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**INTRODUCTION TO REALISM**

## Realist approaches differ from Marxist and Labelling theories because they do not think crime is socially constructed. They argue crime is a real problem, which has to be tackled. They represent a return to an emphasis on sociology as a practical programme of reform, evaluating policies on policing, the criminal justice system as a whole, etc.

## Left realism and Right Realism may both start from the idea of creating workaday useful responses to the “problem of crime” but their conclusions are very different in part because their initial premises are equally divided.

## Similarities:

## Both argue there has been a significant rise in the crime rate – especially in street crime, burglary and assault.

## Both are concerned about the widespread fear of crime (see booklet 1) and the impact crime has on its victims.

## Both argue that other theories have failed to offer realistic solutions to the problem of crime and what they regard as practical policies to reduce it.

## Both emerged in the 1970s and 1980s in the political context of a shift to the right in politics.

## We can divide realist approaches along political lines:

## RIGHT REALISTS: share the New Right or Neo-Liberal political outlook, which favours rolling back the welfare state. They favoured a ‘get tough’ stance on crime.

## LEFT REALISTS: are socialists and favour focusing on communities and victims, solving the problems for why crime occurs.

## Activity: Using your notes and knowledge from last year (Sociology of Education), make a brief summary of the difference in approach to politics from the Right and Left.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Left approach | Right approach |
|  |  |
| View of crime and deviance | View of crime and deviance |

**RIGHT REALISM**

**Summary of Right Realism**

* Right Realism is a useful tool for the critical evaluation of “Left Idealist” approaches like New Criminology and Neo and Traditional Marxism
* It is also forms the basis for an evaluation of Feminist approaches
* Most sociologists see the New Right as a practical policy oriented development from some of the concerns of Functionalism
* It has also been the basis of a number of popular approaches to the fight against crime : Zero Tolerance/ Target Hardening

Right Realism forms of analysis are grounded squarely on **positivist** methodological principles. Methodologically, for Right Realism the “reality” of crime is more-or-less as it is portrayed by Official Statistics. This is primarily because such statistics are considered to reflect the “primary concerns” of society at large about criminal behaviour.

It is a “consensus-based” perspective that does not question the nature of law creation, underlying causes of crime and the like (quite the opposite to left realism).

## New Right Theories

The New Right has had a strong influence on the development of **realist criminologies**: so called because of their emphasis on treating crime as a real and serious social problem that requires **practical solutions,** rather than simply a sociological problem that requires understanding. There is a commitment in this approach to **pragmatic, policy-orientated research.**

These approaches came about in response to an increased concern over crime during the 1980’s, and also to a considerable rise in recorded crime. The **‘law and order’** debate became – and continues to be – **(tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime)** a central electoral issue.

In the mid 1970's in the USA, **Wilson (1975) 'Thinking about Crime',** claimed that crime resulted from selfish and wicked people, and that the criminal justice system had gone 'soft' on criminals. Wilson (Reagan's adviser on crime) advocated the strengthening of penalties for crime. By the 1990's, the USA had the highest rate of imprisonment in the world.

Much of the right realist approach comes across like common sense, yet it also draws on liberal ideas of freedom, choice (criminals chose crime), and responsibility. There are also functionalist ideas concerning the need to support communities in order to promote social order.

## The causes of crime

### 1. Poverty

The link between crime and poverty is questioned, specifically the idea that poverty causes crime. Wilson, in fact argues that affluence and prosperity may well be more linked to rising crime. It was from the early 1960's, a period that saw the longest sustained period of prosperity since World War II that crime in the USA started to soar. It rose at a faster rate and to higher levels than at any time since the 1930's.

**'It all began in about 1963. That was the year, to over-dramatise a bit, that a decade began to fall apart.' - (Wilson, 1975)**

### 2. Culture

It is suggested that there has been a decline in 'civility' and respect for authority in communities that are characterised by **anomie** and **cultural dis-organisation.** Special mention is made of 'fatherless families' and its detrimental effect on young men denied an appropriate role model.

There is an assertion of any direct association between unemployment and crime. According to **Dennis and Erdos (1992):**

**'High unemployment was associated with low criminality in the 1930's. Low unemployment was associated with growing criminality in the 1960's. Unemployment between these extremes was associated with high and rapidly increasing crime in the mid-1980's. In the early 1990's, there was high unemployment and high crime rates.'**

Given the lack of correlation between unemployment and crime, which could have formed the basis for a structural explanation of crime, the new right turns to a cultural explanation. They see a decline in **'family values',** in particular a lack of discipline both inside and outside the home.

**Murray (1990),** on the other hand, blames the welfare state. He argues that the welfare state has sapped moral fibre and eroded Christian ethics thus threatening family values. The welfare state, it is argued, has created a **'dependency culture',** which results in the weakening of the work ethic. The result is a social sickness, which reduces the strength of those moral values and mechanisms of social control so essential for preventing criminal behaviour.

### 3. Opportunity and rational choice

Exclusive blame is not placed on cultural factors outside of the control of individuals, such a view would be cultural determinism, and would remove, at least partially the notion of 'blame' and individual responsibility. Given their commitment to the idea that persons exercise choice and freedom of action it follows that they see an important aspect of deviant and criminal behaviour as freely chosen. Wilson’s theory below adopts this view, believing that if you make the choice to commit crime less desirable, then it the likelihood of it happening decreases.

**People do not have to be deviant.**

A similar emphasis on choice can be seen in the work of **Clarke and Mayhew (1980)** at the Home Office. Their concern is the practical question of how to control crime - hence the term Control Theory. **The question, why do people commit crime? is reversed and instead they ask the question, why don't people commit crime?** Their answer is because of social control and deterrents. Two factors in particular are identified, 'target hardening' and 'surveillance'. Although not actually right realists themselves, Clarke and Mayhew do lend support to the belief that crime and delinquency is a result of choice.

**Key Contributor: James Q Wilson**



* Emphasised the importance of certainty of capture rather than severity of punishment as an essential deterrent to crime.
* Uses evidence from the USA in the 1960s to show that wars on poverty in this case actually led to a rise in crime rate (*is correlation causation?*)
* Three roles for the police:
1. **law enforcement**
2. **order maintenance**
3. **public service**

Public service duties are a **waste of police time** and best given to other agencies.

Law enforcement is made easier when combined with effective order maintenance.

General disorder in the streets leads to a breakdown of the social bonds of community - the general population will be afraid to go out and may eventually move away, leading to the general decline of the area into criminality. So disorder leads to crime.

The police should be encouraged to engage in **policing disorder**.

**“Public drunkenness, street prostitution, and pornographic displays can destroy a community more quickly than any team of professional burglars.”**

In the above, we can see **two main themes** in New Right Realism sociology:

1. At a **macro level**, a form of **Control Theory**, in which moral values are stressed as being the key to crime prevention.
2. At a **micro level**, a form of **"cost / benefit" analysis**, whereby the task of control agencies is to make crime too difficult / risky for the potential criminal.

**Key Study: BROKEN WINDOWS- Wilson and Kelling (Zero-Tollerance approaches to policing and law enforcement)**

See Browne page 430-431 <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/_atlantic_monthly-broken_windows.pdf> for the original (10 page) article.

The `broken windows' thesis suggests that the following sequence of events can be expected in deteriorating neighbourhoods

1. *Evidence of decay (accumulated trash, broken windows, deteriorated building exteriors) remains in the neighbourhood for a reasonably long period of time.*
2. *People who live and work in the area feel more vulnerable and begin to withdraw.*
3. *They become less willing to intervene to maintain public order (for example, to attempt to break up groups of rowdy teens loitering on street corners) or to address physical signs of deterioration.*
4. *Sensing this, teens and other possible offenders become bolder and intensify their harassment and vandalism.*
5. *Residents become yet more fearful and withdraw further from community involvement and upkeep.*
6. *This atmosphere then attracts offenders from outside the area, who sense that it has become a vulnerable and less risky site for crime.*

The "broken window" theory suggests that neighbourhood order strategies such as those listed below help to deter and reduce crime.

* 1. *Quick replacement of broken windows*
	2. *Prompt removal of abandoned vehicles*
	3. *Fast clean up of illegally dumped items, litter and spilled garbage*
	4. *Quick paint out of graffiti*
	5. *Finding (or building) better places for teens to gather than street corners*
	6. *Fresh paint on buildings*
	7. *Clean sidewalks and street gutters*

Summary:

* Wilson argues that crime flourishes in areas where social control breaks down.
* Most of us commit ‘incivilities’ (dropping litter), but are prevented by comments of others in local community.
* Others need to act to prevent us from breaking the law. If incivilities go unchecked the crime rate will increase.
* Individuals are rational and therefore will not commit crime if they know that it does not pay.
* As a result, eliminating poverty or removing marginalisation will not prevent crime.
* What is needed is the building of communities and zero tolerance policing.

|  |
| --- |
| Summarise Wilson and Kelling’s conclusions (you might want to do some additional reading for this e.g. the original article) |

**Some Evaluative Points**

* There is a synoptic link here as Wilson suggests that traditional family values would eliminate incivilities.
* This approach has been criticised as it ignores crimes of the powerful and fails to explain structural causes of crime.
* The New Right has a ‘common sense like appeal’ but many see its recommendations as simplistic and unworkable.
* It refers to a ‘Golden Age’ which never really existed.
* He ignores the fact that crime is not simply a "lower class phenomenon". The **crimes of the powerful** may not be as visible as those of the powerless, but it is clearly arguable that they are just as - if not more so - significant. This is especially true in terms of the moral basis that Wilson conducts his argument... Wilson attempts to rationalize this in the following way,

*"This book [Thinking About Crime] deals neither with "white-collar crimes" nor, except for heroin addiction, with so-called "victimless crimes". Partly this reflects the limits of my own knowledge, but it also reflects my conviction, which I believe to be the conviction of most citizens], that predatory street crime is a far more serious matter than consumer fraud, antitrust violations, prostitution, or gambling, because predatory crime makes difficult or impossible the maintenance of meaningful human communities".*

**Key Contributor: Van den Haag**

**Van Den Haag** ("Punishing Criminals", 1975) proposed a similar set of ideas to those of Wilson when he argues that, within **Capitalism**, the basic rationale of the system is that there are "**winners**" and "**losers**". If we accept this, then we also have to accept that the winners must be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their enterprise and risk-taking without these rewards being illegally taken-away by the losers.

In this respect, Van Den Haag is basically saying that, for Capitalism to continue as a (successful) form of economic production, those responsible for the creation / accumulation of wealth must be protected from the activities of criminals. Thus, for Capitalism to survive, it is, according to Van Den Haag, logical that law enforcement should be concentrated upon the activities of the poor and powerless (the losers)...

The criticisms noted above in relation to Wilson's work apply equally (if not more) to Van Den Haag's argument.

* Inequality is inherent to the capitalist system - reward is obtained by risk
* Laws are necessary to stop people from “cheating” and thus gaining rewards unfairly
* Laws should aim to discourage revolutionary change and the poor taking from the rich - therefore they will inevitably affect the poor rather than the rich - coercion against the poor is absolutely necessary
* Crime is inevitable but can be limited by
	+ punishment
	+ emphasis on moral rules in society
	+ family discipline

Moral codes can be reinforced by proportional punishment which takes the position in society of the perpetrator into account.

**Key Contributor: Milton Friedman**

Saw the drive for equality (through the Welfare State) as:

* imposing on individual freedom
* taking away individual responsibility
* removing respect for the law
* encouraging crime

By the State caring for the old, the infirm etc., social bonds, and especially family bonds, are **undermined** as social obligations become obsolete. Everyone begins to “mind their own business”, creating an atmosphere in which criminals can operate more easily.

**So, removing the Welfare State and *Welfare-ism* will reduce crime.**

**SUMMARY OF RIGHT REALISM**

* **Value consensus is** **the basis for human society** -the fear of social disorder through *anomie* is a strong feature.
* **Human nature is selfish** - naturally self-seeking, not co-operative.
* ***Homo Economicus* (“Economic Man”)** - individual human beings make rational choices for themselves, on the basis of cost vs. benefit, and are best left to do so within a society which offers minimum regulation and maximum freedom - hence the belief in the free market and the long-term benign nature of market forces.
* **Inequality is natural and functional** - in a market-led view of society, poverty is a necessary motivating factor the “stick” which accompanies the “carrot” of material success.
* **The government should act as policeman** - the role of the state is to regulate crime by making costs outweigh benefits for would-be criminals - using punishment as a deterrent - **not** to try to cure poverty or alleviate the distress of the poor.
* **Community is essential** - formal social control is less important than informal constraints - the problem of modern society is the loss of community and New Right theory often reinforces the importance of nationalism, patriotism, etc.
* **Crime is inevitable** - crime may be limited by social control but can never be eliminated - the aim is to limit the impact of crime.
* **Social order is a fundamental need** - above all social order is emphasised - individuals must be able to live without fear of others - this is even more important than strict observance of the law.

|  |
| --- |
| **Consider the points above and the overview of Right Realism. What can you see as positive and negative about it as an approach?** |
| Positives | Negatives |
|  |  |

**Activity: Right Realism has developed out of, but rejected fundamental concepts of Functionalism.**

**Explain this statement below or on a separate piece of paper. Use the statements on the previous page to help shape your discussion.**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**LEFT REALISM**

## See Webb pp.99-102, Browne pp.465-468.

**Left Realism: Summary**

* Developed during the 1980s and 1990s. Like Marxists they see society as unequal because of capitalism, however they are reformist rather than revolutionary socialists. They believe social change can only come incrementally, rather than with the violent overthrow of capitalism.
* Associated with John Lea and Jock Young.
* Links to social democratic/socialist policy outlook.
* Uses victim surveys.
* Suggests **realistic** approaches to policy making for example, a **close collaboration between police and community representatives.**
* Young wanted sociology to offer **practical policies to help** to reduce crime.

Rates of crime and victimization are concentrated in areas characterised by:

* **Marginalisation**: refers to people living on the margins of society, lacking any say in decision making
* **Relative Deprivation**: refers to perceived discontent in relation to others around them.

**Critical of Marxism and neo-marxism, which it accused of:**

* Not taking working-class crime seriously, and romanticising working-class criminal as ‘Robin Hood’ characters fighting against social inequality and injustice, or reducing working-class crimes to simple moral panics.
* Failing to take victimisation seriously, and the fact that most victims were the poor and deprived.
* Having no practical policies to reduce crime.

**Approach: taking crime seriously**

* The left realists argued that from the 1950s onwards there was a real increase in crime, especially working-class crime.
* Young (2011) argued this led to an aetiological crisis – a crisis in explanation – for the theories of crime. For example critical criminology and labelling theory tend to deny that the increase was real. Instead, they argue that it was just the result of increased reporting. In other words, the increase was a social construction.
* Left realist argue against this and believe the crime rate had increased - evidence for this can be found in victim survey such as the British Crime Survey.
* Taking crime seriously involves focusing on who is most likely to be a victim of crime and how disadvantaged groups have a higher fear of crime, which has a direct impact on their lives.

**The causes of crime**

Using p.465 Browne, make notes on the following causes of crime, according to Left Realists

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Study to support** |
| **Relative deprivation** |
| **Subculture** |
| **Marginalisation** |
| **Late modernity, exclusion and the ‘bulimic society’** |
| **The rising ‘anti-social behaviour rate’ and the toxic mix that generates crime** |

Additional space

**Lea and Young in more detail**

For **Lea and Young** in particular, there are a number of points - from a Left Realist perspective - that can be made relating to crime and criminal behaviour.

**Firstly**, they argue that, logically, it is the **well-socialised individual** who should be most-likely to turn towards crime as a "solution" to their personal / social problems, primarily because Capitalism produces:

a. **Egalitarian ideals** (for example, "political equality") and

b. **Material shortages / deprivations**.

Thus, people who are socialised to expect / want material success but who are denied, for whatever reason, this success are more-likely to turn towards crime as a "solution" to this "problem" (this is similar to Merton’s strain theory).

**Secondly**, crime is seen to be a **group / cultural response** to something, rather than a simple matter of individual choice.

Crime will occur when:

a. A social group comes to understand that it is being given a "raw deal" in society.

b. It is easy - through experience - to see the discrepancy between the ideological impetus to consume commodities and the material denial of these socially-valued things.

c. There exists no political channel through which these feelings of discontent can be expressed (in effect, there is no possibility of changing something by political means).

Thus, for crime to occur, there must be:

a. **Economic / political discontent.**

b. The **absence of economic / political opportunities** for the remedy / expression of this discontent.

Again, status frustration in a capitalist society shows a similarity to the work of Merton and Cohen.

**Thirdly**, **Lea and Young's perspective** on crime represents a theoretical return to a more-orthodox, classical, Marxist approach whereby crime is **not** seen as some form of "revolutionary" endeavour (a challenge to the ruling class' legal right to appropriate surplus value privately). Rather, crime is seen much as Marx himself saw crime - as a **reactionary** form of behaviour which represented a diversion from the development of real political solutions to the experience of degradation, exploitation and so forth suffered by the working class.

As **evidence** to support the above position, Lea and Young argue that:

1. The vast majority of criminals appear to hold conventional social values. Like everyone else in Capitalist society, their socialisation stresses such things as:

* ***Individualism,***
* ***Competition.***
* ***The desire for material success / status.***
* ***Sexism, racism, machismo and other ideological forms***.

2. Criminal behaviour has no individual political dimension because:

1. *Most working-class crime involves the working-class as victims.*
2. *Afro-Caribbean criminality is mainly directed towards other Afro-Caribbean’s.*

While **crime** in general has some form of **political dimension** (mainly because people do not tolerate it and attempt to find ways of eliminating it), it is important to note that, unlike Radical Criminology, **New Left Realism sees criminal behaviour as being the expression of Capitalist principles in an illegitimate form**.

The individual criminal / deviant simply appropriates surplus value for themselves, much as capitalists do. But this does not mean that the criminal and the Capitalist are one and the same. The difference between them is that the latter is involved in the general economic productive process (they enable goods to be produced in society by combining with labour), whilst the former has no productive part to play at all - they simply take the product of other's labour whilst giving nothing in return.

3. In relation to Radical Criminology, **Lea and Young** argue that it is the **lack** of any **organized**, political, ideology that targets Capitalism as the root of people's oppression that makes what they term "Left Idealism" inadequate as a theoretical explanation of crime / deviance. As they note:

***"The radicals are correct when they see crime as a reaction to an unjust society. But they make a crucial mistake: they assume that the reaction to a just cause is necessarily a just one. On the contrary: it is often exactly the opposite. the reaction to poverty among poor whites, for example, may be to parade around waving Union Jacks: it may be the tawdry nationalism of the National front. The reaction to relative deprivation may, as Paul Willis ["Learning To Labour] has so ably shown, be sexism, racism and anti-intellectualism. Crime is one form of egoistic response to deprivation. its roots are in justice but its growth often perpetuates injustice.".***

**New Left Realists’ – a social theory of crime and deviance.**

**Lea and Young** argue that we need, as sociologists, to adopt a **"multicausal" approach**. By this they mean two things:

1. **no single factor** can adequately account for the range and variety of criminal / deviant behaviour in society (e.g. Status frustration, economic deprivation and so forth).
2. each factor in the equation:
* **Subculture**,
* **Relative deprivation** and
* **Marginalisation**

is only significant when as it can be **linked to the other factors**.

If only one factor is present in people's lives, it will have little significance. What is important, therefore, is the way in which the three factors appear at the same time.

e.g., , "**relative deprivation**" is **not**, by itself, a **sufficient explanation** of why people turn to crime, mainly because:

* 1. Not everyone who can be shown to be "relatively deprived" turns to crime.
	2. Relative deprivation may be a significant factor in explaining various forms of economic crime (theft, burglary etc.), but wholly inadequate in explaining why people murder each other, commit acts of sexual crime and so forth.

**New Left Realism does not advocate a crass, causal, approach to the explanation of criminal behaviour.**

For example, the notion that "Unemployment (relative deprivation) causes crime" can be easily refuted (disproved) simply by showing that not all unemployed people resort to crime. However, it can be shown that there is a positive correlation between the two ideas. Thus, unemployment can be linked to crime on the basis that our society propagates an ideology of consumerist values.

Feelings of relative deprivation may make the "crime option" more likely - but we still, as sociologists, have to explain **why some unemployed people actually choose the option of crime whilst others (apparently) do not**. This is where other factors (such as the sub-cultural group to which one belongs) come into play, since this combination of social factors can help to explain how and why people make rational choices about whether or not to commit criminal acts based upon the social factors that surround them.

In this sense, the **complexity** of human behaviouris stressed(people do **not automatically react** to something like unemployment by choosing crime as a solution to their material problems), insofar as New Left Realism tries to show how the **structural conditions** that act upon the individual **limit**, **constrain** and **condition** their perception about what represents a "**rational choice**" in any given situation.

|  |
| --- |
| Make a summary of the difference between Left Realism and Critical (Marxist) criminology as described above. Try to break it down into the key arguments and debates (you might want to do this on another piece of paper).  |

**Tackling crime**

**Activity:** Research when ASBOs were introduced, community police officers and the New Deal for young people

**Tackling Crime (The Square of Crime),** use Browne pp.466-467

Lea and Young argue that it is necessary to understand crime and tackle it the following four factors must be explored in terms of how they intersect with each other.

Explain the following in your own words and give an example of another perspective that echoes each element.:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Factor | Perspective and named sociologist/s |
| Social structural factors and formal social control |  |
| Public and informal social control |  |
| The role of victims |  |
| The offenders |  |

**Left Realism: Causes of Crime**

#  Evaluation (using different colours highlight those which are positive and which are negative)

1. Much "New Left Realism" appears to be relatively sophisticated in adopting various sociological explanations of deviance (Merton, Matza, Cohen and the like) with a "Marxist" gloss...
2. It produces a fuller explanation than that offered by any one single theory, particularly as it addresses issues with late modernity.
3. It neglects other responses to relative deprivation and marginality apart from crime, such as Merton’s retreatism and ritualism.
4. Simply because police practices, the collection of Official statistics and so forth under-estimate the extent of middle and upper class crime, why should we assume that levels of working-class crime are under-estimated (and by how much?). The problem here is that whilst we might reasonably suspect various levels of under-estimation, it is simply not possible to quantify (even in very broad terms) the possible extent of this under-estimation. In simple terms, if "levels of crime" are realistically unquantifiable, then any attempt to quantify them will be based upon assumption - and this is hardly reliable or valid...
5. The idea that the police, for example, concentrate upon working-class forms of crime because "that is what people want" tends to oversimplify the picture in terms of both power and ideology. Thus, in relation to the criticism identified by **Moore** ("Investigating Deviance") that,

"Orthodox Marxists criticise the stress placed by New Left Realism on working-class crime and its causes. They suggest instead that much more attention needs to be paid to white-collar crime and to the process of law creation"

1. Lea and Young's theory is too ambitious - it tries to encompass all kinds of criminal behaviour. Do different forms of crime have different causes?
2. In relation to the above, Lea and Young's multi-causal approach does seem to apply well to some forms of crime and to some criminals (economic crime, working class males), but rather less well to other forms of crime and criminals (individualistic crimes such as sexual assaults, middle / upper class males).
3. Finally, self-report studies tend to suggest that female involvement in crime (especially young females) is far higher than is suggested in Official Statistics – yet according to Lea and Young's form of analysis Official Statistics tend to portray a relatively accurate picture of the extent of female crime (which is "confirmed" by their multi-causal theoretical approach.

**Activity: Use this framework as a summary of the contribution made by Right and Left Realism - use this booklet, textbooks, class discussion and your notes. You are welcome to write this in another format if you wish e.g. mindmap, flashcards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** |  |
| **RIGHT REALISM** |
| **How does RIGHT REALISM define deviance** |  |
| **Key views of RIGHT REALISTS** |  |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |
| **KEY CONCEPTS OF RIGHT REALISM** |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |
| **4.** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **EVALUATION OF RIGHT REALISM** |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **LEFT REALISM** |
| **How does LEFT REALISM define deviance?** |  |
| **Key views of LEFT REALISTS** |  |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |
| **What are the main differences between RIGHT REALIST AND LEFT REALIST approaches** |  |
| **EVALUATION OF LEFT REALISM** |
| **1.** |  |
| **2.** |  |
| **3.** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Perspective Evaluation** | **RIGHT REALISM** | **LEFT REALISM** |
| Functionalists |  |  |
| Feminism |  |  |
| Marxism |  |  |
| Social Policy Implications |  |  |

**50:50 Extension Tasks**

To help reinforce your learning and understanding in A-Level Sociology it is important to go beyond the set homework. Knowledge only stays in our heads if it is regularly reinforced and built upon. These tasks will help you do so. It is up to you what you do as people learn in different ways but it is important that you spend the same time on your work as you do in lessons, so 50:50

Tasks:

* Practice short questions from the end of the booklet and from throughout the textbooks.
* Plan and write an essay.
* Undertake additional reading to reinforce your understanding and develop your notes:

Browne, ‘Sociology for AQA Volume 2’, pp.465-469, 532-537

Haralambos and Holborn, ‘Sociology Themes and Perspectives’, 8th edition, pp.371-382

Webb, ‘AQA A Level Sociology, Book Two’, pp.97-102

* Create a quizlet or Kahoot for the different theories https://quizlet.com/en-gb <https://kahoot.com/>
* Write the key concepts (which can be found in the booklet) as flashcards or as a quizlet.

**Exam Practice**

Outline two realist solutions to the problem of crime [4 marks]

Outline two right realist explanations for crime and deviance [4 marks]

Outline three reasons people might commit crimes according to left realists [6 marks]

Item A: Right realist theories have had a significant impact on government policies, especially because they appear to offer practical answers to the problem of crime. Like many sociologists, they see childhood experiences as very important in determining behaviour in later life. They focus on the idea that some people are naturally more aggressive or less intelligent than others, and they stress the need to ensure that crime does not go unpunished.

Applying material from Item A, analyse two explanations of the causes of crime put forward by right realists [10 marks]

Item B: Left realists see crime as a real problem, especially for the disadvantaged groups who are its victims. They see the causes of crime as located in the structure of late modern society, with its high levels of exclusion and insecurity. Their views on how to tackle the problem of crime have had some influence on official policy, particularly under New Labour governments.

Applying material from Item B and your knowledge, evaluate the contribution of left realism to our understanding of crime and deviance [30 marks]

**Essay plan: Left Realism**

**Item B:** Left realists see crime as a real problem, especially for the disadvantaged groups who are its victims. They see the causes of crime as located in the structure of late modern society, with its high levels of exclusion and insecurity. Their views on how to tackle the problem of crime have had some influence on official policy, particularly under New Labour governments.

***Applying material from Item B and your knowledge, evaluate the contribution of left realism to our understanding of crime and deviance [30 marks]***

Paragraphs in 20 and 30 mark essays:

The Sociology sandwich is exactly the same as the burger idea we use for 10 marker, but it needs you to include more analysis/evaluation (using other studies, theories or methodology) to counter the point you are making. Each paragraph should have the elements of this ‘sandwich’ before you move onto your next point.



**Key areas of the question that you need to address:**

|  |
| --- |
| What does the question want? |
| **Introduction:** needs to address the debate and define key concepts in the question |
| How could you use the **item** |
| What key concepts will need to be included? |
| Evidence **for the argument** in the question (including named studies/concepts) | **Counter arguments** to these (including named studies/theories/concepts) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Conclusion- weigh up the debate: based on the evidence you have presented, is left realism an effective theory or crime and deviance? |