood of violence and victimisation in school and on the streets. As one 14 year old young man explained: “If you act weak then you’ll get picked on, it’s as simple as that”. Yet secondly, the desire to accumulate respect is one of the main underlying causes of violence and victimisation:

“If you carry a weapon, for example, people will be scared of you and start to respect you…” (14 year old British Bangladeshi young woman).

This is both a contradictory and complex argument. Those who command respect, I argue, are in a safer position because they are respected by their peers. However, those who command respect are simultaneously under threat, for the very reason that people do have respect for them. Since respect is a scarce resource and one that must be negotiated from others in the process of accumulation, those highest up the ‘hierarchy of respect’ are thus, by virtue of their extensive pools of respect, most at risk from other people’s challenges. Those young people who are unable to command enough respect risk undermining their self-esteem and character, yet those who command too much, will be constantly called upon to defend their positions from a sequence of new challengers.

This begins to suggest why the dynamics of respect, violence and structural context (either threatened or realised) are important for all young people to understand and engage with at some level. Only when these dynamics are understood can young people make assessments of the way in which they wish to present themselves. This understanding is central to all daily activities, from the simplest of actions, such as walking down the street, to the more complex social relationships to be negotiated within, for example, the classroom. Elijah Anderson (1990: 6) explains this dynamic as ‘street etiquette’, which refers to a superficial understanding of people’s
behaviour, through to a far more sophisticated 'street wisdom' which he defines as:

"... largely a state of mind, but it is demonstrated through a person's comportment. It represents a perspective gained through public interaction, the give and take of street life. This perspective allows one to "see through" public situations, to anticipate what is about to happen based upon cues and signals from those one encounters. In essence a "streetwise" person is one who understands "how to behave" in certain public places" (Anderson, 1990: 6).

By understanding the dynamics of respect and violence, young people are in a position where they can choose the nature of their self-image. They are able to evaluate their self-esteem, their respect and those aspects of their lives through which further respect can be gained. Then they must decide how they are going to 'look after themselves': are they going to remain 'streetwise', or do they want to hold a more respected position amongst their peers? If it is the latter, they must challenge others to accumulate their own respect.

The complexity of the balance of respect is so important to young people, for the very reason that it can mean the difference between personal security and insecurity. For many young people and particularly young men, it is important to show themselves to be 'just tough enough' to ensure they stay both 'safe', yet simultaneously 'out of trouble'. This complex dynamic is quite clearly understood; one 14 year old white British young woman explained the dangers of not presenting as 'tough enough': "if boys carry on like they're soft then boys who are tough will take advantage of them and bully them". There was general agreement amongst all the students taking part in this research that if individuals showed themselves to be weak, they would command little respect and would be opening themselves up to potential victimisation. For many young people bullying was understood
through a framework of respect. When young people fail to command, what I will call a 'critical level of respect', the result is that others will simply bully them. The normalisation of bullying and violence was clearly outlined by young people, and implications were that some victims 'brought it on themselves' (see Smith and Ananiadou, 2003).

However, if the young women’s responses showed a simplistic understanding of the links for young men between being tough and keeping safe, young men’s responses displayed a deeper understanding of a complex dynamic. This complexity is best explained by one 14 year old Black British young man, who suggested that:

"Sometimes if boys want to avoid bullying they have to show themselves to be tough, but this can lead to trouble in the streets".

This scenario highlights the contradictory role of respect in 'looking out for oneself'. This young man acknowledges the problem of bullying, and how this can be combated through an individual showing himself to be tough and thus to be respected. However, this example also highlights the potential dangers of this approach. If an individual wants to show themselves to be tough in school to prevent bullying, they must then come to expect an increase in confrontations on the street. The greater a reputation a young man has for his toughness, fighting or violence, the more exposed he will become to challenge: "If boys act tough, they can be in a different danger" (14 year old British Bangladeshi young woman). The danger referred to here is the one posed by others attempting to negotiate respect by removing it from those who are showing themselves to be tough.

For a young man to show his toughness in isolation from peers is a dangerous strategy. Quite simply, showing toughness alone is risking greater physical harm as there is no back-up in case of emergencies. If (in the
unlikely event that it were) successful it may command the utmost respect, if unsuccessful an individual will be stripped of their respect, and most seriously, potentially of their life. For this reason very few of the young people in this research would advocate such a risky coping strategy in an attempt to stay safe and to accumulate respect. An individual can be a formidable fighter, but this will not ensure safety against groups and gangs within a school or street context.

Here the dynamics of the contemporary gang must be understood. As McDonald states:

"Violence between gangs is no longer based on an ethic of one-on-one (the loyal contest), and there is no loss of honour for a group to beat up an individual" (2003: 70).

This is understood by young people growing up in East London, thus making even the strongest of individuals at risk from victimisation by groups. It is for this reason that belonging to gangs or having groups of peers are very popular coping strategies against insecurity. Gangs then serve two vital purposes for their members. Firstly, they provide physical security through a straight-forward 'safety in numbers' philosophy: "gang members trust each other and they protect themselves" (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man). Secondly, gangs provide respect, status and power: "you get lots more friends, it's cool, you're accepted and you get respect" (13 year old White British young man). In a similar way to Sennett's (2003) outline of gaining respect through giving it back others, gangs provide young people a unit for the reciprocal generation of respect. They provide a forum in which young men can fight, negotiate respect within and between gangs, and they provide an audience whereby challenges to respect can be witnessed and respect redistributed accordingly.

* This discussion was referring specifically to the problems facing young men rather than young women.
The complex links between looking after oneself, bullying/violence and respect are described clearly by this 14 year old mixed race young woman:

"Most of the time boys need to show the gang that they are tough and not afraid to fight. The only way to show people is to join gangs, and this will also help them gain respect”.

This young woman articulates a number of things in this statement. She uses forceful language to show that young men have little choice. They ‘need’ to show that they are tough, and failure to do so would be a slur against the most respected form of hyper-masculinity that so many young men strive for. She also outlines and accounts for the perpetuation of gangs amongst young people. When peer pressure demands that individuals show themselves not to be afraid to fight, violence will surely ensue. However, returning to McDonald’s (2003: 71) assertion that there is no loss of honour in ‘a gang beating up an individual’, there is equally nothing to be gained by an individual showing they can fight alone. The safest forum within which young men can show they are unafraid to fight is within a gang or group context. This is further emphasised by one 14 year old British Bangladeshi young woman:

"If you are really tough you can be by yourself, but it's not good to be tough by yourself because people start to hate you”.

Within a gang context, the ‘hate’ exists, but the pressure is diluted and shared amongst the group. For this reason, the streetwise young person, growing up in East London will often choose a gang through which to express their fighting ability.

So far this section has focussed on the role of respect and violence predominantly in the lives of young men. Although respect and violence are apparent in the lives of young women, they are much more prominent in
the experiences of young men. The dynamics of respect and violence also have different meanings for young men and women. As stated previously, the spectacle of fighting in itself is not a universally respect-generating activity for young women. Indeed, in some cases it can have quite the opposite effect. As outlined in chapter five in the case of bullying, girls were more reluctant to express verbally their altercations, whereas for boys this verbal re-enactment of their fighting represented an important stage in the violence process. The importance of control has already been outlined (see chapter three). Campbell (1991) suggests that when men and women talk about their experiences of violence, men are talking in terms of 'taking control', and women are talking in terms of 'losing control'.

Taking control is imbued with positive connotations, losing control, with negative connotations of individual weakness. These ideas emerged in discussions of girls' fighting. Young women were, it was considered, more than capable of fighting, yet they often chose not to. Fighting, in many cases, simply did not play a central role in the maintenance of their self-esteem and character: "girls can fight, but they just don't show it" (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man). Here is a clear difference in the discourse and symbolism of fighting. When the talk is of young men and their relationship to fighting it is public fighting that is described; 'showing off', 'acting tough' and the 'need to show they can fight' are central to fighting talk. For many young women, on the other hand, the dynamic is almost the complete opposite, being one of restraint and control. What sparks fighting in girls is emotion, anger, the 'loss of control' which Campbell (1991) refers to. For young men, fighting holds much less (but not an absence of) emotion, as it is more a strategic action. What is emerging is a picture of gendered violence where young men are tending to engage in proactive violence to actively generate respect. For many young women on the other hand when fighting does occur, it relates more to the more passive salvaging of respect.
These discussions of girls’ fighting differ markedly from the discussions of gendered bullying in chapter five. The young men in that context (aged 11 and 12), argued forcefully that young women 'could not fight’. The style of 'fighting' adopted by young women simply did not warrant the description 'fighting'. This was because in the opinions of the boys, girls only 'pulled hair', rather than adopting a more masculine approach to fighting, using punches, kicks and/or weapons. Discussions by the older students, however, suggested a shift in young male opinions of girls’ fighting styles, and most importantly, a corresponding shift in opinion regarding whether young women were perceived as capable of fighting. Interestingly, once the shift in perception is made that young women are considered as competent fighters, they are then afforded a degree of respect from the young men within the school, as one 14 year old Black British young man explains, with an air of admiration: “I know a lot of girls that can fight better than boys”. To ensure respect in this context, however, young women must be prepared to compromise a degree of their hegemonic ‘femininity’. It is very difficult for a young woman to be respected as a fighter as well as for hyperfeminine heterosexual attractiveness, which for the majority remains as the dominant formulator of respect. As one 14 year old Black African young man explains: "some girls are strong and tomboys that carry knives". The ‘tomboy’ image adopted by some girls is at odds with desired, respected image of hyper-femininity (up to date hairstyle, clothes and long-term boyfriend) outlined by figures 7.4 and 7.5. For young women then, the decisions that must be made in order to gain both respect and to maintain their personal security are more complex still than for young men.

Staging Areas, Respect and the Presentation of Self
As has been discussed in chapter five, the school acts as a staging area for violence, and a space where respect can be fought over and renegotiated. This phenomenon is not specific to East London. Elijah Anderson describes the situation in a North Eastern American city:
"... the school becomes transformed in the most profound sense into a staging area for the streets, a place where people come to present themselves, to represent where they are from, and to stay even with or to dominate their peers. Violence is always a possibility..." (Anderson, 1999: 94).

It is clear then that the actions of the streets ought not be separated completely from the school. Violence and victimisation on the streets is replicated within the school, and activities that take place within the school do not cease at the end of the school day. Because violence and victimisation for many young people is a presentation, it can be acted out in different spaces, to different audiences and for different purposes. The school for many young people is the most common space where people from different geographical areas come together. It is a space where people from different areas can challenge each others’ respect. The school is a site where young people can both see and be seen. This visibility plays a role in the way in which the process of violence and victimisation is presented and engaged with, whether through bullying, ‘acting tough’ or gang activities. In addition, to develop an effective coping strategy, young people must be able to read and react to the signs of potential violence. A 13 year old young woman explained: "By the way people move around and the way they act, you know something is wrong". This young woman is describing, what Anderson (1990) refers to as ‘street wisdom’ whereby young people, understanding the dynamics of the street, can then choose to engage proactively in such dynamics, to avoid certain areas, times of day and so on.

If schools and streets are thought of in terms of staging areas, it becomes clear that they can also be thought of as important spaces where young people congregate for the purpose of presenting themselves. The way in which they present themselves is both complex and well thought out. The ways in which young people choose to present themselves in school is vital to their ability to adapt to life in and out of school, simply because of the
degree of respect, status and self-esteem that they are afforded by their peers.

The presentation of self as ‘fearless’ is central to both the accumulation of respect, and the strategic need to develop coping strategies against personal insecurities. This is true for young men and young women, although the subtleties of fearlessness offer young women an understated option to the overt ‘acting tough’. Until relatively recently the focus of fear research has been solely upon fear rather than fearlessness (although see Goodey, 1997; Koskela, 1997 for examples of boys’, and women’s fearlessness respectively). It is clear from the current research however, that fearlessness is critical to young people’s responses to the threat of violence. Although young people may admit to fear within the safety of their classroom or the anonymity of this research, they are also aware and constantly reminded that they cannot show fear on the streets: "because they could get hurt by gangs and their respect will fall" (14 year old young man).

Fearlessness can be presented in many subtle and less subtle ways. Most obviously, by engaging in violence, an individual or group can forcefully display their lack of fear, through ‘acting tough’. By this type of self-presentation within violent staging areas, such as the school or gang territories, young people can display their fearlessness to a greater audience. Anyone who wants to challenge this would be required to do so through further violence. In addition, less obvious presentation of fearlessness can be inferred through other actions. The way in which people walk, talk, dress and display their wealth through status symbols, give clear indicators, particularly to streetwise young people, of their position in the hierarchy of respect. Indeed, as one 15 year old young man suggested, this is closely linked to reasons for initially joining a gang: “If you join a gang you can act tough, wear chains, jewellery and clothes”. Fearlessness is therefore not simply an expression of physical strength. As outlined in figure 7.1 the adoption of these clothes, without an individual having the capacity to back
up their image is disrespected and dangerous. Even the physically weak can perform fearlessness through the adoption of specific clothes which have great symbolic meaning. The importance of symbols and signs in the presentation of self is made most obvious through the removal of these same symbols. Chains, mobile phones, trainers, caps\(^45\) and so on are crucial to a young person's self esteem, respect amongst peers, and their ability to present themselves as fearless. To compliment these symbols, many young people adopt a 'gangsta' walk\(^46\), which is often read by others as an indication of potential violence. As Jack Katz explains:

"The ghetto bop and the barrio stroll, identify the walker as a native of a place that is outside and antagonistically related to the morally respectable center of society." (1988: 88).

These symbols and signs indicate that the wearer is an active consumer of material goods (MacDonald, 2003), but more importantly, that the wearer is both capable and confident of their ability to defend their clothes and accessories. These clothes and accessories act as a uniform presenting an individual as tough, fearless and streetwise. As one 13 year old young man put it: "gang members wear clothes that make them look like thugs". This was also noted by Anderson:

"Those who don the urban uniform (sneakers, athletic suits, gold chains, "gangster caps", sunglasses, and portable radios or "boom boxes"), may be taken as the embodiment

\(^{45}\) Chunky gold or silver jewellery accessorises two different 'streetwise looks'. British Bangladeshi young men favour tight fitting Moschino jeans, with hooded tops, Burberry caps (or elaborate gelled hair) and Reebok Classic trainers or leather shoes; Afro-Caribbean young men favour very baggy Evisu or Averix jeans or predominantly Nike sports wear, baggy hooded tops of the same make, baseball caps with US team logos and Nike Hi-top trainers or Timberland boots. These are two obviously opposing styles.

\(^{46}\) This often involves swaggering, or walking slowly, with what appears to be a limp. It is possible that this has been adopted from US street style, where shootings are far more common, and limping usually indicates an individual has been shot at some time in the leg. Displaying or presenting such wounds or injures serves to add legitimacy to an individuals claims to toughness or fearlessness (Katz, 1988).
of the predator... They may “put on a swagger” and intimidate those who must momentarily share a small space on the sidewalk” (Anderson, 1990: 167, 176).

It is for this reason that young people engage in mugging each other of clothes and accessories (or street uniform), due to the multiplicity of effect. Stripping an individual of their ‘violent style’ is to remove a deeply entrenched source of respect (ibid, 1990), and to do this publicly serves to cause only greater shame. Importantly, these actions of disrespect and shame, only serve to continue the cycle of respect renegotiation, in turn, the violence continues.

It has been shown that one way in which young people can present their fearlessness is through clothing and comportment; this can be accentuated, somewhat regardless of physical strength, through weapon carrying. There are two main reasons for carrying weapons: firstly as a defensive tool, or secondly as an offensive tool. Those who use weapons defensively do not necessarily view them as a status symbol, but the defensive and the offensive can merge, as Katz outlines:

“...These objects [weapons] suggest that others will have to take seriously the intentions of the badass who controls them... [yet] these things excite by attesting to a purpose that transcends the material utility of power.” (1988; 106).

Weapons can undoubtedly act as a symbol of status - an item that demands respect. One 15 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained: “We show other people that we've got weapons, so they know we're in control”. The second purpose of weapon carrying as an offensive tool is strongly linked to weapons as status symbols, and in this regard, the type of weapon carried is very important. The status of a weapon increases according to its difficulty of access. Guns, for example, would for some demand the most respect, whereas commonly used weapons such as screwdrivers demand little
respect as a status symbol alone, as they are so easy to access. Importantly, however, guns are only considered a symbol of respect if displayed by particular people. This again is similar to the politics of acting tough, and trying too hard to live up to an unfounded 'tough' image. Those people who cannot back up their weapon carrying will instead be disrespected:

"People acting stupid [make the area dangerous], trying to show off with guns and thinking they are 'gangsta'" (13 year old White British young woman).

In this case people 'acting gangsta' are to be feared as their weapons and actions are real, they are, however, not to be respected as their actions appear not to be legitimate.

This said, one of the ways in which respect can be gained is, without doubt through violence and fearlessness. This is the 'code of the street', and young people need to learn to hide their fear under the guise of violence:

"They try to act like they can handle the situation but when it comes down to it they are scared deep down" (13 year old Black British young man).

Indeed, it was suggested that a violent presentation can become so engrained in individuals, gangs and schools that, as this 14 year old girl explained: "They [young people] think violence keeps them safe". Within the 'code of the street', violence is seen as keeping people safe. An individual presenting themselves as violent can increase their respect, status and power. If this respect gets too great, however, the individual will be increasingly called upon to defend their status. For many young people, their experience of violence and victimisation is a highly complex and extremely sensitive one. To try too hard to develop a violent image can be just as dangerous as not trying hard enough.
Concluding Comments

These dynamics of respect, violence and victimisation whilst interesting in themselves, must be seen within a wider framework of citizenship, structural inequality and the context of childhood. As has already been suggested, the respect accumulated by young people is central to their self-esteem and general well-being. But it is important to further investigate the ways in which 'respect' and the perceived need to generate respect through violence and victimisation relates to the status of childhood in contemporary Britain.

Chapter six has outlined the importance young people place on their political capacity to enact change. Such change is only perceived to be possible if young people's positions in society are respected. These views of structural constraints of childhood are inextricably linked to investment in the processes of respect, violence and victimisation. For young people who perceive their position in society to be disrespected, accumulating respect through other means becomes a strategy for salvaging a positive sense of self. As the perception of disrespect of childhood increases, the importance of negotiating respect through peer groups becomes more and more significant. The reproduction of hegemonic gender norms through violence and victimisation increasingly becomes the framework through which respected identities must be negotiated. Even those young people who do not subscribe to, or even reject hegemonic forms of respect, are still influenced by it, simply because of the pervasive nature of its framework. The political construction of a 'culture of respect' must be based upon a thorough understanding of young people’s own views and experiences of respect. If this is not achieved, a society of disrespect for childhood, and a generation of young people striving to salvage their own respected sense of selves will ensue. When young people’s strategies for accumulating respect involves violence and victimisation, facilitating young people’s accumulation of respect through means that will foster their wellbeing becomes an increasingly pertinent political question.
Since 1997, two routes to youth welfare reform have been instigated by the New Labour government. Underpinning their overarching outlook is the encouragement of young people’s positive relationship with society (DfES, 2003; Such and Walker, 2005). This encompasses embracing achievement and attainment within education, promoting successful entry into the workplace and the rejection of anti-social behaviours, such as violence, victimisation and a range of criminal and non-criminal behaviours (DfES, 2003, 2005). The first group of policies are to facilitate young people’s positive engagement with society: strategies such as Sure Start, Children’s Fund, Extended Schools, and Connexions all aim to help young people and

---

47 Both Sure Start and Extended Schools are aimed at providing early intervention social care. They both also seek to provide for both the child and the parents/carers. A Children’s Fund exists in every local authority and serves children aged 5-13 years, and aims to bridge the gap between Sure Start and Connexions. The Children’s Fund’s purpose is to reduce the effects of social exclusion: it seeks to do so by creating partnerships between statutory and voluntary service providers. A requirement of the Children’s Fund partnership is that children and young people are consulted and included within the design and delivery of services (Mason et al. 2005 for a critique). Connexions is the original pilot scheme for joined-up provision of services through partnerships. Despite its targets being dominated by reintroducing young people into education, training or employment, Connexions takes a more holistic approach to educational wellbeing and can act as mediator between the young person and statutory and voluntary sector service providers to support the needs of the complete young person (Ainley et al. 2002; Gaskell, 2005). Extended Schools are the future of joined-up service provision, Connexions is to be devolved into the wider Extended School scheme (DfES, 2005a).
their families to access the support they require\textsuperscript{48} (DfES, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005a; DoH, 2004). The second battery of policy is designed to be employed when children's behaviours are considered to be 'problematic': school exclusions, anti-social behaviour orders and dispersal orders aim to punitively control and regulate the child (DfES, 2005a; Home Office, 2003). This second phase is particularly significant for the present research since the current generation of young people have missed out on early intervention strategies such as Sure Start, Extended Schools and the Children’s Fund. The most 'effective' and commonly called for state intervention for this age group is the criminal justice system. Regardless of the perceived or real effectiveness of either route, it seems logical that the more a child is controlled, sanctioned and punished, the more excluded they will become from mainstream society. Rather than supporting and incorporating young people to engage positively within society through a meaningful citizenship, punitive measures can further exclude those facing and experiencing difficulties. The notion that young people will enact a positive citizenship in light of the threat of punitive sanctioning seems fundamentally flawed.

The philosophical framework used in this research has attempted to highlight the significant and complex interrelations of theories of childhood and youth and the policy and practice of violence and citizenship. The politicised nature of the theory of childhood and youth sheds light upon the underpinnings of youth welfare, youth citizenship and youth criminal justice. Drawing upon young people's views of the practice of childhood and youth should in turn inform the direction of how politics and policy needs to change. The preceding chapters have outlined three significant factors in relation to youth policy. First, young people's lived experiences reflect a significant degree of violence and victimisation within their daily lives. Second, young people feel their youthful citizenship to be a reduced

\textsuperscript{48} This is an important factor. The Every Child Matters Green Paper (DfES, 2003) specifically states that children and families will be supported to become economically active, and families and carers will support their children’s learning, for example. This reflects the change in policy discourse towards individual responsibility.
citizenship status and feel disrespected within wider society. And third, within the context of this disrespect, many young people seek other routes to gain respect amongst their peers: one of these routes being violence and victimisation. These factors are clearly interrelated and most significantly are important in underpinning the wellbeing of young people. With these empirical findings in mind, it seems necessary to reconsider the politics of childhood and youth, in order to fully assess the political and practical implications of this research.

If, as I shall argue, youth welfare is a necessary precursor of youth citizenship, the political nature of the meaning of childhood is imperative. Despite academic debates questioning the usefulness of considering childhood and youth as a developmental period of increased competence, this continues to inform policy decision making regarding education, social care and criminal justice (James and Prout, 1990; Muncie, 1999). The developmental approach to youth competence is overlain by the binary 'knowledge' of children and young people as deviant, morally flawed and in need of control, or innocent and vulnerable and in need of protection. However, this is where the problem lies. In policy terms, there are two constructions of childhood: one imbued with negative connotations requiring control and one imbued with positive connotations requiring protection. This, in turn, creates a two-tier framework of deserving and undeserving childhoods.

In practice I would argue that welfare must be an aim for all young people. But most importantly, those young people who require a 'controlling intervention' are also likely to be those young people most in need of welfare support. If welfare is not constructed as a universal aim for all young people, youth citizenship itself will also be constructed around

49 By 'controlling intervention' I am referring to criminal justice and mental health interventions. Mostly commonly, control is constructed around the criminal justice system. I am of the opinion, however, that prison is an ineffective and damaging intervention for children and young people and that a more appropriate intervention would be the provision of mental health services. If a young person requires restraint to ensure the safety of themselves and the public, an in-patient bed would be more effective than a prison bed.
deserving and undeserving positions in society. But welfare, as reflected within the UN rights of the child, must be a universal aim (Lansdown, 2001; Marshall, 1997; United Nations, 1989). Regardless of young people’s childhoods, achievements or behaviours, their welfare should be paramount.

The construction and adoption of a two-tier childhood both shapes and is shaped by the discourses of the controlled child and the welfare child. These discourses hold the same underlying concern that childhood needs either to be controlled or to be the subject of welfare. Increasingly, under the New Labour government, the controlling aspect of child concern has been developed through policy and practice. Young people’s citizenship behaviours are to be shaped through the delivery of the citizenship curriculum within schools (Crick, 1998; Kerr, 2000; Pykett, 2003; Weller, 2003). Citizenship is an embodiment of responsible behaviours such as volunteering, engagement in school councils and learning about their future engagement in the formal political process (Crick, 1998; Pykett, 2003; Russell, 2005). Criminal justice has been shaped by changes in the definition of anti-social behaviour (Home Office, 1997, 2003). As anti-social behaviour has itself become a 'crime', anti-social behaviour orders against the individual and dispersal orders against all young people under the age of 16 years control young people’s behaviours and their use of and access to, public space (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005).

Drawing upon these binaries to label children and young people as irresponsible can prove to be both meaningless and damaging. Children and young people’s relationships with citizenship and with violence and victimisation are far more complex. Despite moves to understand this complexity by including children and young people within the decision making process50, these decisions commonly continue to be shaped by adult

50 The youth consultation process commonly involves one-off focus group discussions with children and young people. The nature of vulnerable and/or disaffected young people means that trust needs to be built up over time before meaningful engagement will occur. If consultation is so brief the most vulnerable groups will often not engage (Bessant, 2003).
understandings and observations (Sinclair, 2004; Stafford et al. 2003; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). This process is increasingly shaped by adult concerns for and the control of childhood and youth.

This research has so far painted a picture of difficulties and challenges as articulated by young people living and growing up within inner-city London. It is also important to acknowledge and explore the positive aspects of these young people’s lives, the ways in which they cope with challenges and how they understand these challenges within a vision of the future and a possibility for change. This chapter therefore aims to outline the practical implications of this research for individual young people, for young people within schools and for national youth welfare policy more broadly. It will outline young people’s views of the strengths of their communities and the resources upon which they can draw in times of difficulties. It will consider their perceived solutions to the problems of violence and victimisation and their feelings of a reduced citizenship status. The chapter also aims to apply the views of these young people’s to the current policy debates and interventions such as those set out in the ‘Every Child Matters’ and ‘Youth Matters’ green papers (DfES, 2003; DfES, 2005a). Finally it will aim to explore the practical debates and interventions which currently impact upon young people’s daily lives, such as anti-social behaviour policies, extended schools, welfare delivery and anti-bullying policies (DfES, 2002; DfES, 2004b; DfES, 2005b; Home Office, 2003).

**Young People’s Views of Community Resources**

Young people clearly experience many difficulties growing up in inner-city London relating to, for example, violence, bullying, gangs, achievement, attainment and citizenship (see chapters five, six and seven). Despite these difficulties, or perhaps because of these difficulties, young people identified a wide but mixed range of positive attributes to their locality. While a significant minority could not identify anything positive, the social interaction the area provided was most commonly cited as young people’s most positive resource. The possibility of positive social interaction was
mentioned by 30% of the young people taking part in this research; friends, family and the supportive nature of the community more broadly were all cited as having a positive influence of young people's lives. This type of supportive social interaction was clearly linked by some young people to a feeling of contentment and wellbeing. One 14 year old White British young woman said: "Some of the people round this part of London are wonderful, so you feel this is where you're meant to be." This type of holistic comfort was also echoed by another 13 year old British Bangladeshi young man: "I like living in the east end of London because it makes me feel comfortable". It was clear that for a number of the young people in this research, comfort was derived from living within what they perceived to be supportive neighbourhoods: "It's good that there's lots of people from your area, you know them and they look after you" (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man).

More specifically, living in close proximity to family members was also seen as a way in which young people experienced the area positively. Family support was particularly significant when young people faced victimisation on the street; 43% of young people sought support from family members in times of crisis (see figure 8.1). Finally, friendships were also highly valued amongst these young people, and living nearby to close friends was seen to be one of the most important aspects of a positive experience of the area: "It's great, I've got my friends around here and I don't want to leave them" (14 year old young woman). The importance of friendships appeared to have interrelated significance. Firstly, friendships offered important personal support in times of difficulties. In terms of personal support, friends were explicitly cited as supportive in times of crisis: "I think it's a good community. Your friends really stick their necks out for you, they back you up" (15 year old White British young man). In this sense, when young people had experienced victimisation, support was sought from friends in 28% of cases (see figures 8.1 and 8.2).

51 These findings are derived from the questionnaire phase of the research
Secondly, friendship groups provided a form of comforting protection. By simply ‘being there’ and being physically close, friends were reassuringly supportive, as one 15 year old young man stated: “There is a good sense of community and looking out for each other”. For many young people, this was also intricately linked to the potential threat of violence and victimisation outlined in chapter five. One 14 year old British Bangladeshi young man explained this type of support and protection more explicitly:

“I like it round here because it’s got so many gangs of boys everywhere. And it’s good because they are my brother’s friends.”
Some concerns were raised that without positive ways of channelling time spent with friends, difficulties could arise (see later on perverse social capital). It was commonly cited that the area did not offer enough to occupy young people out of school hours:

"More amusing things for people need to be built. Maybe then people will stop hanging on streets together and not get caught up in bad things." (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

It was considered that this lack of opportunity to engage in productive activities could lead to boredom and, in turn, encourage engagement in damaging behaviours (see also chapter five on boredom as a perceived causes of violence and victimisation). In order to fully understand the possible solutions to problems outlined by these young people, it is necessary to understand the importance of family, friends and a supportive community.
Young People’s Views on Searching for Solutions
Throughout this research, young people were asked to identify solutions to problems through two approaches. Firstly, young people were asked to identify something they would like to change about the area in which they lived. Secondly, through diagramming techniques, young people were asked to identify problems within the area and work through what they considered the causes, effects and solutions might be. These two approaches to the research generated two levels of data. When simply identifying things to change in the area, young people commonly saw the police and increasingly punitive measures as the solution to violence and victimisation: “we need more police patrolling the streets of Bethnal Green and harsher rules punishing muggers” (12 year old British Bangladeshi young man).

Managing and Preventing Street Violence and Victimisation
In contrast to this, when reflecting upon the process of violence, young people identified a complexity of problems, and as such, often called for more complex short and long term solutions. In figure 8.3, it is suggested that the role of the police and more punitive measures of control such as dispersal should only be seen as a short-term strategy. Long-term solutions, in the sense of prevention rather than management of an existing problem such as gangs, muggings and stabbings, were commonly seen as the provision of youth facilities. From the perspective of these young people then, the underlying causes of gang crime might be varied (e.g. influence of drugs, friends, peer pressure and so on) but the type of intervention required to stop these ‘risk factors’ being transferred into gang behaviours focuses on early intervention and the provision of youth services. The types of youth services outlined by these young people included sports facilities, such as football pitches and importantly more formally organised football training, safe spaces in which to do homework and be creative through art and drama workshops, and most importantly young people simply wanted safe places to ‘hang-out’. These would be spaces in which to socialise away from the pressures of the streets and would incorporate people from whom they could seek advice and help if and when it was required.
The necessity to provide more facilities and services for young people incorporated a range of needs. Firstly, it was considered that such services would prevent young people becoming involved in violence and victimisation:

"We need to have more facilities, not only for young people but for anyone else out there who wants to do something new. We definitely need more things to do so we don’t get mixed with gangs and idiots on the streets" (British Bangladeshi young man aged 15)

Secondly, it was considered that the increased provision of youth facilities would encourage respect and involvement in a wider political process:

"If I could change anything it would be less crime, and the government needs to listen and pay attention to young people. We need youth clubs where young people will get involved. And better schools..." (British Bangladeshi young man aged 14)

In addition, as figure 8.4 highlights, where poverty was considered as a cause of street robbery, one of the long-term solutions was considered to be greater job prospects for young people. This group of young people
considered government initiatives, such as Connexions should be instrumental in educating young people about their job prospects.

Figure 8.4 'Causal flow diagram' of street robbery. Drawn by one 16 year old, Black African young man, and two British Bangladeshi young women, aged 15 and 16 years old

Finally, the greater inclusion of young people within their communities and within the design and delivery of youth services was also considered a factor in creating respect for the environment:

"More money needs to be spent on this part of London, and they [the government] need to make things like paintings by the kids so they don’t graffiti over them." (15 year old White British young woman)

From the perspective of these young people, the importance of providing youth facilities was multifaceted. Youth groups provided spaces for young people to gather without the possibility of being ‘caught up’ in damaging behaviours. They acted therefore both as a form of early intervention and as a safety net for 'at risk' young people. They also represented a space through which young people and their views could be incorporated into a more meaningful relationship with their communities and with society.

Managing and Preventing School Violence and Victimisation

Bullying is clearly an issue that requires increased attention. Although differences amongst schools are inevitable, bullying was significant within all schools with an overall violence and victimisation report rate of 28.
However, in the case of one of the schools, young women presented as particularly vulnerable, reporting a 38% rate of violence and victimisation within the school alone. When bullying was discussed more specifically, some clear issues emerged. Firstly, a significant majority of the young people felt that bullying in schools was so engrained within the school experience it was simply something that happened and was thus accepted. As one 14 year old White British young woman stated:

"Bullying will always happen because people always argue with each other and fight with each other. If two friends fight, their friendship breaks up and it causes bullying. In my school people always argue with each other, sometimes they bully people without a reason. And sometimes the teacher tries to stop it, but it doesn't often work."

In this context, when bullying is considered to be an inevitable part of school life, preventative solutions are considered less valid, and management strategies are favoured. As regards bullying, peer support was considered crucial in managing its effects and stopping the process of bullying:

"Bullying cannot be stopped. No matter what the teachers do, children can still be bullied. The only way bullying can be stopped is if the victim stands up to the bully, or gets an older relative to deal with the situation." (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

In the context of bullying therefore, peer support and facilitating a victim's confidence to 'stand up' to bullying is considered to be important. Supporting self-esteem in individuals was considered an important aspect of managing and even preventing violence and victimisation and a necessary area of education for citizenship (Naylor and Cowie, 2000):
"[Before leaving school] ... we should learn how to respect ourse ves and then respect for others wll be easier” (12 year old British Bangladeshi young man).

Identifying a Meaningful Citizenship Education
The provision of an holistic education was considered to be an important aspect of citizenship. Citizenship undoubtedly plays an important role in the lives of these young people. Their interaction with society and the feeling that they have the ability to enact political change is crucial. But their experiences of citizenship are also about personal safety, peer support and negotiating the pressures of inner-city London.

In addition, educating and facilitating young people in drawing upon their identified friendship resources was considered important. This again links to issues of social capital as a resource that can be developed for positive ends (Morrow, 1999). Young people were quite clear that social networks were crucial in their lives, but also that they had the potential to be destructive, both to themselves and to their communities (Putzel, 1997; Rubio, 1997). The importance of social networks in these young people’s lives opposes the contemporary political view that poor communities are lacking in social capital. These young people’s reserves of social capital were extensive, as they needed to be to negotiate their lives. However there were real dangers that this social capital might be transferred into a perverse form of social capital without an effective intervention such as youth services.

It was the manifestation of this type of perverse social capital that young people believed might be prevented by management of their existing positive social capital networks (see later on perverse social networks). Acknowledging social networks and their roles in supporting friends through difficulties was considered an important aspect of empowering young people: "we need to learn how to deal with older children so they don’t get pushed around” (13 year old young woman). This is also closely linked to
citizenship, and particularly to the teaching of a meaningful and practical citizenship within schools:

"We need to learn how to co-operate with people, how to socialise and how to be responsible. It's important to learn how to care for yourself and others around you". (14 year old British Bangladeshi young man)

These young people have clear ideas of how short term strategies and long term solutions can be found for the complex problems they face. It is now important both to add these views to the wider policy and practice debates relating to youth welfare and to assess how far these views fit with the theoretical and policy changes being made at a national level.

Including Children’s Voices: (Re)thinking Policy and Practice

The overarching philosophy I adhere to seeks for children and young people’s voices to be central to the research design and implementation. For this reason, young people’s voices are clearly articulated through the research. Given the nature of young people’s views, it seemed important to explore and give weight to voices situated so clearly within a range of current policy initiatives. It is important to note that this chapter is therefore making no claims to influencing policy. I rather seek to position young people’s views in relation to relevant policy and to explore what benefits there may be if young people’s voices were further incorporated into policy and practice.

Promoting and supporting the wellbeing of the school has fast become an objective of the New Labour government. The school is now central to the delivery, not simply of education, but also of social care, youth welfare and political engagement. The government green papers 'Every Child Matters' and 'Youth Matters' outline the role of the school in delivering interventions of individual and group wellbeing, and promote the school to a position of accountability:
“We believe that schools and colleges should be accountable for ensuring the wellbeing and maximum progression of all their pupils and students, including those with severe and complex learning difficulties” (DfES, 2005a: 45).

School policies of promoting wellbeing are to be put into practice through the model of the extended school. This is a model where social care, mental health and youth offending services will be delivered to children and young people through the site of the school. There is much evidence to suggest that providing services through one single point of entry, and within a comfortable environment, reduces stigma and increases the likelihood of intervention uptake (Corrigan, 2004; Rankin and Regan, 2004; Webb and Vulliamy, 2001; Worrell-Davis et al. 2004). However, if children’s and young people’s services are to be delivered in this way there is also a need to incorporate young people’s views into the design, delivery and evaluation of services.

Young people’s voices are increasingly being incorporated within the school. School design, school councils and peer mentoring all represent initiatives of inclusion and wellbeing promotion. The findings from this research can take this argument further and suggest new ways in which the views already articulated could inform new initiatives and ways in which the expression of young people’s views could be encouraged.

The Citizenship Curriculum
It is clear throughout this research, that citizenship is very important to young people’s lives and their wellbeing. Young people place great importance upon their interaction with society, and the feeling that they have the ability to enact change or not. But for the young people within this research, their citizenship represented much more than this. Citizenship was also about personal safety and negotiating the pressures of living in inner-city London. These young people also believed they would benefit from citizenship education if it addressed the range of issues they faced in
everyday life. The range of issues considered important, as figure 8.5 highlights, incorporates immediate and often basic needs, such as self-defence and cookery, issues for their future relating to housing, as well as broader political issues.

Within the context of an increasingly targeted and continuously assessed school curriculum, the citizenship curriculum offers a space within the timetable to address issues important to young people within a non-assessed environment. As citizenship relates to young people’s interaction with society it is necessarily geographically informed (see figure 8.5 highlighting specific issues for "kids who live in the inner-city"). Understanding young people’s experiences and the meanings they apply to their experiences must therefore be central to the effective design and delivery of the curriculum. Citizenship is also about addressing immediate issues. It relates to understanding the causes and effects of problems before change can be enacted. Through the questionnaire survey, young people in this research outlined the importance of learning about ‘personal safety’, ‘respect’ and ‘drug misuse’ within their formal education (Gaskell, 2004).

Figure 8.5 'Citizenship Lessons Should Teach'. Drawn by two, Black British young men aged 15 years old, and one Turkish Cypriot young man aged 15 years old
The important factor is that the citizenship education offers a real opportunity to facilitate young people’s exploration of social, political and economic issues and their interrelation with local, national, and international politics. By exploring young people’s responsibilities, and importantly also their rights, a more enriched understanding of their role in society may ensue. This knowledge can allow young people to develop not simply as passive citizens, but as the active citizens they show the desire to be. This type of education must however, also be accompanied by a real change in the way in which young people are conceptualised within society. If not, young people’s frustrations that their voices are not being listened to, and that the lack of ability to enact change is viewed as a lack of societal respect, will only be exacerbated.

_Anti-Bullying Policies and Facilitating Peer Support_

The possibilities provided through the citizenship curriculum are also closely linked to other initiatives and opportunities for incorporating young people’s views within the running of the school. Bullying, anti-bullying policies and peer mentoring schemes are intricately linked, and require young people’s involvement in order to be effective. With such high rates of victimisation occurring within the school itself, bullying is undoubtedly an obstacle to the holistic promotion of school wellbeing as set out in the national policy ‘Every Child Matters’. Due to the pervasive nature of bullying in many schools and the many - often failed - initiatives and attempts to reduce its occurrence, attempts to further incorporate young people’s views into the design of anti-bullying policies seem both appropriate and necessary. Recent anti-bullying initiatives set out by the DfES also outline the importance of consultation in creating a whole-school approach to bullying policy. It is suggested that: “a policy will only be effective if everybody in school has discussed and understood the problem of bullying, and agreed on good and bad practice” (2002: 4).

It would seem particularly useful then for an anti-bullying policy to emerge first and foremost from children and young people’s views. As has previously
been outlined, young people have many and varied views about the causes, effects and solutions to bullying (see chapters five and seven). Many of the issues raised by these young people would have to be addressed and to a certain extent, resolved if an anti-bullying policy were to be effective. Young people clearly expressed different views about the meanings of bullying, and how these were so strongly gendered in nature. At the core of an effective anti-bullying policy must be an exploration of the gendered nature of bullying, and a detailed understanding of why it is that young men in particular considered bullying to be a predominantly physical dynamic, and a celebrated spectacle. It is also important to explore young women’s roles in a different more verbal, exclusionary or covert form of bullying. Through understanding and analysing these young people’s views, bullying appeared to be a symptom of a greater desire for self-esteem, respect or acceptance amongst peers. Until this is understood, and other, alternative ways in which young people can achieve this level of self and peer acceptance, the implementation of effective anti-bullying policies will be problematic.

The meaning of bullying and the perceived causes of bullying are also context specific (Swain, 1998). As this research has highlighted, the extent of bullying varies as do young people’s feelings towards their schools as sites of bullying. Importantly, these two are not necessarily correlated; increased bullying does not necessarily correlate with increased negative feelings towards the school. This therefore suggests that the nature of the whole school ethos can create an overall more positive environment for all students, including vulnerable young people experiencing individual violence and victimisation. The importance therefore of creating a positive whole school ethos that promotes wellbeing, in the way set out through ‘Every Child Matters’ seems very important. Incorporating young people’s views into what an ideal school ethos might be, how that would prevent bullying, and how it might be achieved, is therefore vital.
Facilitating Peer Support

One initiative increasingly being adopted within primary and secondary schools alike is the idea of peer mentoring (Mental Health Foundation, 2002; Salmivalli, 2001). Another aspect highlighted by the current research is the importance young people place upon their friendships and peer support. Whichever way these friendships manifest themselves, either through gangs, groups or support in times of crisis, young people do generate and place great importance upon these networks. These networks of peer support must be acknowledged for their positive attributes. When peer support networks produce negative, perverse or ‘anti-social behaviours’ these networks must not be overlooked, undermined or negated. These are social networks regardless of the potentially ‘perverse’ nature of their resulting behaviours. It is through these very networks that young people’s attitudes and behaviours can be shaped into more positive outputs for both individual and community (Brotherton and Barrios, 2004). Providing spaces for young people to socialise away from the streets was outlined as a strategy to prevent young people’s social capital from becoming perverse and a way to reshape young people’s perverse social capital into more positive networks of support (DfES, 2005a).

In addressing the issues of violence and victimisation, it was found that the police were not a trusted institution and young people most frequently turned to their friends for support (see figure 8.1 and 8.2) (Naylor and Cowie, 2000). The support young people offer each other should not be underestimated, but occasionally this support can result in the perpetuation of the circle of violence and victimisation when friends ‘back-up’ one another. Rather than undermining young people’s support networks and dismissing them as gangs or 'anti-social', it seems more productive to develop these support structures. It is this philosophy that is at the core of peer support and mentoring initiatives. It would be most effective to support young people in supporting each other. Educating young people in the statutory and voluntary services they are both entitled to and those that
are available to them would simply provide young people with the resources to better support their peers.

**The Extended School Model**

The extended school model encapsulates the future of New Labour reforms for education, social care and youth welfare (DfES, 2005b). The extended school will enable young people to access the services they require within the site of the school (Craig et al. 2004; DfES, 2005b). This model therefore draws upon many of the positive attributes of the school: its role within young people's lives and the solidarity and support it provides. From the perspective of the New Labour government, schools are sites of potential social capital accumulation (National Policy Forum, 2003a). By extending schools, providing services, not only for young people but also for families and all members of the local community, it is hoped that social capital will be accumulated. This way, extended schools become static institutions, rather than transitionary ones where social capital is lost when students leave school.

Extended schools clearly have the potential to deliver more effective and efficient services to young people. They will provide services to children where they spend most of their time. They will seek to provide services in a less stigmatising way, making the receipt of services more visible and normal. They will aim to facilitate statutory and voluntary sector services in another aspect of social care reform: working in partnership. Because partnership working is to be facilitated, it will reduce the number of times a young person has to recount their difficulties before an appropriate intervention can be made (DfES, 2003, 2005a, 2005b). Despite these potential advantages of the extended school, caution must also be raised regarding excluded children and young people. There is the possibility that children and young people excluded from mainstream education will, through this new delivery model, also be excluded from the welfare services they require and are entitled to (Gaskell, 2005).
Anti-Social Behaviour Policies

It is clear from the current research that young people are greatly concerned by what they consider a lack of personal security. Echoing the national policies of anti-social behaviour, young people are concerned by the level of violence and victimisation that faces them in their daily lives. On a superficial level, young people seemed keen for an increase in the number of police officers patrolling the streets, and in the use of CCTV security cameras. These young people, however, were also clear that relationships between young people and the police were strained at best, and that increasing the number of police officers would do little to change their feelings that the police did not respect them, or their right to protection. There were also feelings that the discourse of anti-social behaviour was directed against young people. As one 16 year old British Bangladeshi young man commented: "What's anti-social behaviour...? It's standing on the streets, innit!" The internalisation of these negative discourses as being directed predominantly against young people for simply being young is undoubtedly detrimental to relations between young people and the police. In addition, young people increasingly made links between negative relations with the police and negative relations with the government. As one 14 year old Black British young woman stated:

"The police are often racist. They assume because you're in a group of friends and hanging about they suspect you're up to something because of your colour. If the government gives those orders, the government should be out of power at once."

In this sense, a lack of trust between young people and the police impacts directly upon young people’s ability to enact their citizenship.

Attempting to control young people’s behaviours through anti-social behaviour orders against individuals and dispersal orders against public spaces will not solve any of the problems young people face. As the young people within this research articulated, in order to solve the problems in
their lives, the causes of the problems need to be addressed. Many young people saw the increased provision of youth services - from leisure activities to support services - as the key to the prevention, rather than the control of violence and victimisation.

**Concluding Comments**

The overarching political and practical contribution of this research suggests that violence and victimisation are a reflection of a reduced citizenship status and an internalised societal disrespect. In order to understand the complexity of young people's experiences, young people's views and voices must be incorporated within the development of theory, policy and practice. While this chapter has not claimed to have the capacity to directly influence the making of policy, it has made suggestions as to how these views could be incorporated within a more effective policy and practice. Young people have insightful and varied views relating to their daily experiences of violence and victimisation, of bullying, friendships, support and meaningful citizenship. If effective policy is to be translated into positive changes in young people's lived experiences, young people's views must be explored, understood and incorporated into all stages and at every level of the decision-making process.
Conclusions

"And that is the way I got to end this story
He was out chasin' cream and the American dream
Tryin' to pretend the ends justify the means
This ain't funny so don't you dare laugh
It's just what comes to pass when you sell your ass
Life is more than what your hands can grasp
Good Night!"

(Mos Def and Talib Kweli, 1998. Children's Story)

The aim of this research was to explore young people's own experiences of violence and victimisation, and to understand the meanings they applied to those experiences within the context of their citizenship. Such an aim is shaped first and foremost by a conceptualisation of children and young people as active agents whose voices must be central to any attempt to develop an understanding of youth violence and victimisation. From this perspective it is possible to understand young people's experiences of violence and victimisation - as active - but often silenced agents within their communities. Developing this argument, this chapter will first outline the key empirical findings of the research. It will then outline a range of conceptual contributions of the research before setting out a number of possibilities for future research.

Key Empirical Research Findings
The current research established that violence and victimisation were a source of concern for a significant number of young people within Tower Hamlets. Importantly, actual victimisation rates were also highly significant, making violence and victimisation both on the streets and within schools a very real and pressing problem for young people. Drawing upon the quantitative analysis, age differences emerged as significant. Older
participants, aged between 14 and 16 years, were most likely to consider the area to be dangerous, mirroring the highest rates of actual violence and victimisation for the group. In turn, the most common form of victimisation experienced on the streets and within schools was assault. Supporting existing findings, it was clear that the threat of violence and victimisation was significant in evoking fear in many young people (Goodey, 1997; Pain, 2000, 2003). But for a significant minority of other young people, and less well documented within the existing literature, it was found that this fear was also accompanied and bound to excitement and positive feelings of respect and self-worth (see however, Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Katz, 1988; MacLeod, 1995).

Fear and perceptions of threat to personal safety were commonly linked by the vast majority of young people to activities of groupings and gangs. Groupings and gangs were central to young people's understandings of the process of violence, as they were considered to be both a cause of, and a coping mechanism against, violence and victimisation (Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Brotherton and Barrios, 2004). The public nature of gangs and young male approaches to bullying were also commonly linked to the spectacle of violence (Bourgois, 1995; Greig, 2000; MacLeod, 1995; Phillips, 2003; Phoenix, Frosh and Pattman, 2003). Similar to some existing research findings, the public nature of these interactions was linked to the important accumulations and negotiations of respect (Anderson, 1990, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; MacLeod, 1995).

Gender differences also emerged as a significant factor within the current research. Consistent with the findings of existing research, young men were clearer than young women regarding the nature of the perceived threat facing them (Goodey, 1997; Pain, 2003; Stanko and Hobdell, 1993). They believed this threat was posed by other young people - most commonly in groups or gangs - seeking to publicly assault and/or mug them of possessions and money. Young women, on the other hand, thought that they faced a no less significant threat, but a much less clearly known threat.
Young women feared strangers, sexual assault and murders, as well as fearing the potential assaults and mugging perpetrated by other young people (Goodey, 1997; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a; Nayak, 2003). All young people considered that violence was most likely to be perpetrated by other young men. Unlike much existing research that imposes a rigidly structural or psychological framework onto youth violence (Englander, 2003; Klein, 1995; Thrasher, 1927), young people in the current research themselves attributed the causes of victimisation to peer pressure, to the negotiation of respect and to boredom and contextualised these within wider structural constraints.

Overall, it was found that violence and victimisation were experienced by young people as a highly complex and dynamic process and one directly linked to hegemonic gender identities, self-esteem, peer pressure and the desire to be respected (see also Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Messerschmidt, 2000; Phillips, 2003). Due to the social dynamics of violence and victimisation, schools were commonly cited as spaces of victimisation (see also Alexander, 2000; Anderson, 1999; Phillips, 2003; Smith and Sharp, 1994). As commonly reported within the bullying literature, schools were sites of actual and perceived danger during official school hours (DfES, 2002; Epstein and Johnson, 1998; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Phillips, 2003; Rivers, 1995, 2001; Smith, 2000, 2004; Smith and Sharp, 1994). But importantly and less well documented, young people in the current research reported considerable threat before school, during lunchtimes and immediately after school.

In order to analyse young people’s responses to violence and victimisation, I devised an ‘avoidance, management and engagement framework’. On the streets, young women favoured avoidance strategies such as not going out after dark. Young men, on the other hand, were more likely to supplement this avoidance by employing strategies of management and engagement such as involvement in gang behaviours and weapon carrying. Overall, when on the street, young people generally were more likely to engage in
avoidance strategies. When in school however, there was a greater likelihood that management and engagement strategies would be employed. This most likely reflects the increased surveillance within the school, therefore making engagement in violence 'safer', in the sense that students believe teachers will intervene before fights become too serious. Relating to this, violence and victimisation were considered significant enough for all participant schools to have coordinated policies with neighbouring schools, such as staggered school start and end times and strict security policies, such as security guards and police presence (Aitken, 2001b; Fonagy, 2003; Kimmel and Mahler, 2003).

Young people’s experiences and visions of citizenship were shaped directly by experiences of violence and victimisation. The vision of citizenship expressed by young people was represented through the 'capacity to change.' This 'capacity to change' was understood and articulated as the desire for reduced violence and victimisation, increased participation in the community and greater degrees of respect within society. Experiences of lived citizenship reflected the above desires as well as further concerns regarding the immediate future. Education and employment, social skills and health education were areas young people felt should be taught through the formal citizenship education curriculum (Lister, Middleton and Smith, 2001; Weller, 2003).

I understood young people to experience and understand their citizenship through three main frames of reference: 'trust', 'protection' and 'respect'. These citizenship positions are experienced differentially by young people and as such their relationship with them is fluid. When young people’s experience of trust (in the government, the police, statutory services and so on) is undermined, and protection from the police is not forthcoming, the experience of citizenship is internalised and experienced through feelings of societal disrespect. It was found that while young people’s feelings of being trusted diminished, their desire to trust often remained. However, when young people continually feel that they themselves are not being trusted or
protected they begin to experience this as a lack of respect. These feelings of societal disrespect could then be translated into the desire to accumulate much needed respect; one such route is through an engagement in violence and victimisation.

Significantly the current research found respect to be central to the lives of young people growing up in Tower Hamlets. It is respect that provides a main framework for young people’s own understandings and articulation of violence, victimisation and citizenship. Peer pressure, experiences of violence and victimisation and a broader social and political disrespect for childhood all shape the ways in which young people understand respect and, in turn, how they attempt to accumulate it. Most significantly, it was found that people desire respect because it confirms and validates their sense of self. A respected person is seen by others to be worthy of respect (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 1995; Sennett, 2003).

From the perspective of young people, respect has both a practical and strategic function. Respect is visual, and must be seen; the negotiation of respect, through any means, is therefore expressed through visual experience. Peer groups bestow respect on others, take respect away from others, and therefore shape the boundaries of respect and respected behaviours. It was found that respect could be gained through 'being tough' and being able to look after oneself. But trying too hard to be tough or 'acting tough' without evidence of actual 'toughness', can lead to disrespect. Gangs were understood by young people through their strategic function - as a mechanism for keeping safe and, importantly, for generating respect.

Linked to experiences of bullying and other forms of violence and victimisation, respect could be generated through the presentation of a particular type of hegemonic gender identity. The importance of respect and the accepted ways in which respect can be negotiated through violence and victimisation are so pervasive they impact upon all young people.
Regardless of whether or not an individual engages in the violence and victimisation process, they will experience the pressure of negotiating respect through violence and victimisation.

Despite the difficulties faced by many young people, a wide range of positive aspects of the area were identified: friends, family and the supportive nature of the local community were most commonly cited. Reflecting this, it was friends and family who were most often informed when young people were victimised. When victimisation took place within the school, teachers also provided a significant source of support. In the vast majority of cases, the police were not informed of incidences of violence and victimisation and this reflected feelings that the police would not offer a desired form of protection.

The provision of youth facilities was considered to be one of the most significant potential solutions to the problem of violence and victimisation. Youth facilities (such as organised sports, recreational and support spaces), it was considered, would relieve boredom, incorporate young people into the wider political process through inclusion in decision-making, and encourage a greater level of reciprocal respect between young people and the local community. Bullying, on the other hand, was considered by many to be an inevitable part of the experience of education. It was suggested by some young people that bullying and the impact of bullying could be reduced by facilitating confidence and self-esteem in young people, enabling them to ‘stand up’ to bullying when it occurred.

**Conceptual Contributions**

One of the overarching assumptions of the current research was that placing the views of young people central to the study of young people’s lives provides the greatest insight into their lived experiences. Young people are commonly silenced regarding decisions that affect their day-to-day lives. Yet the current research argued from the outset that incorporating young people’s experiences and views was a necessity. It argued that within the
context of youth violence, young people are most commonly understood only as 'the problem'. There is too often little consideration of young people's experiences, views and role as potential, if not essential problem solvers. Running through the entirety of the current research is the need to listen to young people's voices, and to use these as the basis of any theorisation (Alderson and Morrow, 2004; McDowell, 2001; Matthews, Limb and Percy-Smith, 1998; Pain and Francis, 2003; Skelton, 2001; Valentine, 2000). For this reason, the concept of citizenship was employed through this research as a way of understanding and facilitating young people's roles as active agents within society (France, 1996; Lister, 2002b; Smith, 1995; West, 1996).

The key conceptual contributions of the current research are threefold. Firstly, this research can add conceptual weight to existing understandings of youth violence and victimisation and of youth citizenship. Secondly, and where I believe the current research has most to offer conceptually, is through understanding experiences of violence and victimisation through an understanding of citizenship. The relationship between violence, victimisation and citizenship is undoubtedly complex, but attempting to understand violence and victimisation in this way affords young people greater agency as expert commentators on their own lives. It is through this link that I believe original and insightful ways of understanding young people's experiences can be explored.

Finally it is important to highlight methodological contributions of the current research within the context of youth geographies. Adopting an approach where young people are themselves viewed as experts and valuable for all their views, allows for the most effective use of mixed method and innovative methodological tools. The current research can therefore offer perspectives on working with young people both within schools and youth groups using structured, flexible and 'participatory' tools.
Considering first the existing theorisation of youth violence, there is a need to move away from universal theories of violence that make assumptions about a highly inter-personal experience without incorporating individual views (Jankowski, 1991; Klein, 1995; Thrasher, 1927). Incorporating individual experiences allows for an understanding of violence and victimisation as neither solely structural nor solely psychological in origin. Building on this, the current research has illustrated that young people are not simply victims or perpetrators; rather, it has shown that they are often victim-perpetrators (Goodey, 1997; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a; Pain, 2003). Another significant contribution of this research therefore suggests that violence and victimisation elicits a complex web of emotions, and that these in many ways are expressed through place (Koskela, 1997, 1998; Nayak, 1996; Pain, 2000). Experiences are often mixed, and can involve positive feelings of excitement, established through, for example, the relief of boredom. It must not be overlooked that violence and victimisation can be a pleasurable experience (Katz, 1988). Rather than suppressing and denying the pleasurable aspects of the process of violence these must be acknowledged, understood and incorporated into any form of solution. These findings augment and can further develop geographical work around crime, fear of crime and the emotional geographies of crime and violence (Goodey, 1997; Koskela, 1997, 1998; Nayak, 1996; Pain, 2000, 2003; Valentine, 1989).

Violence and victimisation are undoubtedly experienced as a multiple and complex process. As such, the causes of violence and victimisation must be understood through the interrelations of structural-social-psychological factors. The framework through which I have sought to understand young people’s experiences of violence and victimisation incorporates the articulation of the structural, social and psychological. This I believe is a useful way of conceptualising violence and victimisation. It has proved even more insightful to understand this framework in relation to youth citizenship.
Through understanding citizenship, not as a controlling relationship between citizen and state, but as a fluid and dynamic experience, it can become a useful concept in understanding young people’s marginalisation, disaffection and reduced citizen status. The current research has found that, contrary to much popular political opinion, young people are not apathetic towards politics and their relationship with society (Cunningham and Lavalette, 2004; Fahmy, 2004; National Policy Forum, 2003a). However, many young people felt marginalised as a result of their age and disrespected as citizens. This was internalised and articulated as frustration at not feeling they had the capacity to make political changes, and a sense that they might never be able to engage meaningfully within the political process.

From the views and experiences of young people, it was found that citizenship was experienced through three positions: one dominated by the desire to trust; one dominated by the desire for protection, and finally, one dominated by the desire to be respected. Although these three positions are not rigid or linear, it was clear that for many young people, as they became older, they felt that their experiences of citizenship shifted from a position of trust to one of feelings of being disrespected in society. In many cases, young people reached this ‘respect position’ through a transition of not feeling protected by the state. This proposed framework for understanding young people’s citizenship is valuable for three reasons. Firstly, ‘positions’ are fluid, dynamic and an individual can hold more than one position at any one time. Secondly, this framework doesn’t view young people’s relationship with society to be necessarily negative or antagonistic; it highlights the positive, negative and ideal characteristics of citizenship. Finally, this framework fits well with the extent/ content/ depth framework of citizenship proposed by Isin and Wood (1999). The trust/ protection/ respect framework however offers a more flexibly youth-centred approach to understanding the fluid nature of citizenship. Drawing upon the model proposed by Isin and Wood (ibid), when a young person’s trust in society diminishes, this reconfigures an individual’s feelings of protection and of
respect that they are afforded by society. Rather than being restricted to structural constraints upon the extent, content and depth of citizenship however, the model I proposed simply allows for a more nuanced understanding of structural, social and psychological factors. Youth citizenship, through this framework can thus represent a more holistic experience.

The concepts of violence and victimisation and citizenship were linked for a number of reasons. Firstly, on a theoretical and political level, it is commonly argued that it is young people’s lack of positive citizenship that leads them into violent and victimising behaviours (DfES, 2005a; Home Office, 2003; Russell, 2005). I was interested to explore how far, from the perspective of young people, this appeared to be true, and to examine any other, less rigid relationships between violence, victimisation and citizenship. Popular political thinking is, I believe, overly rigid and linear, and can therefore not fully accommodate the multiple, complex and dynamic nature of young people’s experiences. According to current government policy, young people considered to be lacking in citizenship may turn to violence and victimisation and those engaging in violence and victimisation are considered to lack citizenship (Crick, 1998; DfES, 2003, 2005a; Home Office, 2003 Russell, 2005). Thus, the teaching of appropriate citizenship, and punishing so-called ‘anti-social behaviours’ are considered to be the solutions (Crick, 1998; DfES, 2005a; Home Office, 2003). Linking these concepts in a more fluid and open way allows a more intimate understanding of the undoubtedly fluid complex experience of violence and victimisation. This fluid understanding of the links between violence, victimisation and citizenship facilitates an understanding of experience from structural, social and psychological perspectives. Finally, by exploring an existing theoretical and political link between violence, victimisation and citizenship it is possible to contribute to the current political and policy debates, as well as those relating more broadly to childhood and youth.
Developing this fluid link between the theoretical approaches to violence, victimisation and citizenship has provided original ways of thinking about young people's experiences. Informed by the views of inner-city young people, the concept of respect has emerged as a key analytical tool. It is through the lens of respect that young people's experiences of violence, victimisation and citizenship can be fully understood. When the importance of respect is understood, the interrelation between violence, victimisation and citizenship becomes clearer, yet more complex.

For many young people, a lack of citizenship is indeed linked to the nature, extent and meaning applied to the violence and victimisation they experience. However, it is experienced in a very different way to that outlined by contemporary theoretical and political thinking that stresses young people are to be blamed for their lack of citizenship and that this lack of citizenship is a cause of the perpetration of violence and victimisation (Home Office, 2003). For all young people, experiences of citizenship existed, but they were negative experiences, of a reduced citizen status and of a disrespected position in society. This was linked by many to violence and victimisation through an experience of not being protected by the police. For yet more young people, the dynamics of violence and victimisation were understood through a need to feel respected. Peer pressure, self-esteem and status, within a context of societal disrespect, were critical to many experiences of violence and victimisation. These findings are significant for the area of youth geographies as they clearly highlight the importance of listening to young people's experiences. As much youth geography literature argues, these experiences play a vital part in understanding the ways in which children and young people are shaped by and themselves shape their spatial worlds (Aitkin, 2001; Holloway and Valentine, 2000; James, 1990; McDowell, 2003a, 2003b; Matthew and Limb, 1999; Matthews, Limb and Taylor, 1999a, 2000; Nayak, 2003; Pain, 2003; Valentine, 1996, 1997, 2000)
Using respect as an analytical tool therefore enables an understanding of violence and victimisation as a symptom of a lack of a respected citizenship relationship with the state. Citizenship is not a one way linear ‘responsibility’, as New Labour currently proposes (Giddens, 1998). Instead it is a fluid dynamic between citizens and the state. If young people feel their relationship with the state to be fundamentally disrespectful, they will, in turn, begin to seek out alternative routes to gain respect. Without suggesting in any way that violence and victimisation is the only route to respect, or that it is an inevitable outcome of a reduced citizen status, from the perspective of young people, violence and victimisation is undoubtedly one possible route to increased inter-personal respect.

Respect therefore is a key factor in social interaction, yet it is currently under-conceptualised. Richard Sennett’s proposal that respect can be accumulated through the development of abilities and skills, through care of the self, and through the giving of respect back to others is a useful starting point (2003: 63-64). It is important that the conceptual development of respect is achieved through in-depth empirical work. Understanding young people’s experiences and views of respect are central to developing respect as a useful analytical and theoretical tool. In terms of Sennett’s view of respect, the capacity for violence and the ability to ‘look after oneself’ is undoubtedly respect accumulated through the development of abilities and skills and through care of the self. The notion of respect is important precisely because it has the potential to represent both the cause and the solution to violence and victimisation and to reduced citizen status more widely. Before respect can be fully employed as a conceptual and political tool, all aspects of the desires for and the meanings and negotiations of respect must be understood.

There are a number of key methodological contributions to be offered by the current research to the wider body of youth geographies literature. Methodologically, this research upheld a clear philosophy of valuing youth agency. I approached the research by rejecting the premise that during the
research encounter I would be in a position of power. This is particularly important when working with potentially challenging and vulnerable young people. By making young people aware that it is they who are the experts, the research process becomes a facilitation of ideas, rather than an extraction of information. I found that by approaching the research in this way, the methodological possibilities were more extensive. This approach has significant implications for youth geographies acknowledgement of the agency and autonomy of children and young people, and the desire to engage with the politics of childhood and youth itself. I have found that this methodological approach facilitates a deep and direct challenge to the heart of the politics of childhood. Given the trend within youth geographies to develop strong empirically and theoretically based research, challenging the implications of dominant politics of childhood throughout the research process seems significant.

Practically speaking, using a mixed method approach enabled all young people to contribute on some level. Offering verbal, written and diagrammatic methodological tools provided an opportunity for all to contribute through whichever technique they felt to be least threatening. I opted not to conduct and record in-depth interviews with any young people; this decision was based on requests not to be recorded. For many young people, having a discussion recorded is a threatening experience. To ask young people to do so if they feel uncomfortable, I believe, serves only to further silence them through the utilisation of adultist methodological practices. Based upon the current research, I would suggest for research practice with young people, it is critical to provide a non-judgemental, open situation where young people can contribute to the research in any way they feel appropriate.

Finally, the current research can contribute to a range of political and policy debates. Primarily, these findings augment the current developments within youth policy towards consultation and inclusion of young people’s voices within decision-making processes (DfES, 2003, 2005a; Such and
Walker, 2005; Tisdall and Davis, 2004). However this research would also suggest that in order for all young people to be included meaningfully within this process, there must be fundamental re-conceptualisations of childhood and youth. The current research has illustrated that young people have extensive and insightful views regarding the causes of the problems they face; it is these views that must also be incorporated into part of the solution. As long as children and young people continue to be conceptualised as potentially dangerous, apathetic and 'anti-social' their exclusion from decision-making will continue to reflect - and be reflected in - their reduced citizen status.

Understanding that young people's welfare, rather than their control is of primary importance would serve to redirect the societal and political gaze away from seeing young people as lacking in citizenship and potentially 'anti-social' in nature. Until this re-conceptualisation of childhood and youth is achieved within academic and political thinking, children and young people will continue to be 'at risk' from being criminalised before their welfare is protected (Batmanghelidjh and Gaskell, 2005).

Possibilities for Future Research
I would suggest there are three main areas that the current research has highlighted as important for future work. Firstly, the issue of 'respect' would benefit from more detailed researched understanding. Respect itself is increasingly becoming an area and tool of social policy and it has been suggested that it is not only citizenship that young people are lacking but it is also respect. There is a pressing need therefore to develop a much clearer understanding of respect in the lives of not only inner-city young people, but young people more generally. If respect is so critical to young people's social interactions, it must be understood in order to be incorporated into, rather than be undermined by, government policy.

Linked to respect, the issue of bullying remains significant in the lives of many young people. Despite a wide range of academic literature
documenting the nature and extent of bullying occurring within UK schools, and government initiatives aimed at reducing the levels and severity of bullying, few tangible improvements appear to have been made. A more practically focussed research project could seek to work with schools to develop anti-bullying policies specific to the individual schools. Such a project would be particularly interesting to incorporate within the forthcoming government policies of extended schooling. If extended schools are aimed at establishing an ethic of care throughout the whole school, it would be important to explore how an ethic of care could be incorporated into an anti-bullying policy. At the same time, an ethic of care might itself emerge from an inclusive, youth-centred and respectful anti-bullying policy and research into how this might be achieved and replicated would be highly beneficial.

Finally, respect appears to be a useful analytical tool to explore young people's experiences. It is central to young people's self-esteem, image and social networks. This framework therefore would be useful in exploring a wide range of youth issues. Of particular significance might be an exploration of emotional wellbeing through the lens of respect. Emotional wellbeing appears to be linked both to self-respect (i.e. a positive sense of self) and inter-personal respect (i.e. positive and supportive inter-personal relationships and networks). It is when a young person's self-respect and inter-personal respect are low that emotional difficulties, ranging from low self-esteem to suicidal behaviours, might result. Supporting emotional wellbeing in young people can be particularly difficult as young people do not necessarily have the power to remove themselves from distressing situations. However, an important area of research could seek to explore the relationships between self-respect and inter-personal respect as a basis for identifying strategies for supporting and promoting children and young people's emotional wellbeing. If young people gain self-respect when they feel respected and supported, it is important to research the mechanisms for facilitating and promoting the development of self-respect and therefore emotional wellbeing.
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Appendix 1
This questionnaire is part of a piece of research to find out the opinions of young people. Everything you write on this will be kept private, and by filling this in you will be taking part in an important piece of work.

YOUR OPINIONS ARE VERY IMPORTANT!

1. Are you female or male?
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Male

2. How old are you?
   - [ ] 11
   - [ ] 12
   - [ ] 13
   - [ ] 14
   - [ ] 15
   - [ ] 16
   - [ ] 17
   - [ ] 18

3. How would you describe your ethnicity?
   - [ ] Bangladeshi
   - [ ] Black African
   - [ ] Black British
   - [ ] Black Caribbean
   - [ ] Chinese
   - [ ] Indian
   - [ ] Pakistani
   - [ ] White British
   - [ ] White other
   - [ ] Other (please state) ........................................................................................................................... ...

4. What is your postcode? If you don't know, please write the name of your street.

...........................................................................................................................................................................

5. What job(s) does your parent(s)/guardian(s) do?

...........................................................................................................................................................................

6. What job would you like to do when you leave school?

...........................................................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................................................
7. How serious do you think the following issues are for young people in this area of London? Please circle ONE number for each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Not at all serious</th>
<th>Quite serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
<th>Extremely serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area gets no money from the government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guns/Weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government doesn’t listen to people here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements about young people? Please tick ONE, and respond to ALL the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disrespecting people causes fights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people should have the same rights as adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys have begun to carry guns to get respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the government says and does doesn't affect young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opinions of young people are not listened to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people carry knives for protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs are the main cause of crime and violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people should have the same responsibilities as adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being violent in school is not as bad as being violent on the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be illegal for young people to go out after 9pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Do you enjoy being at school? Please tick ONE.

☐ Yes definitely  ☐ Yes mostly  ☐ Not really  ☐ No
☐ Other (please state) ......................................................................................................................

10. What is your favourite subject? Please tick ONE.

☐ English  ☐ Science  ☐ Geography
☐ Maths  ☐ History  ☐ Foreign languages
☐ Physical Education  ☐ Art  ☐ Citizenship
☐ Design and Technology  ☐ Drama  ☐ Other........................

11. What do you think young people need to learn about before they leave school?

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

12. How do you FEEL when you are at school? Tick as many as you need.

☐ Safe  ☐ Unsafe
☐ Comfortable  ☐ Uncomfortable
☐ Part of a group  ☐ Excluded from a group
☐ Pressured  ☐ Threatened
☐ Powerful  ☐ Vulnerable
☐ My opinion is important  ☐ Nobody listens
☐ Other (please state)......................................................................................................................

13. Do you think YOU have a right to feel safe at school?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

14. Do you think YOU have a responsibility to make sure other people feel safe at school?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know
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15. Have you ever been a victim of crime or violence when in school? (If not, go straight to question 16.)

□ Yes  □ No

If so, what were you a victim of? Tick as many as you need.

□ Mobile phone theft  □ Mugging  □ Physical Assault
□ Racism (verbal)  □ Racism (physical)  □ Theft
□ Homophobia - verbal (verbal anti gay/lesbian abuse)
□ Homophobia - physical (physical anti gay/lesbian abuse)
□ Other ......................................................................................................................................................

If yes, who did you tell when this happened? Tick as many as you need.

□ Nobody  □ Brother/sister  □ Parent/guardian
□ Friends  □ Teacher  □ Police
□ Victim Support  □ Other (please state) ................................................................................................

Why did you tell this person?

................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

16. What do you do to protect yourself in school? Tick as many as you need.

□ Tell a teacher if I have problems  □ Only go around in a group/gang/cru
□ Respect people who are older or tougher  □ Fight Back
□ I carry a weapon  □ I don’t think about protecting myself
□ Go around with friends who can look after me  □ My friend(s) carry weapons
□ My friend(s) carry weapons  □ Other ................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

17. Do you think YOU have a right to be safe on the streets and in public places?

□ Yes  □ No  □ Don’t Know
18. Do you think that OTHER PEOPLE have a right to feel safe on the streets?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

19. Do people think YOU are causing trouble when you and your friends are on the streets?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

Please explain your answer.

20. How do YOU feel when you are in public places (streets, parks etc.)?

☐ Safe  ☐ Unsafe
☐ Comfortable  ☐ Uncomfortable
☐ Part of a group  ☐ Excluded from a group
☐ Pressured  ☐ Threatened
☐ Powerful  ☐ Vulnerable
☐ Other (please state) ..........................................................

21. Have you ever been a victim of crime or violence when outside of school? (If not go straight to question 22.)

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If so, what were you a victim of? Tick as many as you need.

☐ Mobile phone theft  ☐ Mugging  ☐ Physical Assault
☐ Racism (verbal)  ☐ Racism (physical)  ☐ Theft
☐ Homophobia - verbal (verbal anti gay/lesbian abuse)
☐ Homophobia - physical (physical anti gay/lesbian abuse)
☐ Other  ..........................................................

If yes, who did you tell when this happened? Tick as many as you need.

☐ Nobody  ☐ Brother/sister  ☐ Parent/guardian
☐ Friends  ☐ Teacher  ☐ Police
☐ Victim Support  ☐ Other (please state)  ....  ............  ..............  ......
Why did you tell this person?
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

22. What do you do to protect yourself outside school (in streets, parks etc.)?
Tick as many as you need.

☐ Respect people who are older or tougher

How? (please state)............................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

☐ Only go around in a group/gang/cru

Does your group/gang/cru have a name? (please state)
......................................................................................................................................................
How many people are in your group/gang/cru? (please state)
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

☐ Don’t go out after dark

☐ Fight Back

☐ Carry a weapon

What type of weapon? (please state)........................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

☐ I don’t think about protecting myself

Why not? (please state)................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

☐ Only go to areas I know really well

Where? (please state)
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

☐ My friend(s) carry weapons

What type of weapon? (please state)... ........................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
23. Do you think it is ever DANGEROUS for young people in this area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

What do you think makes it dangerous?

24. Which places do you think are MOST dangerous/which places are NOT SAFE to go? (give as many examples as you need, and try and be specific)

25. Who do you think is MOST at risk from crime and violence? Tick ONE.

☐ Children  ☐ Young men  ☐ Young women
☐ Rich people  ☐ Poor people  ☐ Old people
☐ Other

26. Does fear of violence affects the way YOU behave day to day?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

27. Do you think fear of violence affects the way OTHER PEOPLE behave day to day?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know
28. How safe do you feel doing the following? Circle ONE number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY SAFE</th>
<th>MOSTLY SAFE</th>
<th>MOSTLY UNSAFE</th>
<th>VERY UNSAFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking around by yourself during the day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking around by yourself at night</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around with a group of friends during the day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging around with a group of friends at night</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time in parks etc. with friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking home from school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you like living in this area of London?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don't Know

30. What one thing do you LIKE about this area of London?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

31. What one thing do you NOT LIKE about this area of London?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

32. What do you think needs to change in this area of London?

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
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33. When you are not in school (evenings, weekends, etc), where do you spend MOST of your time? Please tick ONE.

- [ ] At home
- [ ] Own bedroom
- [ ] At friends houses
- [ ] At the park/sports area
- [ ] Café/take away
- [ ] On the street/bus stops/hang outs
- [ ] At a local youth group (can also be community youth centre)
- [ ] Other (please state)

34. Why do you spend most of your time there?

35. What do you do when you spend time there?

36. How do you feel when you spend time in this place?

37. Do family/guardians tell you what time you have to be at home?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes

If so, what time do you have to be home?
38. What do you think is important to/has an influence on young people in your area? Write as many as you need.

☐ Supporting Football (which teams?)

☐ Playing sport (which sports?)

☐ Rap/Hip Hop/R 'n' B/Garage music (which artists?)

☐ Pop/Indie/Rock music (which artists?)

☐ Television and film actors/actresses (which ones?)

☐ Politics/government/councils (over which issues?

☐ Religion (which faith?)

☐ Other (please write)

THANK YOU very much for filling in this questionnaire in, everything you have said is very important.

Without YOU, I wouldn't be able to do this research!
Appendix 2
Look at the following headline -
Do you agree with the things that are said about young people?

**Girls are now bigger bullies than boys**
(The Observer: 10/11/02)

- Do you agree with this statement?

- Why do you think girls might be more likely to be bullies than boys?

- What do you think people reading this headline would think about young people?

- Can you think of any problems of the media writing things like this about young people?
Young People, Fear and Safety

Look at the following headline -
Do you agree with the statement and why?

Fear drives one teenager in six to join gangs
(Independent on Sunday: 15/09/02)

- Do you think this statement is true?

- How do young people in gangs behave that might make them safer?

- Apart from fear, what other reasons are there for joining gangs?

- Do gangs fight each other? Are you really safe in a gang?

- How are gangs organised?

- Do you think that young people are scared of violence - what ways are there of keeping safe apart from joining a gang?

- Do you think it is difficult for young people to admit they are scared of violence - why do you think this?

- What do you think adults reading this would think of young people?
Appendix 3
Acting Tough

Read the following statements and as a group decide if you agree or disagree with what is said, you must also give a reason for your decision. When you have worked through all the statements you will be asked to report your opinions back to the class.

1. People become victims of crime/violence because they don't know how to act on the streets.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

2. People will respect you if you carry a weapon.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

3. It's more important for boys to protect themselves than girls.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
4. It is important for boys to show that they are tough.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

5. The best way of showing that you are tough is joining a gang.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

6. People who try to show they are tough are just acting.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

7. Girls don't have gangs because they can't fight
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion
Trust and the Government

Read the following statements and as a group decide if you agree or disagree with what is said, you must also give a reason for your decision. When you have worked through all the statements you will be asked to report your opinions back to the class.

1. We should trust the government completely.
Agree/ Disagree
Reason for opinion
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................

2. Rich people get the most respect in society.
Agree/ Disagree
Reason for opinion
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................

3. The police aren’t racist, they are just doing what the government tells them to do.
Agree/ Disagree
Reason for opinion
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................
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4. It doesn't matter if people don't trust the government.
Agree/Disagree
Reason for opinion

5. Crime and violence only happens because people don't respect each other.
Agree/Disagree
Reason for opinion

6. The only way to get respect is to get a good job.
Agree/Disagree
Reason for opinion

7. There's no point working for £4.10 an hour if you can make £500 a day selling drugs.
Agree/Disagree
Reason for opinion
Bullying, Fighting and Drugs

Read the following statements and as a group decide if you agree or disagree with what is said, you must also give a reason for your decision. When you have worked through all the statements you will be asked to report your opinions back to the class.

1. Bullying in schools will always happen.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

2. It's ok to bully people if they might be gay or lesbian.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

3. Bullying people over their culture is always wrong.
   Agree/ Disagree

   Reason for opinion
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
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4. Being in a gang on the streets is the same as being a bully in school.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

5. Boys only fight to show off to their friends.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

6. People who take drugs are victims, it's not their fault.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion

7. The most common reason for taking drugs is peer pressure.
Agree/ Disagree

Reason for opinion
Appendix 4
Discussion One: Acting Tough

Do you think people try to act tough?

Why do you think this is, what are you acting tough for?

Is behaviour different in school and out of school, or in different places on the street?

How do boys try to act tough?

How to girls act tough, is this different to boys?

Do different ethnicities have different ways of acting tough?

Do the police pick on you if you look and act a certain way?

What happens if someone challenges your 'toughness'?

Can you act tough alone, or do you need a gang or group?

Do girls have gangs/groups the same as boys?

How do they differ to boys - protection, respect etc?

Does living in a high crime area make you more likely to avoid situations (i.e. stay at home, stay in after dark) or confront them (i.e. act tough, carry weapons etc.)?
Discussion Two: Drugs, Fighting and Peer Pressure

Are young people affected by peer pressure?

What do you think you are most under pressure to do?

Is this different for boys and girls?

Are drugs a big part of young people’s lives - in school and out of school?

How do you think taking drugs affects young people?

What reasons are there for taking drugs?

Are drugs and gangs linked, if so, how?

Where do gang activities/ fighting usually take place (i.e parks, schools etc.)?

How could you stop people wanting to take drugs?

Do drugs make an area less safe, why do you think this is?

Are girls and boys at risk from the same things?

Do you trust the police and the government to protect you from crime/violence?

Do you think the police understand why people take drugs, get involved in gangs/crime etc.? Does this matter?
Discussion Three: Citizenship, Trust and Respect

What do you think the government should do for this area?

What do you think the biggest problem is around here?

Do you think this is particular to young people?

Do you think young people can do anything about this?

Do you think it’s more difficult for people living around here to keep out of crime than in other areas?

Do you trust the government to change anything?

Why do you trust/distrust the government?

Do you think trust in the government is important - and why?

Do you think the government does enough to help young people get jobs/careers?

Is respect important for young people?

What things do you get respect for in this area?

What other things could you get respect for?

Where would you say you got most emotional, physical and so on support? (i.e. friends, family, school, youth group, mosque etc.)
Appendix 5
School – Research Overview

- This research took place on the 4th, 5th and 6th of June 2003.

- It is drawn from a questionnaire survey with 178 students from year 7 and year 10.

- The questionnaire was designed to gain an insight into young people’s experiences of school, as well as opinions of issues and problems facing young people in East London.

- All questionnaires were confidential, the following is a broad overview of main findings that emerged from the research.

Report written by Carolyn Gaskell, Department of Geography, Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS
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  - E-mail: c.gaskell@qmul.ac.uk
  - Tel: 020 7882 5400
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Experiences of School

- Over 50% of students in year 7 and 10 said they ‘mostly enjoyed’ being at school.
- Girls were more likely than boys to say they ‘didn’t really’, or ‘did not at all’ enjoy being at school.
- Art and PE were the most enjoyed subjects, with around a quarter of responses each, other subjects such as D T, Drama, and ICT figured highly.
- ‘Respect’ and how to deal with ‘real life issues’ (crime, violence, drugs, as well as college and jobs) were considered most important to learn before leaving school.
- The vast majority of students believed they had both a right to be safe at school, and a responsibility for the safety of others.

Safety at School

- Students in both years predominantly felt safe, comfortable and part of a group (see graphs one and two).
- Boys were almost twice as likely than girls in both years to say they felt unsafe, threatened or vulnerable. Many more boys felt that people didn’t listen to them (either other students or teachers).
- Twelve percent of all students said they had been victims of crime or violence at school. Physical assault or verbal racism made up half of these (affecting Bangladeshi boys most often).
- Coping strategies were most likely to be telling teachers of problems (year 7-26%, year 10-24%), being with friends (year 7-25%, year 10-18%). Respecting others (15%) figured highly for year 7 students, whereas fighting back (18%) was important for year 10.
Problems Facing Young People

- The most serious problem cited by all students was that of drugs. 65% of students in year 7 and 58% in year 10 said this was 'extremely serious' for young people in East London.
- Gangs, weapons and crime were categories also taken seriously. Gangs however, were more than twice as likely to be considered 'extremely serious' by the boys, regardless of age. Concern for crime and weapons were less affected by gender.
- In year 7 it is boys who are more likely to say they felt unsafe, and vulnerable on the streets. By year 10 this has shifted to girls being much more likely to feel unsafe, uncomfortable, and vulnerable than boys (see graphs three and four).

Safety on the streets

- The experience of the street is reflected (and probably caused by) victimisation rates. 29% of students said they had been victim of some form of crime/violence. 20% of these were physical assault, and 17% verbal racism. 8% of incidents were homophobic in nature, the same as the far more widely documented problem of mobile phone theft.
- Bangladeshi boys, and white British girls were most highly represented as victims generally.
- Friends were the most likely people to be told about these incidents for all except for homophobic crimes, where it was most often no one was told.
- Strategies to avoid crime and violence included staying in well known areas (year 7-25%, year 10-18%), and not going out after dark (year 7-23%, year 10-15%). While these reduced in popularity by year 10, those in year 10 were more than twice as likely to fight back, and carry a weapon.
- Speaking of young people generally, 35% of year 7, and 48% of year 10 agreed young people carry knives as protection.