

ETHNICITY, CRIME AND JUSTICE

Official statistics on the criminal justice process show some striking differences between ethnic groups. For example, black people are more likely to be imprisoned than other groups.

How are we to explain these ethnic differences in criminalisation?

- Is it because some ethnic groups are more likely to offend in the first place – and if so, how do we explain such differences?

- Or is it because the criminal justice system is racist and discriminates against ethnic minorities (for example, by police targeting and harassment)?

Not only are there ethnic differences in criminalisation, but some ethnic groups are also more at risk of being victims of a crime. For example, there is considerable evidence of the scale of racially motivated offences against minority groups.

In this Topic, we examine these different aspects of the relationship between ethnicity, crime and justice.

Ethnicity and criminalisation

According to official statistics, there are some significant ethnic differences in the likelihood of being involved in the criminal justice system. Black people, and to a lesser extent Asians, are over-represented in the system. For example:

- Black people make up just 3% of the population, but 13.1% of the prison population.
- Asians make up 6.5% of the population, but 7.7% of the prison population.

By contrast, white people are under-represented at all stages of the criminal justice process. As the Ministry of Justice (2008) notes:

'Members of our Black communities are seven times more likely than their White counterparts to be stopped and searched, three and a half times more likely to be arrested, and five times more likely to be in prison.'

However, such statistics do not tell us whether members of one ethnic group are more likely than members of another group to commit an offence in the first place – they simply tell us about involvement with the criminal justice system. For example, differences in stop and search or arrest rates may simply be due to policing strategies or to discrimination by individual officers, while differences in rates of imprisonment may be the result of courts handing down harsher sentences to minorities.

Alternative sources of statistics

In addition to statistics on the ethnicity of those individuals who are involved with the criminal justice system, we can call on two other important sources of statistics that can throw a more direct light on ethnicity and offending. These are victim surveys and self-report studies.

Victim surveys

Victim surveys such as the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) ask individuals to say what crimes they have

been victims of (usually during the past 12 months). We can gain information about ethnicity and offending from such surveys when they ask victims to identify the ethnicity of the person who committed the crime against them. For example, in the case of 'mugging' (a term that has no legal definition but is used to cover robberies and some thefts from the person), black people are significantly over-represented among those identified by victims as offenders.

Victim surveys also show that a great deal of crime is intra-ethnic – that is, it takes place *within* rather than between ethnic groups.

However, while victim surveys are useful in helping us to identify ethnic patterns of offending, they have several limitations:

- They rely on victims' memory of events. According to Coretta Phillips and Ben Bowling (2012), evidence suggests that white victims may 'over-identify' blacks – saying the offender was black even when they are not sure.
- They only cover personal crimes, which make up only about a fifth of all crimes.
- They exclude the under 10s: minority ethnic groups contain a higher proportion of young people.
- They exclude crimes by and against organisations (such as businesses), so they tell us nothing about the ethnicity of white collar and corporate criminals.

As a result, victim surveys can only tell us about the ethnicity of a small proportion of offenders, which may not be representative of offenders in general.

Self-report studies

Self-report studies ask individuals to disclose their own dishonest and violent behaviour. Based on a sample of 2,500 people, Graham and Bowling (1995) found that blacks (43%) and whites (44%) had very similar rates of offending, while Indians (30%), Pakistanis (28%) and Bangladeshis (13%) had much lower rates.

CHAPTER 2

Similarly, Sharp and Budd (2005) note that the 2003 Offending, Crime and Justice survey of 12,000 people found that whites and those of 'mixed' ethnic origins were most likely to say they had committed an offence (around 40%), followed by blacks (28%) and Asians (21%).

The Home Office has conducted nine self-report studies on drug use since the early 1990s, all with remarkably similar findings. For example, Sharp and Budd (2005) found that 27% of males of 'mixed' ethnicity said they had used drugs (mostly cannabis) in the last year, compared with 16% of both black and white males and 5% of Asian males. Use of Class A drugs such as heroin and cocaine was much higher among whites (6%) than blacks (2%) or Asians (1%).

The findings of self-report studies challenge the stereotype of black people as being more likely than whites to offend, though they support the widely held view that Asians are less likely to offend. However, self-report studies have their limitations in relation to ethnicity and offending.

Overall, the evidence on ethnicity and offending is somewhat inconsistent. For example, while official statistics and victim surveys point to the likelihood of higher rates of offending by blacks, this is generally not borne out by the results of self-report studies.

Ethnicity, racism and the criminal justice system

There are ethnic differences at each stage of the criminal justice process. How can we explain them? How far are they the result of racism within the criminal justice system? We need to look at the main stages of the process that an individual may go through, possibly culminating in a custodial sentence.

Policing

As Phillips and Bowling (2012) note, since the 1970s there have been many allegations of oppressive policing of minority ethnic communities, including:

'mass stop and search operations, paramilitary tactics, excessive surveillance, armed raids, police violence and deaths in custody, and a failure to respond effectively to racist violence.'

Stop and search

Members of minority ethnic groups are more likely to be stopped and searched by the police. Police can use this power if they have 'reasonable suspicion' of wrongdoing. Compared with white people, black people are seven times more likely to be stopped and searched and Asian people over twice as likely. Data from the British Crime Survey and the CSEW indicate similar patterns. It should be noted

that only a small proportion of stop and searches result in arrest.

In addition, under the Terrorism Act 2000, police can stop and search persons or vehicles whether or not they have reasonable suspicion. Statistics show that Asians are more likely to be stopped and searched than other people under the Terrorism Act.

It is therefore unsurprising that members of minority ethnic communities are less likely to think the police acted politely when stopping them, or to think they were stopped fairly. As Phillips and Bowling (2007) note, members of these communities are more likely to think they are 'over-policed and under-protected' and to have limited faith in the police.

Tasers The chance of being involved in a Taser incident varies with ethnicity. During 2010-14, police deployed Tasers over 38,000 times. For Asians, the chance of involvement was three in 10,000 and for whites six, but for blacks it was 18 in 10,000 (Hoyle 2015).

Explaining stop and search patterns

There are three possible reasons for the disproportionate use of stop and search against members of minority ethnic groups:

Police racism The Macpherson Report (1999) on the police investigation of the racist murder of the black teenager Stephen Lawrence concluded that there was institutional racism within the Metropolitan Police. Others have found deeply ingrained racist attitudes among individual officers.

For example, Phillips and Bowling (2012) point out that many officers hold negative stereotypes about ethnic minorities as criminals, leading to deliberate targeting for stop and search. Such stereotypes are endorsed and upheld by the 'canteen culture' of rank and file officers.

Ethnic differences in offending An alternative explanation is that disproportionality in stop and searches simply reflects ethnic differences in levels of offending. However, it is useful to distinguish between low discretion and high discretion stops.

- In low discretion stops, police act on relevant information about a specific offence, for example a victim's description of the offender.
- In high discretion stops, police act without specific intelligence. It is in these stops, where officers can use their stereotypes, that disproportionality and discrimination are most likely.

Demographic factors Ethnic minorities are over-represented in the population groups who are most likely to be stopped, such as the young, the unemployed, manual workers and urban dwellers. These groups are all more likely to be stopped, regardless of their ethnicity, but they are also groups who have a higher proportion of ethnic minorities in them, and so minorities get stopped more.

Arrests and cautions

Figures for England and Wales show that in 2014/15 the arrest rate for blacks was three times the rate for whites. By contrast, once arrested, blacks and Asians were less likely than whites to receive a caution.

One reason for this may be that members of minority ethnic groups are more likely to deny the offence and to exercise their right to legal advice (possibly out of mistrust of the police). However, not admitting the offence means they cannot be let off with a caution and are more likely to be charged instead.

Prosecution and trial

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) is the body responsible for deciding whether a case brought by the police should be prosecuted in court. In doing so, the CPS must decide whether there is a realistic prospect of conviction and whether prosecution is in the public interest.

Studies suggest that the CPS is more likely to drop cases against ethnic minorities. Bowling and Phillips' (2002) argue that this may be because the evidence presented to the CPS by the police is often weaker and based on stereotyping of ethnic minorities as criminals.

When cases do go ahead, members of minority ethnic groups are more likely to elect for trial before a jury in the Crown Court, rather than in a magistrates' court, perhaps due to mistrust of magistrates' impartiality. However, Crown Courts can impose more severe sentences if convicted.

Convictions and sentencing

It is therefore interesting to note that black and Asian defendants are *less* likely to be found guilty.

This suggests discrimination, in that the police and CPS may be bringing weaker or less serious cases against ethnic minorities that are thrown out by the courts.

Black offenders have imprisonment rates three percentage points higher, and Asian offenders five point higher, than white offenders. This may be due to differences in the seriousness of the offences, or in defendants' previous convictions.

However, a study of five Crown Courts by Roger Hood (1992) found that, even when such factors were taken

into account, black men were 5% more likely to receive a custodial sentence, and were given sentences on average three months (and Asian men nine months) longer than white men.

Pre-sentence reports

One possible reason for harsher sentences is the pre-sentence reports (PSRs) written by probation officers. A PSR is intended as a risk assessment to assist magistrates in deciding on the appropriate sentence for a given offender.

However, Hudson and Bramhall (2005) argue that PSRs allow for unwitting discrimination. They found that reports on Asian offenders were less comprehensive and suggested that they were less remorseful than white offenders. They place this bias in the context of the 'demonising' of Muslims in the wake of the events of 11 September 2001.

Prison

In 2014, just over a quarter of the prison population were from minority ethnic groups. Among British nationals, 5.5 per 1,000 black people were in jail compared with 1.6 per 1,000 Asians and 1.4 per 1,000 white people.

As such, blacks were four times more likely to be in prison than whites. Black and Asian offenders are more likely than whites to be serving longer sentences (of four years or more).

Within the total prison population, all minority groups have a higher than average proportion of prisoners on remand (awaiting trial rather than actually convicted and serving a sentence). This is because ethnic minorities are less likely to be granted bail while awaiting trial.

Finally, we can note the existence of similar patterns in other countries. For example, in the United States, two out of five prisoners held in local jails (both convicted and those awaiting trial) are black, while one in five is Hispanic.

Activity Media

Ethnicity and criminal justice in America

...go to www.sociology.uk.net



Explaining the differences in offending

Large-scale migration from the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent began in the 1950s. Until the 1970s, there was general agreement that the minority ethnic communities had a lower rate of offending than the white population.

However, from the mid-1970s, increased conflict between the police and the African Caribbean community and higher arrest rates for street crime meant that 'black criminality' increasingly came to be seen as a problem.

CHAPTER 2

By contrast, it was not until the 1990s that crime by Asians also began to be viewed as a problem, with media concerns about the growth of 'Asian gangs'. The events of 2001 – widespread clashes between police and Asian youths in towns in northern England and 9/11 (the Islamist terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September) – helped to crystallise the idea that Asians, and especially Muslims, were an 'enemy within' that threatened public order and safety.

As we have seen, official statistics on the criminal justice process show differences between ethnic groups. The question is therefore how we explain these patterns. There are two main explanations for ethnic differences in the statistics:

- **Left realism:** the statistics represent real differences in rates of offending.
- **Neo-Marxism:** the statistics are a social construct resulting from racist labelling and discrimination in the criminal justice system.

Left realism

Left realists such as Lea and Young (1993) argue that ethnic differences in the statistics reflect real differences in the levels of offending by different ethnic groups. As we saw in **Topic 4**, left realists see crime as the product of relative deprivation, subculture and marginalisation. They argue that racism has led to the marginalisation and economic exclusion of ethnic minorities, who face higher levels of unemployment, poverty and poor housing. At the same time, the media's emphasis on consumerism promotes a sense of relative deprivation by setting materialistic goals that many members of minority groups are unable to reach by legitimate means.

One response is the formation of delinquent subcultures, especially by young unemployed black males. This produces higher levels of *utilitarian* crime, such as theft and robbery, as a means of coping with relative deprivation. Furthermore, because these groups are marginalised and have no organisations to represent their interests, their frustration is liable to produce *non-utilitarian* crime such as violence and rioting.

Application

How could you use Merton's concept of anomie and A.K. Cohen's concept of status frustration to explain these patterns of utilitarian and non-utilitarian crime?

Lea and Young acknowledge that the police often act in racist ways and that this results in the unjustified criminalisation of some members of minority groups. However, they do not believe that discriminatory policing fully explains the differences in the statistics. For example,

they note that over 90% of crimes known to the police are reported by members of the public rather than discovered by the police themselves. Under these circumstances, even if the police do act in discriminatory ways, it is unlikely that this can adequately account for the ethnic differences in the statistics.

Similarly, Lea and Young argue that we cannot explain the differences between minorities in terms of police racism. For example, blacks have a considerably higher rate of criminalisation than Asians. The police would have to be very selective in their racism – against blacks but not against Asians – for it to be the cause of these differences.

Lea and Young thus conclude that the statistics represent real differences in levels of offending between ethnic groups, and that these are caused by real differences in levels of relative deprivation and marginalisation.

However, Lea and Young can be criticised for their views on the role of police racism. For example, arrest rates for Asians may be lower than for blacks not because they are less likely to offend, but because police stereotype the two groups differently, seeing blacks as dangerous, Asians as passive. Furthermore, these stereotypes may have changed since 9/11, because police now regard Asians too as dangerous – thus explaining the rising criminalisation rates for this group.

Neo-Marxism

While left realists see the official statistics as reflecting real differences in offending between ethnic groups, albeit in a somewhat distorted way, other sociologists argue that the differences in the statistics do not reflect reality. On the contrary, these differences are the outcome of a process of social construction that stereotypes ethnic minorities as inherently more criminal than the majority population. The work of the neo-Marxists Paul Gilroy (1982) and Stuart Hall et al (1979) illustrates this view.

Gilroy: the myth of black criminality

Gilroy argues that the idea of black criminality is a myth created by racist stereotypes of African Caribbeans and Asians. In reality, these groups are no more criminal than any other. However, as a result of the police and criminal justice system acting on these racist stereotypes, ethnic minorities come to be criminalised and therefore to appear in greater numbers in the official statistics.

In Gilroy's view, ethnic minority crime can be seen as a form of political resistance against a racist society, and this resistance has its roots in earlier struggles against British imperialism. Gilroy holds a similar view to that of critical criminology, which argues that working-class crime is a political act of resistance to capitalism.

Most blacks and Asians in the UK originated in the former British colonies, where their anti-imperialist struggles taught them how to resist oppression, for example through riots and demonstrations. When they found themselves facing racism in Britain, they adopted the same forms of struggle to defend themselves, but their political struggle was criminalised by the British state.

However, Lea and Young criticise Gilroy on several grounds:

- First-generation immigrants in the 1950s and 60s were very law-abiding, so it is unlikely that they passed down a tradition of anti-colonial struggle to their children.
- Most crime is intra-ethnic (criminals and their victims usually have the same ethnic background), so it can't be seen as an anti-colonial struggle against racism. Lea and Young argue that, like the critical criminologists, Gilroy romanticises street crime as somehow revolutionary, when it is nothing of the sort.
- Asian crime rates are similar to or lower than whites. If Gilroy were right, then the police are only racist towards blacks and not Asians, which seems unlikely.

Hall et al: policing the crisis

Stuart Hall et al adopt a neo-Marxist perspective. They argue that the 1970s saw a moral panic over black 'muggers' that served the interests of capitalism.

Hall et al argue that the ruling class are normally able to rule the subordinate classes through consent. However, in times of crisis, this becomes more difficult. In the early 1970s, British capitalism faced a crisis. High inflation and rising unemployment were provoking widespread industrial unrest and strikes, conflict in Northern Ireland was intensifying and student protests were spreading. At such times, when opposition to capitalism begins to grow, the ruling class may need to use force to maintain control. However, the use of force needs to be seen as legitimate or it may provoke even more widespread resistance.

Moral panic The 1970s also saw the emergence of a media-driven moral panic about the supposed growth of a 'new' crime – mugging. In reality, mugging was just a new name for the old crime of street robbery with violence, and Hall et al note that there was no evidence of a significant increase in this crime at the time. Mugging was soon to be associated by the media, police and politicians with black youth.

Hall et al argue that the emergence of the moral panic about mugging as a specifically 'black' crime at the same time as the crisis of capitalism was no coincidence – in their view, the moral panic and the crisis were linked. The myth of the black mugger served as a scapegoat to distract attention from the true cause of problems such as unemployment – namely the capitalist crisis.

The black mugger came to symbolise the disintegration of the social order – the feeling that the British way of life

was 'coming apart at the seams'. By presenting black youth as a threat to the fabric of society, the moral panic served to divide the working class on racial grounds and weaken opposition to capitalism, as well as winning popular consent for more authoritarian forms of rule that could be used to suppress opposition.

However, Hall et al do not argue that black crime was solely a product of media and police labelling. The crisis of capitalism was increasingly marginalising black youth through unemployment, and this drove some into a lifestyle of hustling and petty crime as a means of survival.

Hall et al have been criticised on several grounds:

- Downes and Rock (2011) argue that Hall et al are inconsistent in claiming that black street crime was not rising, but also that it was rising because of unemployment.
- They do not show *how* the capitalist crisis led to a moral panic, nor do they provide evidence that the public were in fact panicking or blaming crime on blacks.
- Left realists argue that inner-city residents' fears about mugging are not panicky, but realistic.

More recent approaches

More recently, sociologists have offered other explanations for ethnic differences in crime rates, including the following.

Neighbourhood FitzGerald et al (2003) examine the role of neighbourhood factors in explaining the greater involvement of black youths in street robbery. They found that rates were highest in very poor areas and where very deprived young people came into contact with more affluent groups. Young blacks were more likely to live in these areas and to be poor. However, whites affected by these factors were also more likely to commit street crime. Thus, ethnicity as such was not a cause. However, black people may be more likely to live in poor areas because of racial discrimination in the housing and job markets.

Getting caught Some groups run a greater risk of being caught. Sharp and Budd (2005) found that black offenders were more likely than white offenders to have been arrested. Reasons included that they were more likely to commit crimes such as robbery, where victims can identify them, and to have been excluded from school or to associate with known criminals – factors that raised their 'visibility' to the authorities.

Activity Media

Urban riots and 'race'

...go to www.sociology.uk.net



Ethnicity and victimisation

Until recently, the focus of the 'ethnicity and crime' debate has been largely on the over-representation of black people in the criminal justice system. However, more recently, sociologists have taken an interest in other issues such as the racist victimisation of ethnic minorities.

Racist victimisation occurs when an individual is selected as a target because of their race, ethnicity or religion. Racist victimisation is nothing new, but was brought into greater public focus with the racist murder of the black teenager Stephen Lawrence in 1993 and the subsequent inquiry into the handling of the police investigation (Macpherson 1999).

Our information on racist victimisation comes from two main sources: victim surveys such as the CSEW, and police-recorded statistics. These generally cover:

- **Racist incidents** Any incident that is perceived to be racist by the victim or another person.
- **Racially or religiously aggravated offences** (assault, wounding, criminal damage and harassment) where the offender is motivated by hostility towards members of a racial or religious group.

Extent and risk of victimisation

- The police recorded 54,000 *racist incidents* in England and Wales in 2014/15 – mostly damage to property or verbal harassment.
- However, most incidents go unreported. The CSEW estimates there were around 89,000 racially motivated incidents in 2014/15.
- The police also recorded 38,000 *racially or religiously aggravated offences* in 2014/15, mostly harassment. 8,600 people were prosecuted or cautioned for racially aggravated offences in 2014.

The risk of being a victim of any sort of crime – not just racist crime – varies by ethnic group. The 2014/15 CSEW shows that people from mixed ethnic backgrounds had a higher risk (27.9%) of becoming a victim of crime than did blacks (18%), Asians (15.8%) or whites (15.7%).

The differences may be partly the result of factors other than ethnicity. For example for violent crime, factors such as being young, male and unemployed are strongly linked with victimisation. Ethnic groups with a high proportion of young males are thus likely to have higher rates of victimisation. However, some of these factors (such as unemployment) are themselves partly the result of discrimination.

While the statistics record the instances of victimisation, they do not necessarily capture the victims' experience of it. As Sampson and Phillips (1992) note, racist victimisation

tends to be ongoing over time, with repeated 'minor' instances of abuse and harassment interwoven with periodic incidents of physical violence.

The resulting long-term psychological impact needs to be added to the physical injury and damage to property caused by the offenders.

Responses to victimisation

Members of minority ethnic communities have often been active in responding to victimisation. Responses have ranged from situational crime prevention measures such as fireproof doors and letterboxes, to organised self-defence campaigns aimed at physically defending neighbourhoods from racist attacks.

Such responses need to be understood in the context of accusations of under-protection by the police, who have often ignored the racist dimensions of victimisation and failed to record or investigate reported incidents properly.

For example, the Macpherson Enquiry (1999) concluded that the police investigation into the death of the black teenager Stephen Lawrence was 'marred by a combination of professional incompetence, institutional racism and a failure of leadership by senior officers'. Others have found deeply ingrained racist attitudes and beliefs among individual officers.

Topic summary

Official statistics show that blacks and other ethnic minorities are more likely to be **stopped**, **arrested** and **imprisoned**. This may be because they are more **likely to offend**, or because of **racism** in the criminal justice system, or because they are more likely to fall into the **demographic groups** who are stopped. **Self-report studies** show lower offending rates among minorities than among whites. Black defendants are more likely to be acquitted but if convicted are more likely to be jailed.

Left realists argue that blacks do have a higher crime rate because of their greater **relative deprivation** and **social exclusion**, whereas **Neo-Marxists** argue that black criminality is a **social construction** serving to distract attention from the **crisis of capitalism**.

Minorities are more likely to be **victims** of crime, while being both over-policed and under-protected.

EXAMINING ETHNICITY, CRIME AND JUSTICE

QuickCheck Questions

Check your answers at www.sociology.uk.net



- 1 How much more likely are black people to be stopped and searched than whites: (a) 5 (b) 7 (c) 10 times?
- 2 Identify two problems in using self-report studies to study ethnic differences in offending.
- 3 How do Lea and Young account for (a) utilitarian and (b) non-utilitarian crime among blacks?
- 4 In what way does Gilroy see ethnic minority crime as political?
- 5 Suggest two criticisms of Gilroy's views.
- 6 According to Hall et al, how did the moral panic over mugging help capitalism?
- 7 What is meant by the term 'institutional racism'?
- 8 Identify two social characteristics of ethnic minority groups that make them more likely to be victims.

Questions to try

Item A The risk of being a victim of crime appears to vary by ethnic group, both in terms of 'ordinary' crimes and racially motivated crimes. This is shown in victim surveys. Surveys are based on the assumption that people are aware of what is happening to them. All suspected crimes have to go through a process of being reported and investigated before they are officially categorised as a crime. The role of the police is crucial to this process.

Item B Official statistics suggest that there is a clear relationship between ethnicity and offending. These show black people and to a lesser extent Asians as being over-represented in the criminal justice system. In the view of some sociologists, this is because at each stage in the system, from policing through to sentencing, institutional racism distorts the picture of ethnic patterns of offending. However, left realists argue that there are real differences in offending rates and that these differences can be explained in terms of factors such as relative deprivation and marginalisation.

- 1 Outline two reasons why members of some ethnic groups are more likely than others to receive custodial sentences. (4 marks)
- 2 Applying material from **Item A**, analyse two explanations of the apparent differences in the rates of victimisation of ethnic groups. (10 marks)
- 3 Applying material from **Item B** and your knowledge, evaluate sociological explanations of the relationship between ethnicity and offending. (30 marks)

The Examiner's Advice

Q2 Spend about 15 minutes on this. Divide your time fairly equally between the two explanations. You don't need a separate introduction; just start on your first explanation. To answer this question, it's essential that you take two points from the Item and show through a chain of reasoning (see **Box 4.1** in chapter 4) how each explains the apparent differences in the rates of victimisation between ethnic groups. (It is a very good idea to quote from the Item when doing so.)

You could use ideas such as patterns of victimisation in relation to 'ordinary' and racially motivated crime; reporting, investigating and categorising of crimes; the role of the police; and people's awareness of crimes.

For example, ethnic minorities may be unaware of being victimised or that the crime was racially motivated. Thus they may not report the crime, or not report it as a racist crime, leading to an under-estimate of victimisation.

Use concepts such as police-recorded statistics, over-policing, under-reporting and factors affecting risk of victimisation (e.g. age, employment status, area of residence). Offer some brief evaluation by noting that victimisation statistics are constructs produced by social processes.

Q3 Spend about 45 minutes on this. Consider different explanations of the relationship between ethnicity and offending. Organise your answer around a debate about whether the statistics represent reality or not. Start by examining the left realists' view that the statistics are a reasonably accurate representation of offending patterns and present their explanation.

Evaluate by contrasting the official statistics with the results of self-report studies. Use this to argue that offending rates may be socially constructed rather than real. Examine the social processes involved at different stages of the criminal justice system, e.g. stops and searches, arrests and sentencing, to show how the statistics are socially constructed. Examine in detail neo-Marxist explanations (Gilroy; Hall et al) that black criminality is a myth or the product of moral panic. Use Lea and Young, and Downes and Rock to evaluate these views.

Use the above concepts, issues and studies, plus relative deprivation, subculture, marginalisation, neighbourhood factors, hegemony, high and low discretion stops, institutional racism, demographic factors, police racism, over-policing, colonialism, resistance, capitalist crisis, criminalisation. Use studies such as Bowling and Phillips, Sharp and Budd, Hood and Fitzgerald.