

What's White About Multiculturalism?

**Exploring everyday multiculturalism, prejudice and
targeted hostility with young White British people
in Leicester**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the
University of Leicester

by

Stevie-Jade Hardy
Department of Criminology
University of Leicester
July 2014

What's White About Multiculturalism?

Exploring everyday multiculturalism, prejudice and targeted hostility with young White British people in Leicester.

Abstract

This study used the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explore how young White British people interpret, negotiate and engage with diversity and 'difference' in Leicester. Young people's views and experiences were captured through employing an ethnographic strategy which facilitated observations, informal conversations and interviews, documenting auto-ethnographical experiences and questionnaire completion.

The findings illustrate that the majority of young White British people living in Leicester view multiculturalism, in its ideological form, as being positive for England. However, when the sample was asked to reflect upon their own 'everyday' experiences of engaging with people from different backgrounds, the lived reality appears quite different. The findings demonstrate that the ways in which young people encounter and interact with diversity in mundane social spaces can be undermined by fear, prejudice and hostility. At its most extreme this unfamiliarity with 'difference' can motivate young people to actively disengage with the multicultural population around them. The intolerance and resentment towards 'difference' can be understood as the result of an interplay between socio-economic status frustration, a heightened importance of identity and place to certain groups of young people and the micro-multicultural context.

Finally, this study used the concept of everyday multiculturalism to understand the motivation and causation of acts of targeted hostility, incidents in which the victim is selected on the basis of their perceived ethnicity or religion. This study demonstrates that incorporating the concept of everyday multiculturalism within existing theoretical explanations of targeted hostility, achieves a more sophisticated understanding of the real-life situational cues and contexts which give rise to acts of targeted hostility. It is only through a closer engagement with the real lives of young people that a more empirically rooted understanding of targeted hostility can be achieved, and more effective policy and practice recommendations can be developed.

Acknowledgements

This section has proved almost more difficult to write than any of the other parts of this thesis. I now have a greater appreciation of why actors and actresses struggle in delivering a concise, heart-felt, mildly humorous acceptance speech at the Oscars. Thankfully I have no pressure on me to be concise, heart-felt or humorous.

This feels as if it has been a long journey and there have been many people who along the way have offered support, advice and most importantly, cups of tea. To begin a list to thank each and every person who has helped shape this work would double the entire wordcount, so I will begin by giving extended thanks to all of you, including those reading now who are seeing this work for the first time.

Foremost, I owe a huge 'thank you' to Neil and Sam for all of your support and guidance throughout the PhD, particularly when it came to grammar, typos and catchy titles. I would also like to extend a thank you to Jon for your help and advice during my Masters and in the early stages of this process.

To both my mother and father, I think this proves that I definitely cannot be related to either of you. On a serious note, thank you for your continued support over the last three years and for your unfaltering belief that I could actually do it. To Jay and Craig thank you for just being there and being yourselves (most of the time). A special mention goes out to Grandad – yes I have finally finished and yes, you are alive to see it ... Phew.

To my many friends (all six of you) I would like to say a big thank you for all of your support over the last three years and the many distractions you have provided, such as cheese jokes, alcohol and "*good pizza*". To Geraldine, a special thank you for always being there and always believing in me – you should probably hurry up and finish yours now. And Kate, I know how much you have been looking forward to being acknowledged. However I fear it might evoke the same feeling as when you really look forward to a night out and you are left feeling underwhelmed. But seriously, thank you for always being there offering very little helpful advice and guidance, and huge amounts of support.

Finally, I owe a big debt of gratitude to the young people who took part in this research. Thank you.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction to the Research	1
1.1 Exploring Everyday Multiculturalism and Targeted Hostility.....	2
1.2 Structure of the Thesis	5

CHAPTER TWO

2. Understanding Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism.....	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 The Demise of Multiculturalism	11
2.3 Exploring Everyday Multiculturalism	15
2.4 Youth, Identity and Belonging in a Risk Society	17
2.4.1 Societal Inequality.....	20
2.4.2 Social Capital and Social Mobility	23
2.4.3 ‘Chavs’: Disadvantaged White Youth.....	25
2.4.4 The Importance of Intersectionality	26
2.5 Conclusion.....	29

CHAPTER THREE

3. Understanding Everyday Multiculturalism, Prejudice and Targeted Hostility	31
3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 Perceptions of Multiculturalism	32
3.2.1 The Fear of ‘Difference’	36
3.3 Everyday Multiculturalism and the Development of Prejudice	39
3.4 Understanding Targeted Hostility.....	44
3.5 Exploring ‘Everyday’ Acts of Targeted Hostility with Young People.....	53
3.6 Conclusion.....	56

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Methodology	58
-----------------------------	-----------

4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	Using a Grounded Theory Framework	59
4.3	The Sample.....	66
4.3.1	Leicester: A Multicultural Utopia?	68
4.4	Data Collection: Ethnography, Observations and Interviews	74
4.4.1	Auto-Ethnography.....	80
4.5	The Survey	83
4.6	Data Analysis.....	86
4.7	Ethical Considerations	87
4.8	Conclusion.....	92

CHAPTER FIVE

5.	(Dis)Engaging with Multiculturalism	95
5.1	Introduction	95
5.2	The Subgroup	96
5.3	Views on Multiculturalism	100
5.4	Patterns of Prejudice	104
5.4.1	A Hierarchy of Hostility	111
5.4.2	The Issue with Immigration	115
5.4.3	Perceptions of Entitlement.....	120
5.5	Exploring the Lived Reality of Multiculturalism	124
5.5.1	Disengaging with Diversity and ‘Difference’	129
5.5.2	A Silver Lining?	132
5.6	Conclusion.....	134

CHAPTER SIX

6.	Targeted Hostility in Context	136
6.1	Introduction	136
6.2	‘Everyday’ Racism.....	137
6.3	Understanding Targeted Hostility	139
6.4	Targeted Hostility as an Outlet	147
6.5	Explaining Targeted Hostility in a Multicultural Context.....	151
6.5.1	The Role of Failure and Frustration	151

6.5.2	The Myth of White Entitlement.....	156
6.5.3	Understanding Thrill Seeking Behaviour	159
6.6	Incorporating Everyday Multiculturalism: The Importance of Context	167
6.7	Conclusion.....	170

CHAPTER SEVEN

7.	Moving Forward: Implications for Research, Theory and Policy	172
7.1	Introduction	172
7.2	Doing Research <i>with</i> Young People	172
7.3	Theory.....	177
7.3.1	Recognising the Importance of Context	180
7.3.2	The Geography of Targeted Hostility.....	183
7.3.4	Blurring the Victim and Offender Boundary	185
7.4	Policy	187
7.4.1	Tackling Prejudice in Schools	188
7.4.2	Engaging Young People in Youth Work	195
7.4.3	Addressing Targeted Victimisation with Young Offenders.....	200
7.5	Conclusion.....	208

References	211
-------------------------	------------

Appendices	252
-------------------------	------------

Questionnaire.....	253
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction to the Research

I stood in front of the group and I couldn't believe what I was hearing. It was "Paki this" and "Paki that". I don't think I said anything. I just stared at the group who continued to denigrate and dehumanise Asian people in a manner which was more suited to talking about football or the weather. What left me feeling most disturbed was hearing a song sung by a young girl with angelic features, who couldn't have been older than ten years. Looking directly at me with unwavering eyes, she sang the vilest racist rhyme I think I've ever heard in my life which included the line "burn a Paki". She completed the song by picking up a pebble and throwing it at the Chinese Take Away. I asked her why she had acted in such a way and she replied, "I hate the Chinky China men". I could feel the tears coming there and then and I knew I had to turn around and walk away.

The above is taken from a diary entry written after meeting a group of young White British people, who in time became the subgroup at the centre of this study. I met this group through my role as a detached youth worker within the Youth Offending Service, which involved engaging with local youths in areas characterised by high levels of anti-social behaviour, and developing and delivering educational and cultural activities with the aim of reducing offending. One placement in particular based within an area on the cusp of the city and county divide, stood out from the others and made a significant impression on me. At the time I did not regard myself as being particularly naïve or out of touch with the 'real world', but within a week of meeting this group of young White British people my eyes were opened to a level of prejudice and hostility that I did not think existed any more. I was not too dissimilar to the group in terms of my ethnicity, age and interests, in yet it was evident that our opinions on Leicester's multicultural population and our experiences of engaging with minority ethnic people differed greatly. The inability to identify with this group of young White British people who had grown up in the same multicultural city as I had, motivated me to try and understand why they viewed 'difference' with such hostility and why they refused to engage with the diverse population around them.

1.1 Exploring Everyday Multiculturalism and Targeted Hostility

As Meer and Modood (2012:1) explain, the ‘first decade of the twenty-first century will be remembered for a series of historical episodes, including international military conflicts and global financial crises; for technological innovations in mass communication, information collection, storage and surveillance; alongside an increased recognition of climate change and an associated environmental awareness’. Along with these global transformations has been a growing awareness of the changing nature of our societies and in particular, of the ways in which societies are dealing with this diversity. One of the marked political changes in terms of managing ethnic and religious plurality has been the shift away from the language of multiculturalism and the use of multiculturalist policies. The exact cause of this ‘demise’ lacks clarity, but the most cited explanations are the terrorist attacks of 2001 (Gove, 2006) and inter-ethnic conflicts, both of which are perceived to illustrate a lack of social and community cohesion between minority ethnic and religious communities and the ‘native’ population (Malik, 2007; Policy Exchange, 2007). In its place we have seen the emergence of a social and community cohesion agenda, and with it a renewed emphasis on strengthening a collective national identity, developing civic ties and prioritising immigrant assimilation.

One of the concerns with the continuing political and to some extent, academic debates on the meaning, use and failings of multiculturalism is that they are disconnected and out of touch with everyday life. Today, most of the world’s societies are ethnically, religiously and culturally diverse, and it is within these micro-geographies that multiculturalism continues to shape everyday life for ordinary people. It could be argued that the top-down policy changes which have occurred within the last decade have had little impact on the ways in which people negotiate ‘difference’ as part of their daily lives. There is an emerging body of research which uses the concept of everyday multiculturalism to try and understand how people interpret and engage with diversity and ‘difference’ within mundane micro-spaces (Colombo and Semi, 2007; Wise, 2007; Harris, 2009). As Semi, Colombo, Camozzi and Frisina (2009: 67) explain, this analytical approach ‘enables us to view multiculturalism

- that is, situations of coexistence in the same social space ... as a concrete, specific context of action, in which difference comes across as a constraint ... and as a resource'. Using the concept of everyday multiculturalism enables greater recognition of the dynamic nature of multiculturalism which plays out in ordinary micro-geographies. A closer investigation of the ways in which the group of young White British people mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, encounter (or more appropriately do not encounter) diversity within their daily life could explain why they held such hostile views towards Leicester's multicultural population.

The need for research exploring how young people specifically view and manage ethnic and religious diversity becomes ever more compelling in the current socio-economic context and the marked rise in xenophobia within this population (Harris, 2009; Walker and Taylor, 2011). Despite this there has been a paucity of research conducted on how young people come to understand and interact with 'difference' as part of their everyday lives, particularly so within a British context. There was a marked increase in research attention in the wake of the disturbances in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford but overwhelmingly this focused on 'Asian' and 'Muslim' youth (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). In the broader field of multicultural youth studies there has been a tendency for research to focus on microcosms of extreme racist youth or the problems that minority ethnic youth experience in forming a stable cultural and national identity. Therefore, this demonstrates two significant gaps in knowledge: firstly, in exploring how 'ordinary' young White British people view diversity and secondly, in using everyday multiculturalism as an analytical concept to explore how this population manage and engage with 'difference' within the context of their everyday lives.

As the quotation at the beginning of this chapter highlights, the subgroup of young White British people openly expressed racist and religious-motivated prejudice. More concerning was how honest, and to some extent proud, the group were in disclosing their involvement in targeted hostility. From the outset it is worth stating that the term 'targeted hostility' is used to refer to acts in which the victim is selected on the basis of their perceived ethnicity or religion. Such acts are more commonly referred to

as 'hate crimes', and although literature from within the field is drawn upon throughout this thesis, the use of the term is avoided so as to highlight the absence of hate, the 'ordinariness' of such acts and the 'low-level' nature of many incidents.

The diary account detailed at the start of this chapter fails to fully capture the 'unspectacular' way in which the group expressed racism and their involvement in targeted hostility. Research attention on racism tends to be weighted towards minority subcultures, reinforcing the idea that incidents of targeted hostility are 'the exceptional acts of exceptional people' (Räthzel, 2008 cited in Harris, 2009: 289). Often such expressions of prejudice and hate are explained through personal circumstances of deprivation or psychological problems (Back, *et al.*, 2008: 17). The perception that these views and acts are atypical has contributed to a denial in everyday racism being a significant feature of young people's lives. Valentine (2008: 328) explains that 'everything from hate crimes and violence to discrimination and incivility, motivated by intolerance between communities in close proximity to each other, is commonplace'. Using everyday multiculturalism as a lens through which to analyse negotiations and interactions at a grass-roots level demonstrates that racially and religiously motivated prejudice *affects* everyday engagement and also is *affected* by these engagements.

This study aimed to develop knowledge on the interplay between young people's everyday interactions with ethnic and religious diversity and the verbal and physical expressions of prejudice. Research within this area is much needed as it is often under-appreciated that young people are most likely to occupy the micro-geographies in which diversity and 'difference' come together, such as at school, in town centres and at leisure-based activities. There is limited research conducted on the ways in which young people from different backgrounds engage with each other in these spaces, and in particular the everyday conflicts and incidents which arise within these geographies. A denial of the prejudices that young people hold and how this impacts on negotiating multiculturalism, obscures the very real fears and tensions that exist in the context of everyday life. By not addressing these challenges and antagonisms the likelihood of underlying prejudices manifesting into acts of targeted hostility increases (McLeod and

Yates, 2003). A number of hate crime studies have illustrated the involvement of young adults in acts of targeted hostility and the significant emotional and physical impact that these incidents have on victims, families and communities (Sibbitt, 1997; Iganski, 2008). For this reason this study sought to explore the 'mundane' ways in which young White British people express prejudice and act upon it, and to consider how this was influenced by their everyday encounters and interactions with multiculturalism in Leicester.

1.2 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is structured to reflect the two central themes of this research: first, to explore the everyday lived reality of multiculturalism and second, the ways in which (dis)engaging with diversity impacts on racist and religiously motivated prejudice and acts of targeted hostility. For this reason both the literature and findings chapters are separated into these two themes.

Chapter Two begins by introducing the key themes of identity and belonging. The transition from adolescence to adulthood and the associated developmental factors, are seen as being integral to understanding how young White British people negotiate, interpret and experience everyday multiculturalism. This chapter narrows the scope of the study's target population by introducing literature on the demise and demonisation of the 'white working-class'. The label is now regarded as an ambiguous social classification, and throughout this thesis the phrase 'socially and economically disadvantaged' is used in its place (Jones, 2011). However, the concept of 'white working-class' and the associated literature provides an insight into the culture, norms and values of such communities. Importantly, this chapter considers the use of social and cultural capital as being more appropriate theoretical concepts in understanding the barriers of social mobility for young people from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, and the impact that this has on their willingness to engage with diversity.

Chapter Two also uses the notion of intersectionality to bring together the various themes raised within the chapter. This is used to illustrate that people experience multiple social divisions throughout their lives and the interplay between a person's identity characteristics such as age, class, ethnicity and their situational context, could help explain why certain groups of young White British people might be more accepting of ethnic and religious plurality than others. Finally, Chapter Two introduces the concept of multiculturalism and subsequently illustrates how multicultural policy and top-down dialogues fail to engage with socially and economically disadvantaged White British communities.

Chapter Three begins by using existing literature to consider public and political concerns about multiculturalism, ethnic and religious plurality and immigration. It is through a more detailed analysis of the lived reality of diversity and how these experiences with 'difference' could exacerbate underlying ethnic and religious prejudice, which could provide a more sophisticated and empirically rooted understanding of living everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility. Specifically, Chapter Three highlights the hostility directed towards specific immigrant communities and the Muslim population and explores how this climate of prejudice affects opinion on multiculturalism. Considering how individual, intergroup and even societal prejudice develops and manifests within multicultural micro-environments helps to understand why certain young White British people are motivated to target minority ethnic and religious communities. Although such acts are officially defined as 'hate crimes', this chapter uses the concept of targeted hostility to instead emphasise the feelings of fear, threat and hostility which underpin such incidents and also highlight the 'ordinariness' of these behaviours. This is not to downplay the significant impact that 'hate crimes' have on the victim, but rather to suggest that using this framework is more effective in illustrating how 'ordinary' young people can commit such acts in the context of their everyday life.

Chapter Four provides an in-depth explanation of the methodology used to explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility with young people. It begins by outlining three research aims which guided the research process:

- 1) To use the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explore how young White British people living in Leicester interpret, manage and engage with diversity and 'difference'.
- 2) To explore the extent to which the concept of everyday multiculturalism helps to understand what motivates and causes young White British people to commit acts of targeted hostility.
- 3) To use the research findings to consider what research, theory and policy developments could help to address the challenges posed by prejudice, everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility.

The chapter moves on to focus on the use of a grounded theory framework and offers a brief overview of how the grounded theory philosophy emerged, its original form and finally, the two more 'contemporary' modifications of the methodology. This discussion provides the historical context and main principles of grounded theory in order to demonstrate the relevance of this approach to the current research. The reader is then introduced to the city of Leicester, detailing its appropriateness as a site for exploring everyday experiences of multiculturalism, and justifying the use of a location within northern Leicestershire to gain access to young White British socially and economically disadvantaged people. In terms of data collection, Chapter Four outlines the use of an ethnographic strategy and in particular, the importance of spending a prolonged period of time getting to know the subgroup. In the three months spent with the group of 15 young White British people from a socially and economically marginalised background, I documented observations, informal conversations, and conducted interviews. In order to capture a much broader range of views and experiences from 'ordinary' young White British people a questionnaire was developed and administered in three schools within both the city and the county. In total 425 surveys were returned from 14 to 19 year olds who self-defined as being White British. The final section of this chapter discusses the ethical and personal challenges faced during the research process such as researcher bias, re-negotiating consent and participant harm, and how the use of auto-ethnography helped in managing these dilemmas.

Chapter Five is the first of the findings chapters and aims to address the first research question by detailing participants' perceptions of multiculturalism, the lived reality of

social cohesion and the barriers preventing meaningful interaction in Leicester. The chapter explores the concept of everyday multiculturalism by comparing the ideology of multiculturalism to the lived reality of social cohesion between people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Initially, Chapter Five details the findings from the survey which had been designed to collect opinions on multiculturalism and to explore the capacity in which members of different ethnic groups engage with each other on an everyday level in Leicester. The findings from the survey demonstrate that although the majority of young people are aware of the positive attributes multiculturalism can produce, understanding of the ideology is very different to their context-specific experiences of ethnic and religious diversity in Leicester. Those findings suggest that prejudice and hostility could be undermining social cohesion and engagement in Leicester and Leicestershire.

Chapter Five uses the three months fieldwork phase with the subgroup to illustrate that the disconnect between the group's expectations of white entitlement and their means of achieving social mobility and success, produces feelings of insecurity and frustration. This chapter demonstrates the importance of location to members of the subgroup, the strength of their attachment to each other as well as to their families and the wider community, and the exclusion they felt from wider society. Exploring the subgroup through the more complex framework of everyday multiculturalism highlights the importance, value and function of identity and place to this group of young people, and how this impacts on their willingness to engage with diversity and 'difference'.

Chapter Six explores the involvement of young White British people in acts of targeted hostility. Specifically it considers whether the concept of everyday multiculturalism is an effective analytical lens through which to understand the contexts and situational cues that can motivate and cause young White British people to act upon underlying prejudices. The chapter again combines both the survey and subgroup data to explore the sample's exposure to and use of everyday racism, and their involvement in incidents of targeted hostility. This chapter explores the acts of targeted hostility which took place in the context of the subgroup's everyday life to consider the underlying motivations and the immediate micro-context. Chapter Six proposes a

theoretical explanation for why young people commit acts of targeted hostility, which combines strain, doing difference, psycho-physiological theories and everyday multiculturalism.

Chapter Seven uses both the research experience and findings to consider the ways in which research, theory and policy could be developed to tackle the themes raised within this study. In terms of research, the chapter outlines how important it is to develop a framework which enables research to be conducted *with* (rather than *on*) young people, and to convey how effective this approach has been in capturing and understanding the lived experience of multiculturalism and targeted hostility. In particular, the experience indicated how important using a 'softer' methodological approach which factors in sustained observation and informal conversation is to conducting research with young people perceived to be 'difficult' to engage with or 'hard to reach'. Chapter Seven moves on to consider the implications this research has on academic theory and practitioner practice. This study illustrates that using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as a lens through which to analyse real people within mundane micro-contexts could help develop more nuanced theoretical explanations of targeted hostility. In particular, integrating the concept of everyday multiculturalism within existing theories of why 'ordinary' people engage in targeted hostility is essential to giving life and meaning to otherwise abstract explanations. A consistent theme throughout this final chapter is that the educational environment, youth work and youth offending programmes need to do more to engage and empower young people in difficult and challenging debates. It is only through listening to young people and understanding the ways in which they interpret, negotiate and engage with diversity that we can develop more effective initiatives and interventions which are rooted in the reality of young people's lives.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Understanding Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism

In the age of mass migration and the internet, cultural plurality is an irreversible fact; like it or dislike it, it's where we live, and the dream of a pure monoculture is at best an unattainable, nostalgic fantasy and at worst a life-threatening menace

Salman Rushdie (2005:n.p.)

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this first chapter is to outline some of the central themes integral to this research. This study has two main strands of enquiry; first, to use the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explore how young White British people in Leicester negotiate, interpret and engage with ethnic and religious diversity; second, this study investigates whether accounting for the interplay between individual identity characteristics and living in a multicultural micro-geography could more effectively explain expressions of everyday racism and acts of targeted hostility. Before theorising on the interplay between multiculturalism and the expression and enactments of racially and religiously motivated prejudice, it is necessary to firstly discuss the importance of 'youth' in the development of identity and belonging. The transition from adolescence to adulthood, and the associated developmental factors, are seen as being key to understanding how young White British people negotiate and manage everyday multiculturalism and the subsequent motivations for committing acts of targeted hostility.

As the quotation from Rushdie (2005) explains, global transformations have irreversibly changed not only the landscape of human geography but also the social and economic environments we now live in. Often the concepts of identity and belonging are explored as universal developments experienced by all young people, underplaying the influence of individual characteristics and contexts. However, this chapter seeks to critically analyse how the development of identity and the

importance of belonging could be influenced and exacerbated by experiences of everyday multiculturalism. This chapter narrows the scope of the study's target population by introducing literature on the demise and demonisation of the 'white working-class'. Although now an ambiguous social classification, using the associated literature provides an insight into the culture, norms and values of White British, socially and economically deprived communities. Importantly, this chapter considers the use of social and cultural capital as being more appropriate concepts to understanding the barriers for social mobility for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. This chapter moves on to introduce the concept of intersectionality and in particular, to illustrate that people experience multiple social divisions throughout their lives and it is the nexus between a person's identity characteristics and situational context that influences their perception of the self and their experiences. The chapter uses this concept to convey that acknowledging the influence of age, social status, ethnicity and situational contexts could achieve a more realistic understanding of how young White British people interpret and engage with diversity and why certain individuals are more hostile towards 'difference' than others. This theme is explored in more detail in Chapter Three which considers what motivates young White British people to express and act upon racially and religiously motivated prejudice in the context of everyday life.

2.2 The Demise of Multiculturalism

Over the last decade the doctrine of multiculturalism has become heavily contested and increasingly replaced by the rhetoric of social and community cohesion in government policy and public opinion. Since early 2000 many Western governments have expressed great concern with 'integration', or arguably more aptly, the lack of assimilation by immigrants within the host country (Back, Keith, Khan, Shukra and Solomos, 2002). Vertovec and Wessendorf (2009: 7) explain that 'the rise, ubiquity, simultaneity and convergence of arguments condemning multiculturalism has been striking'. Focusing specifically on the UK, the 'backlash against multiculturalism' (*ibid*, 2009: 7) is said to have been fuelled by the growing anxiety around the issue of race

and the perceived loss of national identity and 'Britishness' (Clayton, 2009). Mirroring the government shift, public concern as to whether the presence of both established and new immigrant communities has a detrimental impact on the 'native' White British population, and in particular the 'white working-class', became more vocal after the 2001 inter-ethnic disturbances (Neal, 2003; Clayton, 2009). Understanding both the political and public opinion on multiculturalism provides the necessary context to this study.

Although multiculturalism as an ideology and the vast amount of literature examining it are not the primary focus of this research, it is necessary to briefly outline where the concept emerged. This overview emphasises the failure of political discussions on multiculturalism and the top-down policies embodying it, to engage with the everyday lived reality of ordinary people. The term 'multiculturalism' emerged in academic and political discourse within the 1960s and 70s, predominantly from within Canada and Australia. In its original policy application in Canada, multiculturalism was concerned with the legal dilemmas over constitutional and land ownership problems relating to the indigenous peoples (Meer and Modood, 2011). In contrast, multiculturalist policy within Australia originally centred on the assimilation of new migrants before being broadened to also refer to the indigenous people. In both of these countries multiculturalism and the relating policies, were presented as being the expression of 'liberal values' which granted minority groups equal citizenship and individual freedom within the host country (Kymlicka, 2005; Triandafyllidou, Modood and Meer, 2011). Since this time conceptions of multiculturalism have amassed considerable critique and its embodiment through policies has varied widely throughout the Western world (see Triandafyllidou, Modood and Meer, 2011). Modood and Meer (2011: 181) define multiculturalism as:

... the political accommodation by the state and/or a dominant group of all minority cultures defined first and foremost by reference to race, ethnicity or religion, and, additionally but more controversially, by reference to other group-defining characteristics such as nationality and aboriginality.

In the height of its popularity, multiculturalism provided a framework and a set of policies which ostensibly embodied tolerance and advocated the recognition of cultural diversity. To some extent the dialogue of multiculturalism promoted and even legitimised visible ethnic, religious and cultural 'difference' (Joppke, 2004). Specifically within Britain, multiculturalism provided an effective framework for dealing with cultural difference and 'represented a reconciliation of sorts with post-colonial immigration—one that hinged on tightened restrictions on the settlement rights of former colonial subjects' (Paul, 1997 cited in Nagel and Hopkins, 2010: 4). Multiculturalist policies are said to have shifted our thinking of what it means to be 'British', with the concept of 'Britishness' now embodying a plurality of identities (Parekh, 2000).

In the last three decades multiculturalism has been a key term within British political discourse, particularly within New Labour's government. During Labour's term, a raft of legislation was passed which embodied the principles of multiculturalism such as introducing faith schools, racial and religious discrimination legislation, incitement to racial and religious hate legislation and the Equality Act (Modood, 2011). More recently however, many political parties around the western world have not only distanced themselves from the concept of multiculturalism but have been rather public in their criticism of the policies embodying it. One of the most vocal heads of state in criticising multiculturalism and multiculturalist policies has been Britain's current Prime Minister, David Cameron. Within his first speech after election he suggested that 'state multiculturalism' has failed because 'we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and the mainstream' (cited in Wright and Taylor, 2011: n.p.).

It is difficult to pinpoint when the 'demise' (Hesse, 2000: 5) of multiculturalism began, for example Weldon (1989:31) suggested that 'our attempt at multiculturalism has failed. The Rushdie Affair demonstrates it' (cited in Weller, Purdam, Ghanea, Cheruvallil-Contractor, 2013: 224). However, it was over a decade later that Kundnani (2002: n.p.) argued that the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and 7/7 'sounded the death knell for multiculturalists'. Although within Britain multiculturalist policies remain intact,

anti-multicultural rhetoric has now achieved traction and the concept of multiculturalism is politically embattled. It is worth noting that another concept has begun to emerge within academic and political discourse in the wake of multiculturalism. Interculturalism features within the political dialogue on integration within Holland and Germany, Russia in teachings of world cultures, and Spain and Greece through educational narratives on migrant diversity (de Witt, 2010). Interculturalism has become such a key concept that 2008 was the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (EYID), with the European Commission stating that the objective was to encourage 'all those living in Europe to explore the benefits of our rich cultural heritage and opportunities to learn from different cultural traditions' (cited in Meer and Modood, 2012: 3). The central tenet of interculturalism is to 'facilitate dialogue, exchange and reciprocal understanding between people of different backgrounds' (Wood, *et al.*, 2006: 9). However, interculturalism has yet to feature prominently within the political discourse and policies in Britain.

Within Britain there has been a marked shift away from the government promoting multiculturalism to instead prioritising common values, a shared sense of belonging and the development of community ties. This is regarded as a reaction to the disturbances in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in 2001 (Cantle, 2001), with the official response following the conflict alluding to these three multicultural cities being 'accidents waiting to happen' (see Cantle, 2001; Ritchie, 2001; Thomas, 2011). The use of multicultural policies by the government is said to have encouraged and even promoted 'difference' (Cantle, 2005). Consequently, these policies are said to have led to considerable social division along the lines of ethnicity, religion and culture. The ensuing geographical segregation within these three cities was in turn exacerbated by the perceived unequal distribution of council resources amongst different communities (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). The underlying tension and frustration within Oldham, Bradford and Burnley culminated in a summer of conflict between minority ethnic communities, the 'native' White British population and the Police Service in 2001. In response, the Labour government began to use the narrative of social and community cohesion rather than multiculturalism, as its guiding principle (Burnett, 2004). More broadly, many western societies began to adopt a raft of

policies that compelled immigrants to conform to the host society's norms, dividing those who saw it as a progressive movement and those who regarded it as a return of 'cultural cloning' (Joppke, 2004; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009). Specifically within Britain, this led to the development of citizenship and language tests, measuring community cohesion at a local level and to the legal obligation for schools to embed and promote social and community cohesion. However, there is limited empirical evidence to suggest how these policies have been understood and implemented by statutory bodies; and furthermore what impact they have had on individuals and communities in the context of everyday life (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013).

2.3 Exploring Everyday Multiculturalism

Existing political and academic discussions on multiculturalism and multiculturalist policies are seen as being 'disconnected from real life experiences and actual intergroup relations' (Howarth and Andreouli, 2010: 2). Whilst the theoretical debates on the meaning, application and subsequent failings of multiculturalism continue, ordinary people are faced with managing micro-multicultural geographies as part of their everyday lives. Little is known about the lived reality of negotiating and engaging with ethnic and religious difference. Far from academic interest in multiculturalism subsiding, there has been a growing interest and awareness of the need to explore 'actually existing multiculturalisms' (Uitermark, *et al.*, 2005). More recently there has been a development towards using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as an appropriate methodology to addressing this gap (see Colombo and Semi, 2007; Wise, 2007; Harris, 2009). As Wise (2004: 4) explains, everyday multiculturalism is the:

... diversity that exists in real, lived environments, not simply in abstract multicultural policy, and consequently implies layers of ethnically different individuals inhabiting suburbs and urban environments, corporeally interacting with one another as neighbours, shoppers, workers; rubbing up against one another in a myriad of quotidian situations.

Within the broad field of multicultural studies, a range of definitions have been developed to explain the concept of 'everyday multiculturalism' (see Colombo and

Semi, 2007; Wise, 2007; Harris, 2009;). However, the above definition offered by Wise (2004) captures the complexity of the phenomenon. As Wise's (2004) definition illustrates, everyday multiculturalism is a grounded approach to investigating the lived experience of diversity and the everyday practices and interactions which take place between social actors from different backgrounds.

This analytical approach could have helped to provide a more realistic and empirically rooted understanding of what caused the disturbances in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford. As Amin (2002: 965) argues with reference to young British Asians, understanding the geography of belonging and identity explains why the young men within these three cities were not willing to accept the minority societal position which generations before them had. The juxtaposition between their British identity as well as their sense of belonging to the local area and country, and the perceived unequal treatment and lack of entitlement which comes with a minority status, created considerable frustration. By recognising how young people understand and interact with cultural difference as part of their daily life, one can begin to achieve a more 'real' representation of the social cohesion in a given community or city. There needs to be a greater focus on the mundane social spaces in which social groups encounter and interact with each other within the context of the 'everyday' (Amin, 2002). As Navak (2003: 178) explains, discussions on cross-cultural relationships, multiculturalism and social cohesion 'need to engage more closely with lived experience and the changing cultural and material geographies of young lives'.

There has been an assumption, somewhat naive, that young people who live in 'super-diverse' (Vertovec, 2007: 1025) cities are more tolerant of ethnic and religious plurality, and that only a minority are seduced into 'regressive nationalism, fundamentalism and racism' (Butcher and Harris, 2009: 449). Berry (2006: 728) explains that this has reinforced the 'multicultural ideology' whereby there is a 'general and fundamental view that cultural diversity is good for a society and for its individual members'. However, even in cities where there has been no overt, major inter-ethnic disturbances, denying the existence of everyday racism, obscures young people's 'very real fears, differences and antagonisms inevitably generated in

conditions of massive social, cultural and economic change' (Harris, 2009: 201). Within this emerging field there are calls for multiculturalism to be viewed as dynamic, involving social actors forging and re-forging a sense of the self, and ideas about the 'Other', as well as managing these 'differences'. This is particularly pertinent for young people as they are most likely to occupy the spaces in which ethnic and religious diversity come together, such as school, city centres, places of entertainment and leisure based activities (Harris, 2009). It is within these multicultural micro-geographies that contestations over belonging and entitlement are played out (Howarth and Andreouli, 2010). It is by using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as a lens through which to analyse local misunderstandings, tensions and incidents within the context of everyday life, that acts of targeted hostility can be seen as one interaction in an ongoing process of negotiation (Wise, 2005). This more comprehensive framework begins to highlight that it is somewhat naïve to suggest that people who commit acts of targeted hostility are solely motivated by hate and equally, that this is a 'stable identity characteristic' (Wise, 2005: 184). It is only through a more detailed exploration of the micro social spaces where young people encounter, negotiate and make sense of each other, that the lived reality of multiculturalism and the conflicts which occur within these contexts, can be more accurately understood.

2.4 Youth, Identity and Belonging in a Risk Society

Literature suggests that the term 'young person' or the era of youth has a variety of meanings and understandings depending on the institution, organisation or field (Newburn, 2002). The terms 'childhood', 'adolescence' and 'youth' are socially constructed, and therefore are imprecise at being able to measure and pinpoint social and intellectual developmental progress (McAlister, Scraton and Haydon, 2009). However, under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, institutional policies govern that all those under the age of 18 are obligated to receive unique protection and special rights (McAlister, Scraton and Haydon, 2009). Unfortunately many of these policies and practices are based on the perceived homogeneity of young people, in the sense that they will act in a particular way, and share similar age related behaviours. However, as Valentine (2000: 257) suggests:

...the category 'woman' conceals a plurality of experiences, so too the single category child can universalise or oversimplify the complexity of young people's forms of identification and over determine the false boundary between adult and child.

The perception that young people are 'incomplete, vulnerable beings' (Mayall, 1994: 3) is somewhat correct, but it equally downplays the wide range of experiences and expectations that young people have in terms of finding their place in a complex and chaotic world.

Although 'youth' as a social position is a relative phenomenon and young people throughout history have experienced a multitude of challenges, research suggests that in comparison to previous generations the transition from 'childhood' to 'adulthood' is now more lengthy and tumultuous than ever before; global changes in unemployment, economic restructuring, global health risks, militarisation and educational transformation have been identified as responsible for this change (Thomson, Flynn, Roche and Tucker, 2004; Venkatesh and Kassimir, 2007; Jeffrey and Dyson, 2008; Taylor-Gooby and Cebula, 2010). Young people and their multiple positions and experiences throughout their transition to adulthood, are beginning to be investigated and analysed through a much more nuanced framework (Hopkins, 2011). For example, there is a growing recognition of how young people now face the same opportunities of exposure into the social and cultural spheres as adults and therefore are confronted with the same risks and choices (this theme will be explored in more depth later within the chapter). By being targeted by the same media outlets and increasingly regarded as independent economic members, young people now have much more opportunity to experience the freedom of an individualised society, and all of the unpredictability, instability and increased risk of failure which comes with it (Beck, 1992; Valentine, 2003). Kruger (1990) suggests that for this reason the categories of 'child' 'adolescence' and 'youth' are blurring, and previously linear approaches into adulthood are now much more convoluted and riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions (Valentine, 2003). A lack of recognition of the precarious position of

‘youth’ and what it means to be a young person in current society, could have contributed to the misunderstanding and even denial, of how challenging it can be for young people to interact and manage ethnic and religious diversity in a multicultural society.

The three outbreaks of disorder in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in the summer of 2001 involved young men and adolescents of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin, and young White British people, fighting with each other as well as the police (Denham, 2001). Since this unrest there has been an increased focus on the younger generation, particularly those from a minority ethnic background, and their perceived struggle to come to terms with not only their own cultural identity but also that of others (Harris, 2009). Specifically, Muslim youth have received a significant amount of research attention, which primarily focuses on whether the younger generation are struggling to ‘adapt’ to western culture and integrate within society (Poynting, Noble, Tabar and Collins, 2004). Even in the aftermath of the northern disorders of 2001, much of the media, political and academic attention focused on the ‘problem’ with the ‘Asian’ and ‘Muslim’ communities within these cities (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). To a lesser extent but still notable, there has been a growing academic interest in the rise of youth involvement in extreme far-right groups, including neo-Nazism. Both of these research strands exacerbates the perception that an unwillingness to embrace multiculturalism, holding racist or religiously prejudiced views and committing acts of targeted hostility are problems facing only a minority, atypical group of young people. Until more recently (see Sveinsson, 2009; Thomas and Sanderson, 2013) discussions with ‘ordinary’ White British people on ethnic and religious plurality have been limited and this is especially true for young people, despite young White British people playing a central role in the disturbances in 2001 (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). It is for this reason, that the present study is located within the narrative of ‘ordinary’ young White British people and specifically those who are from a socially and economically disadvantaged background, who live in a multicultural city.

2.4.1 Societal Inequality

In order to comprehend the importance of ethnicity and in particular, being 'White British' for certain groups of young people (such as the subgroup who are at the centre of this study), it is necessary to consider the literature focusing on the meaning and the subsequent dilution and demonisation of the 'white working-class'. Both global economic restructuring and the national shift towards deindustrialisation, led to a considerable change in the class structure in Britain (Thomson, Flynn, Roche and Tucker, 2004; Venkatesh and Kassimir, 2007; Jeffrey and Dyson, 2008; Standing, 2011b). One of the products of these profound global transformations has been the increase in levels of risk facing those most disadvantaged (Elias, 1978; 1982). In 'Risk Society' Beck (1992: 2000) explains how these changes have facilitated the shift from a traditional 'scientific' view of the world, to one focused on unpredictability, hazards and risks (Furlong and Cartmel, 2008; Taylor-Gooby and Cebula, 2010). Reflexive modernity is now characterised by questioning and fearing 'risks' within the context of everyday life (Lupton and Tulloch, 2002; Threadgold and Nilan, 2009). Unemployment and financial security, personal relationships, health problems, crime and terrorism, as well as personality failures and physical imperfections (Denney, 2005) can all form the everyday matrix of risk and will impact on the way in which people live and think in modern society (Threadgold and Nilan, 2009).

Theorists of 'reflexive modernity' suggest that as the world becomes more complex and difficult to understand, traditional static sources and structures such as class, gender, religion, marriage, employment and even the concept of the 'nuclear family', fragment (Giddens, 1994; Standing, 2011b). Greater appreciation of the considerable global, economic and social restructuring is central to gaining a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural and material geographies of young people's lives. Due to the 'rise of the network society' and 'the information age' (Castells, 2004), young people are now exposed to and experience the risk society that did not exist for their parent's generation (Beck, 1992; Furlong and Cartmel, 1997). For Giddens, the culture of risk in modernity 'produces difference, exclusion and marginalisation' (1991:6). Furlong and Cartmel (2008:5) explains that 'diversification involves the emergence of

new experiences and trajectories but does not involve a process of equalisation nor does it dilute the nature of class-based inequalities on an objective level'. Therefore suggesting that although lifestyle choices and patterns of behaviour are now free from the constraints of previous eras, heightening the diversification in which people experience life in contemporary Britain, the structural and social divisions pertaining to class are still just as prevalent within society. As Beck (1992: 35) explains, risk is unequally distributed within society and may be arranged in a manner, which follows the inequalities characteristic of a class society:

Like wealth, risks adhere to the class pattern, only inversely; wealth accumulated at the top, risk at the bottom. To that extent, risks seem to strengthen, not abolish, the class society. Poverty attracts an unfortunate abundance of risks. By contrast, the wealthy (in income, power or education) can purchase safety and freedom from risk.

The traditional class based inequality has been exacerbated by the fragile state of Britain's economy, with the recession being described as the most severe in the last three decades (Duncan and Gilmore, 2009; Kollowe, 2009). Britain's economic instability could contribute to the strain and frustration experienced by young people in a variety of ways; indeed, cuts to public services, legislative upheaval in financial and educational support and an ever-increasing number of young people who are not in education, employment and training (NEET) are just some of the consequences of Britain's economic recession (Gilmore, 2009; Freedland, 2010; Kite, 2010; Watson, 2010; Brady and Chorley, 2010; The Prince's Trust, 2014). Research illustrates that although globally lifestyle choices and patterns of behaviour are now less constrained than previous eras, opportunities to achieve and generate social mobility have actually decreased for young people in the last decade (Bynner and Parsons, 2002; Thomson, Flynn, Roche and Tucker, 2004; Gentleman and Mullholand, 2010). However, a lack of opportunity and the ensuing sense of failure and frustration are not experienced equally by all young people in Britain. Rather, research demonstrates that for the majority of White, non-disabled, middle class young people, this era, in terms of the distribution of opportunities and resources, is far smoother and certain compared to

the experience of the socially and economically deprived and minority ethnic youth (MacDonald, Shildrick, Webster and Simpson, 2005; Gentleman and Mullholand, 2010). This is supported by research conducted by The Prince's Trust and the ESRC which confirmed that it is thousands of Britain's poorest youngsters who will bear the brunt of the recession (Princes Trust, 2009).

Along with global changes reinforcing class division and increasing the risk and insecurity of the lives of socially and economically disadvantaged communities, there has also been a marked shift in the public perception of the 'white working-class', and in particular the growing acceptability of vilifying such communities (Collins, 2004). Jones (2011) suggests that one cannot separate the demise of the 'white working-class' through Margaret Thatcher's policies in the class war of the 80s and the beginning of a culture of demonisation towards these communities. As Jones (2011:10) highlights:

Its institutions, like trade unions and council housing, were dismantled; its industries, from manufacturing to mining, were trashed; its communities were, in some cases, shattered, never to recover; and its values, like solidarity and collective aspiration, were swept away in favour of rugged individualism. Stripped of their power, and no longer seen as a proud identity, the working class were increasingly sneered at, belittled and scapegoated...

This era saw the birth of 'individual responsibility' where instead of explaining social and economic inequality as products of a deeply divided and unequal society, it became a question of individual failure. The emergence of this new social Darwinism drew focus towards the individual and their own poverty of ambition in explaining economic hardship (Jones, 2011). This philosophy has become embedded within much political rhetoric today, exemplified by Britain's Prime Minister David Cameron stating that 'social problems are often the consequences of the choices people make' (cited in Porter, 2008: n.p.). The marked global, political and societal transformations are said to have led to an identity crisis within many White British socially and economically disadvantaged communities. Where the 'white working-class' used to have a strong sense of belonging to their community and a proud employment based identity, there now exists a void. It is within this vacuum that whiteness, national identity and place

become increasingly valuable sources of pride and recognition (Collins, 2004; Thomas and Sanderson, 2013).

2.4.2 Social Capital and Social Mobility

The weakening of traditional class based divisions has shifted focus onto the concepts of social, cultural and economic capital as a means of assessing an individual's potential for social mobility. These concepts could provide the theoretical insight into the lives of the young White British socially and economically disadvantaged people within this study. Both nationally and internationally, social capital has become an increasingly popular and influential concept in policy debates and social theory and has been used to understand 'the values that people hold and the resources that they can access, which both result in and are the result of collective and socially negotiated ties and relationships' (Edwards, Franklin and Holland, 2003: 2). Three main theorists have come to explain social capital and the process by which people develop social networks and relationships and the impact this can have on an individual's social mobility (Reynolds, 2009). Firstly, Putman (2000) emphasises the importance of trust, reciprocity and civic engagement as particular forms of social capital generated in social networks. This is particularly relevant when it comes to the central themes of this chapter, as social capital can produce strong civic identification and participation, both of which are viewed as being integral for social integration and social cohesion. Importantly, Putman (1994) developed a framework which illustrated that social capital is differentiated in its capacity to produce 'bonding' and 'bridging' networks. 'Bonding' social capital emphasises the strength of attachment to a homogenous group as opposed to 'bridging' social capital which is much more outward looking and involves developing relationships and networks between heterogeneous groups and communities (Putman, 1994). For young people, ordinary interactions which take place within the context of everyday life, such as at school, leisure activities and other public spaces, provide opportunities for both 'bonding' and 'bridging' social capital.

The second perspective is provided by Coleman (1990) who developed a more functional understanding of social capital which suggests that social capital gained

from networks, families and communities is used as a social resource to best represent an individual's interest and achieve social mobility (cited in Reynolds, 2009). Although the theories proposed by both Putman and Coleman illustrate that social capital is a desired resource, both fail to recognise the ways in which power and structural inequalities are reproduced in social networks, including ethnic, gender and social-class inequalities (Morrow, 2001; Edwards and Gillies, 2005; Reynolds, 2009). However, it is the third theorist, Bourdieu (1986) who addresses this issue by explaining that economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital are dependent on a person's position in the social-class structure within society. Social capital is important in the era of youth as young people who have inherited social capital from their parents begin to form their own identity, as well as cultural and economic capital separate from that of their family (Morrow, 2001; Lucey and Reay, 2000; Helve, 2007; Holland, Reynolds and Weller, 2007). Bourdieu (1984) suggests that structural inequality and social networks create habitus which instills 'a sense of one's place' (Bourdieu, 1984: 466) and therefore can lead to young people being reluctant to seek employment, schools and cultural activities outside of the perceived area of belonging. This intrinsically impacts on cultural and economic capital, as although it can be gained from external experiences and sources, it is said to flow from habitus (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 74–6).

In recent years, social capital has become an increasingly popular concept in policy debates surrounding social exclusion and social cohesion (Schuller, Baron and Field, 2000; Field, 2003; Franklin, 2004). A number of scholars and policy-makers have referenced the work of Putman in discussions on national identity and 'Britishness', and more specifically, have used his theory to support the contention that increasing diversity within a given area can have a negative impact on neighbourhood solidarity (Putman, 2007; Kymlicka, 2011). It is argued that the social reproduction of unequal cultural and economic capital leads to a vicious cycle in disadvantaged communities, especially when these communities experience an increase in ethnic and religious plurality, as it is said to reinforce 'bonding' social capital as oppose to 'bridging'. Even if a 'community' has a strong 'bonding' network which produces a strong collective local

identity and a clear sense of belonging, they lack any power to counter the socio-economic and cultural inequality and therefore, are unlikely to achieve social mobility (Putman, 2000; Ferguson, 2006).

2.4.3 'Chavs': Disadvantaged White Youth

Within the last decade, young people from socially and economically deprived communities have become a marginalised group within their own right, suffering a unique form of public vilification and demonisation. A number of media commentators and academics have noted that the culture and lifestyle of this collectivity is increasingly the object of disdain, and sometimes ridicule within society (Klein, 2008; Skeggs, 2009; Garner, 2010). One of the manifestations of this prejudice has been the acceptability and 'normalised' use of the term 'chav'. The term is intrinsically linked to the concept of the 'underclass' coined by Charles Murray in the 1980s and which came to represent those who were 'reliant' on the welfare system. Those fitting the label 'chav' are regarded as not subscribing to the culture of the 'majority' due to having customs and values which are seen as being at odds with wider society (Hayward and Yar, 2006). The concept of 'chav' goes further with Hayward and Yar (2006:14) explaining that those defined as such are seen as impoverished consumers being stereotyped by their:

... clothing (branded or designer 'casual wear' and 'sportswear'), jewellery ('chunky' gold rings and chains), cosmetics ('excessive' make-up, sunbed tans), accessories (mobile phones), drinks ('binge' drinking, especially 'premium lagers' such as Stella Artois), and music (R&B, hip-hop).

'Chav', regarded as being 'the word of 2004' (Burchill, 2005: n.p.), has become a catchall label used to describe anyone possessing certain negative traits including the 'white working-class', unwed teen moms, the unemployed or those receiving benefit and those involved in antisocial behaviour and criminality (Hayward and Yar, 2006). When 'chav' appeared in the Collins English Dictionary in 2005, the definition provided was 'a young working-class person who dresses in casual sports clothing'. However, the acronyms that have been created for the word 'chav' illustrate the widespread

understanding and target for such hostility. For example, '[C]ouncil [h]oused [a]nd [v]iolent' and '[C]ouncil [h]ouse [v]ermin' demonstrates how the word is rooted firmly in the stereotypical perceptions of young people from socially and economically deprived backgrounds (Hayward and Yar, 2006; Jones, 2011). Unlike similar names, the word 'chav' has its origins in the marginalisation and social exclusion of particular social groups. In terms of its etymology, most lexicographers agree that 'chav' owes its origins to the Romany dialect word for small child ('chavo' or 'chavi') (Hayward and Yar, 2006; Jones, 2011).

The impact of this widespread demonisation is yet to be fully explored but undoubtedly this form of vilification will affect the way in which young people from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds form their own identity and sense of belonging, and engage with the world around them. Howarth (2002) found that the young people she engaged with in Brixton became increasingly angry and bitter, not only with their position within society, but also because of the way that 'outsiders' looked and treated them. It has been found that when young people are consciously aware of this disapproving and stigmatising gaze, they are less likely to challenge it. Instead, it becomes more likely that young people will begin adhering to and even strengthening the stereotypical view of them, in what has been termed the self-fulfilling prophecy (Allport, 1954; Goffman, 1968; Evans, *et al.*, 2001; Howarth, 2002). Elsewhere, research supports the suggestion that young White British people experience a unique form of prejudice from 'outsiders' and adults who look down on their language, culture and community as being 'racist' and anti-social (Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). Policies embodying equality and multiculturalism are said to have led to a 'white backlash' within certain communities (Hewitt, 2005). Thomas and Sanderson (2013) found that young White British people living in Oldham felt that they were being demonised for being true 'native' Englishmen.

2.4.4 The Importance of Intersectionality

Identity and self-image are fundamental to how people, particularly those in adolescence, come to define themselves and how they act within their surroundings

(Trahan, 2011). As Hermans (2002: 148) notes, the 'enlarging complexity of society adds to the complexity of the self'. By drawing on different cultures and by being affiliated with various groups through bridging networks, people develop multiple identities. Conversely this will also impact on young people who disengage or are reluctant to interact with people from different backgrounds, by reinforcing the distinctness of *their* ethnicity and *their* culture in comparison to 'Others'. Using the concept of intersectionality brings together the theoretical concepts of social, cultural and economic capital and the influence that these have on a young person's identity and sense of belonging. One of the central tenets of the present study is to acknowledge that people experience multiple social divisions throughout their lives and this impacts people in different ways (Dill and Baca Zinn, 1997; Trahan, 2011). Understanding the juxtaposition between the illusion of White entitlement and the reality of society's inherent class and cultural inequality provides the context necessary to exploring everyday multiculturalism and the development of ethnic and religious prejudice.

Identity is said to form via the intersection of ethnicity, gender and class and these social divisions concurrently affect an individual's life experiences (Baca Zinn and Dill, 1996; Trahan, 2011). Trahan (2011: 2) suggests that there 'exists multiple hybrid forms of oppression for those with different combinations of race, class, and gender identities'. It is the combination of a person's race, class, and gender that influences their perception of the self and 'Others', and their experiences (Wildman 1997, cited in Trahan, 2011). The intersectionality approach demonstrates that there are serious implications for those individuals who, through different social divisions, experience the contrasting positions of privilege and disadvantage (Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Trahan, 2011). Young White British socially and economically disadvantaged males in particular, are regarded as occupying paradoxical positions; on the one hand they are demonised because of their social status and lifestyle choices but on the other hand they are assigned 'superiority' precisely because of their whiteness and masculinity. As Weis, Proweller and Centrie (1997: 211) explain 'white working class men represent a position of privilege, at the same time they represent the loss of such privilege'. These

contrasting positions are thought to have a significant impact on the development of their identity (Quinn, Thomas, Slack, Casey, Thexton and Noble, 2006).

The intersectionality perspective suggests that where individuals experience different forms of oppression and yet feel they should be afforded the position of privilege, strategic social and self-defence mechanisms can develop (Crenshaw, 1991; Trahan, 2011). In the present study it is suggested that some White British, socially and economically disadvantaged young people are in the ambiguous position of being disadvantaged due to the social divisions pertaining to social status and age, and yet conversely may perceive themselves as being in a position of privilege and entitlement due to their ethnicity. It is this contradiction that may impact on the way in which young people experience everyday multiculturalism.

Investigating the nexus between identity, belonging and territory could explain why experiences of everyday multiculturalism could give rise to acts of racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility. When place and ownership are so integral to a person's identity and belonging, a threat to this whether it is real or imagined, generates a sense of frustration and fear. As Valentine (2008: 333) suggests, White majority prejudice is forged within a risk society which has seen communities become 'antagonized and defensive in first, by the competition for scarce resources, and second, in the debate about conflicting rights'. Standing (2011a: 148) supports this by explaining 'insecure people make angry people, and angry people are volatile, prone to support a politics of hatred and bitterness'. It could be argued that for young White British socially and economically disadvantaged people, their perceived ownership and sense of belonging becomes increasingly valuable to forming a stable identity in a multicultural city. For young people, micro-territories such as schools, shop corners, parks and places of entertainment are a symbolic representation of their identity and ownership. It is for this reason that the ways in which young 'ordinary' White British people interpret and encounter everyday multiculturalism must be recognised as a product of the intersections between their identity characteristics, the socio-cultural context they have grown up in and the mundane micro-geographies in which they interact with 'difference'.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has identified the target population for this research as being ‘ordinary’ young White British people, and particularly those from a socially and economically disadvantaged background. The rationale for doing this was to readjust the weight of literature that exists on exploring the development of identity and sense of belonging for minority ethnic young people. In the aftermath of the Oldham, Burnley and Bradford riots, the research and political focus was overwhelmingly directed towards minority ethnic people and perceived lack of social cohesion. This chapter suggests that multicultural policy and the subsequent community cohesion dialogue fails to engage with white socially and economically marginalised communities. The complexity and impact of forming an identity, achieving a sense of national or local belonging and succeeding in education and economic terms has been somewhat overlooked in research and policy when it comes to young White British people. Drawing upon the concepts of social, economic and cultural capital enables a more comprehensive understanding of how social and economic inequality continues to constrain both individuals and whole communities when it comes to social mobility. When policy, research, and social systems fail to take account of ‘structural and institutionalised patterns of oppression’ (Ginwright, *et al.*, 2005: 28) and the different resources available to privileged and disadvantaged young people, the latter are most vulnerable to feelings of frustration and marginalisation (Kelly, 2003; Morris, 2007; Bottrell, 2009).

This chapter highlights that understanding global and social changes and the impact that these have on the development of identity and belonging, could explain how young people come to engage with multiculturalism differently. The legacy of multiculturalism and multicultural policies is that many cities now have a population that is living-apart-together (Harris, 2009). It is this societal backdrop that highlights the need to use a more ‘real’ methodological approach to understand the lived realities of young people, particularly in a multicultural city. Everyday multiculturalism

has not yet been used as a concept within the field of hate crime. Targeted hostility needs to be analysed in the context of the perceived failure of multiculturalism to foster inclusive neighbourhoods, and to instead emphasise social differences in ethnicity, religion and social status. It could be argued that ethnic and religiously motivated prejudice and incidents of targeted hostility are 'motivated by intolerance between communities in close proximity to each other' (Valentine, 2008: 328). By better understanding the context in which a young person is located and taking into account their individual demographics and experiences with cultural diversity, a more complex and empirically rooted framework can be developed to understand the motivation and causation of acts of targeted hostility by young people.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Understanding Everyday Multiculturalism, Prejudice and Targeted Hostility

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter sought to contextualise this study by providing a brief overview of the emergence, and subsequent demise, of multiculturalism. This outline aimed to demonstrate how using 'top-down policies or large-scale attitudinal surveys' fail to account for how people come to engage and interact with diversity on an everyday level (Bloch and Dreher, 2009: 194). The chapter introduced the concept of everyday multiculturalism as offering a new perspective in understanding how young White British people interpret, engage and negotiate with diversity and 'difference'. Chapter Two detailed a range of themes including the demonisation of white socially and economically disadvantaged communities, the role of social capital and the unequal distribution of risk and insecurity, to consider how these factors impact on the development of a young person's identity and sense of belonging. A closer investigation of how a young person feels about themselves, as well as the world around them could help to understand why they may be unfamiliar with diversity and also feel threatened by 'difference'. This chapter focuses more explicitly on the challenges and conflicts which occur within multicultural micro-geographies. Analysis of 'lived environments' and more specifically how experiences within these micro-contexts cause or exacerbate underlying tensions, may provide a more realistic and empirically rooted understanding of why people hold and express prejudiced views and commit acts of targeted hostility.

This chapter begins by outlining existing research on how 'ordinary' people feel about multiculturalism. Research demonstrates that although the majority of the general public perceive multiculturalism as being positive, there are very real fears and tensions which undermine the lived reality. Specifically, this chapter considers how the

heightened hostility towards certain 'out-groups', such as immigrant communities and Muslim population in particular (Burnett, 2013), could explain the increase in xenophobic views in young people. Considering how individual, intergroup and even societal prejudice develops and manifests within multicultural micro-environments could help to explain why certain young White British people commit acts of targeted hostility. Although such incidents are officially defined as 'hate crimes', this thesis uses the term 'targeted hostility' to emphasise the feelings of fear, threat and hostility which underpin such incidents and to highlight the 'ordinariness' of these behaviours in the eyes of the perpetrator. This is not to downplay the significant impact that 'hate crimes' have on the victim but rather to illustrate that using this framework is more effective in accounting for why 'ordinary' young people are motivated to commit acts of targeted hostility and how these incidents arise within the context of everyday life.

3.2 Perceptions of Multiculturalism

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, 'multiculturalism' as an ideology, and through its embodiment in government policies, has faced mounting criticism over the last decade. State policies are said to have encouraged the promotion of 'difference' and consequently have led to minority self-segregation (Nagel and Hopkins, 2010). The wider social and political climate has been significant in shaping both the public and state retreat from multiculturalism. In particular the terrorist attacks in both London and New York have been pivotal in generating intolerance and hostility towards the ethnic 'Other' (Allen, 2007). In the wake of the terrorist attacks in September 2001 Furedi (2002) wrote that the 'next big thing' was likely to be fear (Furedi, 2002: vii). Within Britain the July 2005 terrorist attacks were committed by people born and/or brought up in Britain and as Kepel (2005) states, the terrorists 'were the children of Britain's own multicultural society' (cited in Meer and Modood, 2009: 491). Allen (2011) suggests that because the terrorists were 'home-grown' and of Muslim faith, it has been used as proof that the multicultural social model and the integration of non-indigenous beliefs and norms had not been successful. The previous chapter briefly focused on the academic literature detailing 'the demise of multiculturalism' and

illustrated the shift in political rhetoric towards a dialogue of integration and social cohesion. The following section will explore how the 'general public' perceives multiculturalism, and in particular how they view community cohesion between different ethnic and religious communities.

Canada was the first country to conduct systematic studies of attitudes towards multiculturalism and, since the 1970s, it has reported that the majority of respondents support multiculturalist policies and ethnic and religious diversity more generally (Berry, Kalin and Taylor, 1977; Berry, 1984). However, studies conducted in many other Western countries have produced a much less positive picture. One country in particular which has been vocal about the negative impacts of cultural diversity is the Netherlands (Kymlicka, 2011). Widely cited as a country in which multiculturalism 'failed', critics in the Netherlands blame the resurgence of racially and religiously motivated prejudice and increasing segregation on the implementation of multicultural policies (Sniderman and Hagendoorn, 2007). Multiple attitudinal studies conducted in the Netherlands (Van de Vijver, *et al.*, 2006; Breugelmans, van de Vijver, and Schalk-Soeka, 2009) demonstrate that although the majority of inhabitants are against discrimination and unequal treatment, they do not support immigrants maintaining their own 'native' culture either and strongly favour assimilation. Similarly in Australia respondents felt that multiculturalism brought many positive features to the country such as enriching national culture and boosting the economy, however they also voiced strong concerns about social segregation and racial intolerance (Dandy and Pe-Pau, 2010). Attitudinal surveys conducted in various western countries report a similar picture; studies in Germany (Zick, Wagner, Van Dick and Petzel, 2001), Spain (Medrano, 2005), the United Kingdom (Heath and Tilley, 2005), and the USA (Citrin, Sears, Muste, and Wong, 2001) showed neutral (indifferent) or slightly negative attitudes towards multiculturalism. A recent analysis of data from 21 countries in the European Social Survey showed that differences among countries on attitudes towards multiculturalism were, although significant, fairly small (Schalk-Soekar, Van de Vijver, Arends-Tóth, and Van Hemert, 2007).

Specifically within the UK, recent polls illustrate that 90 per cent of respondents think

that Britain has become multicultural and, of this, 70 per cent believe that having a diverse population brings many positive attributes to the country (Ashcroft, 2013). However, an attitudinal survey conducted by Ipsos MORI exposed a much more conflicting picture. Although the majority of British people think multiculturalism makes the country a better place, 32 per cent feel it 'threatens the British way of life' and 54 per cent believe that 'parts of the country don't feel like Britain anymore because of immigration' (cited in BBC News, 2005). The majority of respondents also appeared to support the assimilation of immigrants with 58 per cent suggesting that 'people who come to live in Britain should adopt the values and traditions of British culture' (ibid, 2005). When the same sample were asked whether they thought Britain had become more or less racially tolerant, 34 per cent answered 'more' and 39 per cent answered 'less'. In a more recent survey conducted by NatCen, a third of respondents admitted to being racially prejudiced, returning to the level reported thirty years ago in the British Attitudes Survey (Taylor and Muir, 2014). The perceived increase in racial intolerance in Britain is being explained by the growing concern and anxiety towards levels of immigration and widespread Islamophobia. The attitudinal surveys detailed above suggest that British people broadly perceive multiculturalism as being positive for the country, but find the lived reality of a diverse population evokes feelings of concern and a sense of threat.

The findings from both Ashcroft (2013) and Ipsos MORI (2005) should be regarded with caution due to the associated samples. For example, in the survey conducted by Lord Ashcroft the respondents were overwhelmingly Conservative voters and therefore representative of a certain demographic within Britain. Additionally, neither of the studies included people under the age of eighteen. Pagani and Robustelli's (2010) study is one of few which either involves or focuses explicitly on young people. Focusing on children and young people within different schools in Italy, they found significant negative attitudes towards multiculturalism and diversity. They identified basic motivations such as ignorance and fear that contributed to young people's unwillingness to accept multiculturalism. Pagani and Robustelli (2010: 252) subdivided fear 'into three more specific motivations, namely (a) fear for their own safety and for their welfare, (b) fear of loss of identity and (c) fear of losing other people's affection'.

Tyler's (2003) study in the ex-mining town of Coalville not only offers a rare insight into how young White British people view diversity, but more specifically it offers an insight into how young people living in Leicestershire feel about multiculturalism and is therefore particularly relevant to this study. Tyler (2003) found that the young people within her sample regarded the multicultural environment that they had grown up in as banal and ordinary; even when participants had openly racist parents and families, they felt comfortable and competent in challenging these prejudices and stereotypes (Tyler, 2003: 305-306).

A further study conducted by Ipsos MORI (2005) also raises important questions about young people and how they view their own identity, as well diversity and 'Britishness' more generally. Conducted in the wake of the terrorist bombings in London, the study found that young White British people lacked a strong connection and attachment to Britain (Ipsos MORI, 2005). The report explains that this is because 'ethnic identities have far more emotional resonance with Black and Asian young people' than White people (Ipsos MORI, 2005: 5). This provokes an interesting debate as to whether the lack of 'emotional resonance' towards ethnicity and nationality is experienced by all young White British people. It could be argued that ethnicity and nationality might become more important to White British people when they experience socio-economic disadvantage, or lack a stable sense of belonging and recognition. The report also illustrated that when young people were confronted with being in a numerical minority position such as when travelling abroad, they felt as if being British and their traditional culture and customs became more important (Ipsos MORI, 2005). This finding could resonate with how young White British people, who live within multicultural micro-geographies, feel about their identity and sense of belonging. Finally, the study highlights that many of the young White British respondents felt threatened by the increased competition for jobs and state resources and were increasingly fearful of being seen as 'non-PC' or even racist when talking about race, culture and 'Britishness' (Ipsos MORI, 2005).

3.2.1 The Fear of 'Difference'

Immigration and the perceived threat of the 'Other', emerge as significant contributory factors as to why people view multiculturalism so negatively (Gonzalez, *et al.*, 2010; Stephan, *et al.*, 2005; Schalk-Soekar and Van de Vijver, 2008). This section builds upon the previous to consider how the concept of 'difference' is central to understanding the levels of intolerance and hostility towards immigration, the Muslim community and multiculturalism more broadly. Studies within Australia and the Netherlands (Ang, *et al.*, 2002; Betts, 2005) demonstrate a commonly held perception that immigrants are given more opportunities to study and work, and given preferential access to national resources over 'native' inhabitants. However, both studies found that respondents who reported high life satisfaction and who were more highly educated were more favourable to immigration and diversity (Ang, *et al.*, 2002; Betts, 2005). In a recent British Attitudes Survey investigating the most important issues facing the country, immigration figured as the top concern for 38 per cent of respondents, and of this sample 69 per cent thought there were too many immigrants within Britain (Duffy and Frere-Smith, 2014). In contrast to the perception that it is the older generation who are most likely to show the greatest opposition to immigration, recent research illustrates that it is in fact younger people who express the highest levels of hostility and frustration towards immigration and specifically, the Muslim population.

Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz (2001) found relatively high percentages of young people in England, Germany and Denmark held negative attitudes towards 'immigrants'. The younger respondents within Bartlett, Birdwell and Littler's (2011) study also felt that immigrant communities had detrimentally affected Britain's collective national identity and in particular, threatened their right to education, employment and housing. One participant within Bartlett's *et al.* (2011: 57) research stated that 'foreigners are slowly suffocating our lovely country'. Legrain (2006: 276) suggests that White British people are often accepting of Britain's multicultural status as long as it is not visually noticeable, such as through cultural dress and the use of different languages (Legrain, 2006: 276). On a local level, tensions between different ethnic groups are often aggravated by myths about preferential treatment, such as

immigrants receiving state housing and benefits at the expense of the 'native' population (McGhee, 2008; Valentine, 2010). Legrain (2006) explains that hostility towards 'immigrants' is often founded on certain misconceptions, including that immigrants and locals are competing for the same jobs, and that there are only so many jobs to go round, so that every job an immigrant takes is one less for the 'native' population (Legrain, 2006: 66).

The notion of 'difference' is key to understanding both the host nation's fears towards multiculturalism and also the hostility directed towards specific out-groups. Modood (2012: 5) suggests that post-immigration minorities are differentiated from the norm by two kinds of process:

On the one hand, by the fact of negative 'difference': with alienness, inferiorisation, stigmatisation, stereotyping, exclusion, discrimination, racism and so on. On the other hand, by the senses of identity that groups so perceived have of themselves. The two together are the key data for multiculturalism. The differences at issue are those perceived both by outsiders or group members – from the outside in and from the inside out – to constitute not just some form of distinctness but a form of alienness or inferiority that diminishes or makes difficult equal membership in the wider society or polity.

The current British socio-structural and political framework is said to reinforce who may legitimately belong to a particular national and/or ethnic identity (Jamal, 2009). This framework is seen to differentiate between 'native' inhabitants and those who have a 'home outside Britain' (Miles and Brown, 2003: 62; Modood, 2007; McGhee, 2008). By reinforcing who legitimately belongs to Britain, specific groups of 'Others' such as immigrant communities and Muslim people are subjected to the Othering process (Modood, 2007; McGhee, 2008). The global and economic transformations detailed in the previous chapter have been integral to this process. It is suggested that the profound global changes have helped to generate a homogenising pressure over the world (Castles, Kalantzis, Cope and Morrissey, 1988; Wren, 2001). Particularly in Europe, the emphasis of 'countries without borders' and the demise of independent nation states has contributed to a 're-surgence of separatist nationalism' (Wren, 2001: 141) in which cultural homogeneity is regarded as a way of reasserting a strong

national identity. This process, which bounds individuals and groups together based on a collective ethnicity and culture, perpetuates the perceived threat that specific groups of 'Others' pose to the 'British' way of life.

Martin Barker was the first to coin the emergence of a new political discourse in the 1970s as a 'new racism' (Barker, 1981; Allen, 2010). Resonating with much of the political and public thought today, Barker (1981) suggested that immigration, multiculturalism and cultural diversity would come to be regarded as having a detrimental impact on 'native' identity, customs and values (Wren, 2001; McGhee, 2008; Allen, 2010). Barker (1981) identified that societal discriminatory processes which were traditionally based on the assumption of the somatic or biological variation of ethnic groups were increasingly becoming centred on 'cultural' differences (Barker, 1981; Allen, 2010). It is suggested that due to the existing socio-structural and cultural hierarchy, which emphasises the normalcy, superiority and liberalism of 'White English' culture, and the increasing political retreat from celebrating diversity, prejudice towards cultural 'difference' has become not only justified but almost natural (Allen, 2010). As the Runnymede Trust (2007) state:

The expression of anti-Muslim ideas and sentiments is becoming increasingly seen as respectable. It is a natural, taken-for-granted ingredient of the commonsense world of millions of people every day ... Islamophobic discourse, sometimes blatant but frequently subtle and coded, is part of the fabric of everyday life in modern Britain.

(cited in Allen, 2010:231)

This contention is supported elsewhere in research, with Bloch and Dreher (2009) suggesting that society is plagued with high levels of fear and resentment towards specific ethnic 'Others' such as Arab and Muslim people and this significantly influences views on multiculturalism. Since September 2001 Muslim people, and those who are perceived to be, have experienced many forms of targeted hostility, such as unfriendliness, jokes in bad taste and name-calling, to the more extreme incidents of harassment and violent attacks (Burnett, 2013). The sensationalised media and political onslaught of the Muslim population following the terrorist attacks in 2001 and

2005 have led to an exaggeration and distortion of Islamic customs, which has culminated in Islam being seen as incompatible with the British way of life (Fekete, 2009; Mythen, *et al.*, 2009). A recent survey found that more than a quarter of 18 to 24 year olds in Britain felt that they did not trust Muslims, 44 per cent believed that Muslims did not share the same values as the rest of society and 28 per cent stated that Britain would be better off with fewer Muslims (Kotecha, 2013). Consequently, an 'Us' and 'Them' dichotomy has been constructed which embellishes the threat that cultural and religious 'difference' poses to 'our culture' and 'our ways' (Fekete, 2009; Mythen, *et al.*, 2009; Allen, 2010: 228; Williamson and Khiabany, 2010).

It is worth briefly noting that children and young people are less likely to be able to differentiate between those who are Muslim and those who are not. Social psychological research into the development of biases suggests that for both children and young people, stereotypes and generalisations 'serve as building blocks for human thought and behavior' (Medin, 1989: 1469) and help us make sense of a complex world. Therefore, young people identify 'visible' categories of difference between 'us' and 'them' in order to deal with the complexity of cultural diversity. It is suggested that young people judge and evaluate an individual or group by identifying differences such as skin colour, food, dress and language. Consequently, a ethnic and religious ignorance due to simplified stereotypes and generalisations could lead to 'Asian' looking individuals encountering the same Othering process. This everyday cultural racism accentuates 'difference' and breeds intolerance, which in turn will have an impact on how young people from different backgrounds encounter and engage with each other in the context of everyday life.

3.3 Everyday Multiculturalism and the Development of Prejudice

Social researchers suggest that prejudice and racism manifest themselves at different levels: individual, interpersonal, intergroup and institutional. Although prejudice is expressed and conveyed at the individual level, the importance of structural contexts and the social identities within which people live out their everyday lives is central to

its development (Augustinos and Reynolds, 2001). Before tailoring the discussion to consider how everyday multiculturalism impacts on targeted hostility, it is necessary to briefly outline how prejudice is defined, and how we develop such views. Allport, one of the most influential writers in the field, defines prejudice (1954:7) as ‘...an aversive or hostile attitude towards a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group’. Central to social psychological definitions is the idea that prejudice is a social orientation directed at whole groups or an individual belonging to a particular group (Brown, 2010). Such definitions emphasise the negative element of both individual and group prejudice. However, it must be acknowledged that prejudice and discrimination can be both negative and positive. As Jacobs and Potter (1998) suggest, prejudice is a ‘complicated, broad and cloudy concept’ (Jacobs and Potter, 1998: 11) and for this reason the terminological debate has not been without issue.

One of the main criticisms with existing social psychological definitions is that they appear to emphasise that prejudiced views are inaccurate or incorrect. For example, ‘ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization’ (Allport, 1954:10); ‘an unjustified negative attitude toward an individual based solely on that individual’s membership in a group’ (Worchel, *et al.*, 1988: 449); ‘without sufficient warrant,’ (Allport, 1954: 7); ‘a failure of rationality’ (Harding, *et al.*, 1969: 6); and ‘irrational, unjust, or intolerant’ (Milner, 1975: 9). These definitions imply that there are certain groups of people who hold prejudiced views which are in some way false or lacking an evidential basis, suggesting that their beliefs and generalisations are unfounded. Such definitions are assuming that they have not had a way to establish or find ‘correctness’ in their opinions. This perspective infers that there are specific individuals or groups such as academics, whose opinions are founded more in reality and/or experience, and therefore are ‘right’. If a truth-value element is added to the definition then it is obscuring and even ignoring the relativistic nature of what is essentially an intergroup perception (Brown, 2010). For certain individuals and groups, their opinions and beliefs may be rational, ‘true’ and correct due to the framework and social context in which they have grown up in or find themselves within now. For example, if ‘ordinary’ young White British people are surrounded by friends, family

and a community who share the same 'prejudiced' views and live within an environment in which they can physically see ethnic 'Others' in positions of power who are markedly more wealthy, then this is their validation and 'truth'.

Cognitive development and social psychological theories have been used to explain how and why children and young people develop and express prejudiced views. The cognitive development theories focus predominantly on category awareness (Brown, 2010). It is impossible for one to hold a prejudiced attitude or act in a discriminative manner without being able to categorise individuals, such as 'male' or 'female'. Therefore, assessing what age children can achieve this categorical distinction is paramount to mapping the development of these concrete assumptions (Aboud, 2005; Bigler and Liben, 2006). Research has found that children as young as three are able to distinguish between two of society's major social categories: gender and ethnicity. There are signs that children have the ability to demonstrate attitudinal and behavioural preferences among these categories (Brown, 2010). It is for this reason that Giles and Hewstone (1986: 1) believe that one of the most disheartening aspects of prejudice is the 'early age at which it rears its ugly head'.

Allport (1954) suggests that there are three social mechanisms for acquiring prejudice: learning, conformity and contact (Allport, 1954). The most prominent factor in children learning societal norms and prejudice is through direct transfer of their parents' words, emotions and stereotypes (ibid, 1954). The social setting and context in which a young person is brought up in is fundamental to the development of prejudiced views. This is especially true if the child is surrounded by unequal relationships of power, insecurity and aggression (Allport, 1954; Aboud, 2005). This latter point could be an important factor in the transference of racially or religiously motivated prejudice within socially and economically disadvantaged families, peer groups and communities. Psychologists and sociologists have used different theoretical perspectives to understand the development of negative stereotypes, prejudices and xenophobia in host communities towards ethnic or religious 'Others'. Although the theories are many, probably the most notable are social identity (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) cultural socialisation (Rosenfield and Stephan, 1981), contact theories

(Pettigrew, 1998) and group threat theory (Hjerm, 2007). All of these theories highlight the individual traits and social contexts and conditions which are conducive to developing, sustaining and reducing prejudice in intergroup contexts.

It has long been acknowledged within social psychology that the group in which we identify with, such as our peer group, can have a negative and confounding impact on prejudiced views, especially in young people. Young people are more likely to be tolerant of racist speech and acts of targeted hostility if a friend expresses that view or acts in that way (Lun, Sinclair, Glenn, and Whitchurch, 2007; Paluck, 2010). The influence of our peers in particular, is said to impact on the affective and behavioural component of prejudice formation. Importantly, the difference between child and adolescent prejudices is the latter's need to form a significant and stable identity within their social environment (Aboud, 2005). Adolescence is a pivotal stage in which our identity begins to form, including the development of norms, values and a sense of belonging (Erikson, 1950). Our peer group membership is central to social development and general feelings of self-worth (Heaven, 1994; Cotterell, 1996). As young people become more aware of the status hierarchy of groups in society and in the micro-contexts of their everyday life, they are better able to understand social relationships and the implications of belonging to one group over another. Young people develop an understanding and awareness of their own and other peoples' social identity, and the associated affective responses when faced with that reality (Turner, 1999 cited in Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011).

Tajfel (1981: 255) explains that social identity is:

... that part of the individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in the social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that group membership.

Social identity theory suggests that prejudice is a consequence of an individual's need to identify as being more positive and superior to other groups (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; 1986). This theory suggests that when social identity is highly important to an individual, others who share that same characteristic have a 'referent informational

influence' on their opinions and actions. Therefore, a person evolves to see themselves as an interchangeable member of the group, rather than an independent individual, becoming highly influenced by group norms and attitudes (Spears, Doosje and Ellemers, 1999 cited in Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011). Social identity is seen to embody the central themes raised in the previous chapter. The strength of peer, familial and community attachment and belonging is dependent on how important maintaining that social identity is to the self (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). As Allport (1954: 42) explains 'hostility toward out-groups helps strengthen our sense of belonging'. Paramount to achieving this is reinforcing that 'in-groups' are positive, distinct and the norm compared to 'out-groups' who are a threat and judged negatively, as seen with both the Muslim population and immigrant communities. The need for both self and group esteem provides a motivation for individuals to evaluate their own group more favorably than they do other groups (Hewstone, Rubin and Willis, 2002). In doing so, the psychological need for a positive self-image is met, the individual's sense of belonging is enhanced, and social cohesion within the in-group is strengthened.

When faced with a potential threat to our identity, highly identified individuals are motivated to protect that identity through increased discrimination (Branscombe and Wann, 1994; Cuhadar and Dayton, 2011). Within many western countries it is assumed that being White in an ethnic and religiously diverse context is a protective and normative factor (Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011). However, research shows that this feeling is dependent on your status within society and your group's numerical presence within a given space. Sachdev and Bourhis (1991) found 'dominant high-status members in society who find themselves in numerical-minority contexts were highly discriminatory toward subordinate low-status, numerical-majority group members' (cited in Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011: 359). Research suggests that when groups of people feel threatened due to being in a minority position, whether this is ethnic or numerical, levels of stereotyping, prejudice and ethnocentrism are likely to increase (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Hogg, 2005; MORI 2005). Kumar *et al.* (2011) found that White adolescents' in-group solidarity increased because they were in a numerical minority position within a multicultural space, resulting in the

development of a salient and central White racial identity. Elsewhere, Breugelmans and Van De Vijver (2004) found that the percentage of immigrants living in a specific district influenced Dutch majority members' attitudes toward multiculturalism. Contrary to what the contact hypothesis would predict, districts with higher levels of immigrants showed more negative attitudes toward multiculturalism (ibid, 2004).

Research supporting social identity theory conveys that levels of intergroup bias in young people tends to increase if the in-group identification is strong, with group norms, emotional attachment and group functioning being consistent throughout all the group members (Verkuyten, 2002; Abrams, Rutland, and Cameron, 2003; Abrams and Rutland, 2008). How a young person feels about themselves and how they believe the external world views them, will affect the strength of their group affiliation and how negatively they perceive out-groups (Fenigstein, 2009). In the Netherlands, as in most European countries, multiculturalism is typically seen as identity threatening for the majority group and identity supporting for minority groups (Van Oudenhoven, Prins and Buunk, 1998). The present study illustrates the complexity of everyday multiculturalism for young White British people who find themselves in a numerical minority position. Social identity theory in particular could help to understand why certain young White British people who lack social and economic capital, develop and express hostility and prejudice towards specific 'out-groups'. Looking in more detail into the everyday politics and geographies of multiculturalism gives meaning and context to how both minority and majority groups negotiate their national and local identity and sense of belonging.

3.4 Understanding Targeted Hostility

So far this chapter has illustrated that although the general public ostensibly recognise multiculturalism as being positive, underlying fears and tensions can hamper the everyday lived reality of engaging with diversity. Often this hostility is directed towards specific 'out-groups' such as immigrant communities and the Muslim population and is motivated by the real or imagined threat that these groups pose to both national and

individual identity, culture and way of living. The following section aims to consider the motivation and causation of targeted hostility, acts which embody the unfamiliarity, fear and hostility towards 'difference'. It is worth stating from the outset that there exists a significant gap within existing literature to explain the causal link between prejudice and acts of targeted hostility. Green *et al.* (2003: 72) suggests that 'It might take the better part of a lifetime to read the prodigious research literature on prejudice ... yet scarcely any of this research examines directly and systematically the questions of why prejudice erupts into violence'. Although there is a lack of evidence as to why prejudice as a psychological phenomenon leads to violent behaviour, this study aims to incorporate literature from the broader criminological field to help explain the motivation behind offending. Within the field of hate studies there is an assumption that prejudice, hostility and the notion of 'difference' are central to why perpetrators select the victim. As the following section illustrates, existing hate crime literature builds upon prevailing economic, social and psychological theories of criminal offending to explain the causal link.

Acts of prejudice directed towards an individual because of their actual or perceived identity are officially defined as hate crimes, and although literature within this field is included within this chapter, the term 'targeted hostility' is used in its place. Scholars within the field itself have debated at length the appropriateness of the term 'hate' because as Chakraborti and Garland (2009: 3) explain:

... 'hate' is a slippery, emotive and conceptually ambiguous label that can mean different things to different people, and this has important implications for the way in which we conceive of the offences that fall under its umbrella framework and the actors involved in a hate crime, whether these be victims, perpetrators or agencies of control.

Elsewhere, Perry (2003: 2) observes that the 'phrase is fraught with dilemmas and difficulties. Laypeople as well as professionals and scholars tend to take it far too literally.' This viewpoint has led to some academics, particularly in North America to re-label this phenomenon as 'bias crime', emphasising the importance of underlying prejudices rather than hatred (Lawrence, 1999; Perry, 2003).

Despite the relatively recent adoption of the concept of hate crime to many western countries, the swift maturation within the field has contributed to the development of more inclusive and comprehensive analytical frameworks and therefore, a growing body of knowledge on a complex and contentious phenomenon. Unfortunately, there exists a paucity of research and knowledge on offending, particularly with regard to what motivates people to commit acts of targeted hostility (Gadd, 2009). This is because the majority of the literature within the field focuses on victimology (Bowling and Philips, 2002: 114) and that which does focus on offending overwhelmingly relies on secondary 'official' sources of data (Sibbitt, 1997; McDevitt, *et al.* 2002; Gadd, 2009). This thesis focuses on why young White British people specifically commit acts of targeted hostility within the context of their everyday life and considers how this behaviour was influenced by their engagement, or lack of, with diversity and 'difference' in mundane social spaces. For this reason, this section considers the existing research within the field which explicitly focuses on hate offenders to frame the intentions of this study.

Levin and McDevitt (1993) developed the first hate crime offender typology based on a review of 168 crime case reports and interviews. Originally Levin and McDevitt proposed a 'three-category hate crime offender typology: offenders who act for the thrill of it, those who perceive themselves as defending their turf, and those offenders who are a mission to 'rid the world of evil'' (McDevitt, Levin, Nolen and Bennett, 2010: 131). After further testing of the hypothesis McDevitt, Levin and Bennett (2002) revised the typology to include 'retaliatory violence'. McDevitt *et al.* (2002) found that the majority of hate crime offenders (66 per cent) were 'set off by a desire for excitement and power' (McDevitt, *et al.*, 2002: 306). Those categorised as 'Thrill Seekers' spoke of feeling bored prior to the incident and wanting to have 'some fun' at 'someone else's expense' (Levin and McDevitt, 1993: 65). This has been supported through other studies such as Byers *et al.* (1999: 84) who found that the majority of the hate crime offending against the Amish community appeared to be motivated by thrill seeking behaviour:

...[perpetrators] travelled the country back roads looking for victims – often while out drinking – cruising for Amish. Once found, the Amish were often targets. These attacks tend to be random and anonymous ... [and the] offending rest largely with the thrill or excitement experienced.

Similarly Franklin's (2000) study exploring homophobic hate crime illustrated that young offenders committed such acts because they were 'fun'. McDevitt *et al.* (2002) categorised the second most common motivation (25%) as 'Defensive' whereby perpetrators committed acts of hate crime in reaction to the perceived threat posed by 'outsiders'. For this category of offenders hate crime is used as a means of protecting their own standard of living and that of their community. This category is supported by Ray and Smith's (2001) study who found that the majority of perpetrators were unemployed and engaged in hate crime as it provided an opportunity to experience empowerment, gratification and superiority (Ray and Smith, 2001; Hemmermen, *et al.*, 2007).

The aforementioned hate crime studies help to construct a picture of hate crime offenders. Such literature suggests that hate crime offenders are more likely than other kinds of offenders to act in small groups (Craig, 2002; McDevitt *et al.*, 2002; Dunbar, 2002). Levin (1993) reported that more than half of all hate crimes involve multiple offenders, whereas only about one quarter of ordinary violent crimes do. The influence of our peer group is thought to be especially important to explaining hate crime motivation and causation for young people. For this reason, it is necessary to consider wider criminological literature on gang activity and youth delinquency. Thrasher (1927), one of the pioneers of gang studies, identified a range of traits which help to understand gang membership and behaviour. For example, Thrasher (1927) observed that gangs were constantly evolving and were characterised by close-knit formations and loyalty, which echoes the principles of social identity theory. Thrasher's (1927) work on gangs had particular ramifications for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds, as he suggested that gang activity is more common in urban settings due to the population density, poor housing and economic inequality.

The role of status frustration and inequality is also integral to Cohen's (1955) work on delinquent youths and gang involvement. Cohen (1955) sees gangs as means whereby young people react or respond to status deprivation and the subsequent frustration they experience. Cohen suggests that young people may turn to delinquency and gang activities to symbolise their anger and hostility at being unable to achieve middle class goals or become successful. Cohen's (1955) work on delinquent young people has been used to illustrate how individuals come together as groups with shared views and cultural values. Both Thrasher's work on gangs and the subcultural theory proposed by Cohen, have been criticised widely for their 'seemingly overly deterministic nature' (cited in Hall, 2013: 113). In response Matza (1964), who was acutely aware of the theoretical weaknesses, noted that most young offenders tend to drift in and out of offending behaviour and to 'grow out of' crime. Matza (1964) observed that criminal offending was often mundane, ordinary and sporadic, which was in contrast to the hedonistic appeal proposed by Cohen (1955). Furthermore, he incorporated his collaborative work with Sykes (1957) to explain how the 'techniques of neutralisation' used by young offenders illustrate that such behavior is not entirely counter-cultural. Sykes and Matza (1957) identified five techniques of neutralisation including denial of injury, denial of responsibility, denial of victim, appeal to higher loyalties and condemnation of the condemners. This theoretical take on offending is illustrated by many of the studies conducted into the motivation and causation of hate crime offenders, particularly that of Sibbit (1997).

Sibbit's (1997) study based within two London Boroughs has been one of the most influential studies conducted on hate crime offending. Sibbit (1997) constructed an age related offender typology and found that children as young as 4 years old were involved in wider patterns of harassment and intimidation, learning such behaviour from parents, older siblings and friends (Sibbit, 1997; Hall and Hayden, 2007). This research also supports the work of Allport on prejudice by conveying how instrumental family and the home environment are in reproducing racist opinions and criminal behaviour (Allport, 1954; Sibbit, 1997). Sibbitt (1997) found that an overwhelming proportion of racist perpetrators had troubled family backgrounds, growing up in an environment where violence was often used as a means of resolution and where

general offending behaviour was the norm (Sibbit, 1997; Ray and Smith, 2001; Dunbar and Crevencoeur, 2005). Sibbit (1997) identified the 'problem family' as experiencing a number of issues including poor health and aggressive tendencies and who often see themselves as persecuted and rejected by wider society.

Sibbit's (1997) study demonstrated that the most problematic age category was 15 to 18 years olds. Typically these individuals had been highly influenced by the views of their family and their friendship group, were engaging in low-level anti-social behaviour and those who had left school found themselves with limited employment opportunities. Wider sociological and criminological literature adds further support to Sibbit's (1997) observations of hate offenders. Sutherland's (1939) theory of differential association indicates the pivotal role that social learning plays in causing youth delinquency. Sutherland (1939) suggests that due to the influence of social learning, a young person is more likely to offend if they have strong associations with the individuals engaging in similar activities, thus supporting Sibbit's (1997) finding that family and friendship groups are integral in the transmission of 'hate' from one generation to the other. As Sibbit (1997) explains, social learning becomes ever more crucial when young people find themselves in marginalised and disadvantaged positions. It is within this milieu that the young people within Sibbit's (1997) study were becoming seduced by far-right ideology and engaging in acts of racially motivated targeted hostility to gain status amongst their peers and secure their place within the group.

Research suggests that perpetrators of racially motivated crimes often perceive the wider community as holding the same prejudices and, by extension, condone acts of targeted hostility (Gadd, *et al.*, 2005; Hemmermen, *et al.*, 2007). Both Bowling (1998) and Hewitt (1996) found that offenders felt that they were acting out community prejudices that had gone unchallenged within these settings. Offenders spoke of feeling a sense of duty to express racist attitudes and engage in acts of targeted hostility on behalf of both the community and the peer-group they belonged to (Hewitt, 1996; Bowling, 1998). Sibbitt (1997: p vii) uses the term 'reciprocal relationship' to describe how 'perpetrators see this as legitimising their actions. In

turn, the wider community not only spawns such perpetrators, but fails to condemn them and actively reinforces their behaviour'. Research within the field illustrates that acts of targeted hostility are rarely viewed by the perpetrator, their friends, family or community as being atypical or exceptional (Sibbitt, 1997; Iganski, 2008).

A continual theme running through much of the research on hate crime offenders is the role that social and economic disadvantage plays in exacerbating underlying prejudices and motivating acts of targeted hostility (Hall, 2013). Both Ray and Smith's (2001) and Gadd and Dixon's (2005) studies found that offenders were overwhelming White British and came from socially and economically deprived and marginalised backgrounds. Racially motivated offenders were often young men who had low levels of educational qualifications, little to no employment experience and had multiple criminal convictions (Sibbitt, 1997; Ray, *et al.*, 2001; Gadd, *et al.*, 2005). The motivation for hate crime offending within these studies has been explained using Merton's (1968) strain theory which suggests that inherent inequalities in income, education and general societal resources can create 'strain' for certain sectors of society. Merton (1968) suggests that there are multiple ways in which people can respond to the feeling of strain, including deviant and criminal behaviour. The perpetrators within both Ray and Smith's (2001) and Gadd and Dixon's (2005) studies belonged to socially and economically disadvantaged communities and perceived minority ethnic communities as a threat. Hjern (2007) suggests that feelings of group threat are exacerbated by certain conditions such as the high visibility of the subordinate groups, geographical segregation limiting everyday contact, an unstable economic climate and finally, heightened political contexts. Elsewhere Valentine (2010) found that young marginalised White British heterosexual men reported feeling the least socially integrated and often justified their intolerance towards 'difference' through economic and cultural terms, which was found to be hard to counter within the current socio-economic climate. Multiple studies convey that racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility is most likely to take place in areas where the community perceived a territorial threat to the White 'hinterland' (Hewitt, 1996; Ray and Smith, 2001). Often hate crime offenders see themselves as being the 'real victims' of a society which has excluded, belittled and marginalised them.

When a community experiences multiple forms of inequality and feels marginalised from mainstream society, the self-prescribed identity, which serves to make them feel 'different', is strengthened (Anderson, 1994; Trahan, 2011). As theorised in the previous chapter, in order to compensate for the emotions which come from feeling socially excluded and despondent, young people form close attachments and develop a strong sense of belonging to their friends, family and their immediate community. Embodying Putman's (1994) concept of 'bonding' social capital, 'local nomadism' and territorial behaviour can develop in which disadvantaged and marginalised young people rarely engage with people who are not in their immediate social circle or venture out of the confines of their local area. Territoriality is a 'symbolic process of magically appropriating, owning and controlling the material environment in which you live, but in real, economic terms is owned and controlled by 'outsiders'' (Robins and Cohen, 1978: 73). Territoriality and belonging are seen as important resources for young disadvantaged men in particular, as it provides them with a 'solution' to their position at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy (Pickering, Kintrea and Bannister, 2012). Locality can generate a geography of inclusion around which residents can construct a sense of pride, cultural identity and belonging (see Parker, 1974; Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004). However, the neighbourhood can also be a constraining force limiting the opportunities for economic and cultural capital and social mobility, compounding and reproducing feelings of exclusion and exacerbating the perceived difference of ethnic and religious 'Others'.

Perry's (2001) theory of 'doing difference' is regarded as one of the most comprehensive theories used to explain hate crime motivation. Perry (2001) offers a structural perspective to explain how western societies have institutionalised and legitimised prejudice and oppression through state policies and practices throughout history (Perry, 2001). This process was central to the development of a hierarchy within society which places those who are white, male and heterosexual at the top and therefore, prioritises their rights to power and status (Perry, 2001). When lower status members threaten the mythical norm or hierarchy, verbal and physical abuse can be used in an attempt to quash the threat, and consequently ensure that the hierarchy

within society continues (Perry, 2001: 3). For Perry (2001) harassment, intimidation and violence do not occur within a vacuum; rather, acts of hate crime should be recognised as historically and socially contingent and regarded as an extension of the Othering process present within contemporary society. In 'doing difference' hate crimes are seen as acts which reinforce the 'superior' and 'inferior' positions of the perpetrator and the victim, and send a message to the community to which the victim is perceived to represent that they are different and do not belong. Perry's theory acknowledges the intersections between identity, social status and perceived entitlement and the need to emphasise 'difference' and inferiority so as to reinforce that the perpetrator and the group they belong to, are superior, echoing the principles of social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; 1986).

Perry's definition although comprehensive, raises questions about its applicability to young people and their motivations for committing racist and religiously motivated targeted hostility. Perry's (2001) theory has received various criticisms, primarily because the majority of racist perpetrators are from a disadvantaged socio-economic background and therefore do not hold an empowered position within the societal hierarchy to come under threat. However, a perpetrator's motive is more complex than might be assumed because it is relative to that individual (Perry, 2001). Thus, although racist perpetrators may occupy a low status position on a hierarchy based on class, due to the traditional notions of whiteness and supremacy, they may perceive themselves to be at the top of a hierarchy based on race (Perry, 2001). This notion was discussed in the previous chapter with reference to the intersectionality approach whereby aspects of an individual's identity become more significant in comparison to others depending on their situation.

The literature used within this section, which explains hate crime perpetration as the result of either thrill seeking behaviour, economic strain or the desire to maintain power, appears too simplistic (Hall, 2013). In response to this limitation, Walters (2011: 314) attempted to 'examine the intersections' between the various individual, economic and structural theories to provide a more holistic and sophisticated approach to understanding hate motivated offending. Walters (2011) attempted to

understand hate crime motivation by synthesising Merton's strain theory with Perry's structural perspective to explain the macro context to which acts of targeted hostility take place. Within this perspective it is the fear that groups of 'Others' will encroach upon the 'native' inhabitants culture and socio-economic opportunities that aggravates underlying prejudices (Hall, 2013). Although together these theories explain the macro context which can give rise to prejudiced views and feelings of hostility, the theory developed so far still fails to adequately explain why certain individuals act upon the socio-economic and structural strain, whilst others do not (Walters, 2011). To overcome this theoretical weakness Walters (2011) incorporated self-control theory. For Walters (2011) the inclusion of self-control bridges the gap between macro-level contexts and micro-level offending behaviour. Although this theoretical approach is regarded as moving the field forward in providing a more comprehensive explanation for hate crime offending, it still lacks a more explicit recognition of the situational dynamics and social contexts which cause socio-economic and structural strain to manifest into expressions and acts of racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility.

3.5 Exploring 'Everyday' Acts of Targeted Hostility with Young People

The previous section provided a brief overview of the existing literature focusing on perpetration within the field of hate crime. Although there has been a significant maturation within the area, there still exists a paucity of research into offending specifically. This present section aims to highlight how this study proposes to explore the existing fault lines in hate crime research. What becomes apparent from the analysis of existing hate crime research is the rare inclusion of young people. Although Sibbitt's (1997) research creates an age related typology, it is one of the few studies to actively and explicitly engage with young people, despite statistics showing that the majority of hate crime is committed by 16 to 24 year olds (Home Office, 2013). This chapter specifically has outlined a range of studies which illustrate that young people are more likely to express higher levels of xenophobic attitudes than older generations; that young people express high levels fear and ignorance towards diversity and multiculturalism more generally; and that young people are particularly

hostile towards specific groups of 'Others' such as immigrant communities and Muslims (Ipsos MORI, 2005; Pagani and Robustelli, 2010; Bartlett, Birdwell and Littler, 2011).

Even in broader academic fields such as multicultural studies, there has been a tendency for research to focus on microcosms and subcultures of extreme racist youth, rather than 'ordinary' young people. As already mentioned within this chapter, young people are most likely to occupy the micro-geographies in which diversity and 'difference' comes together. The lack of research on young people and their views and everyday experiences with 'difference' and targeted hostility, could be motivated by the perception that young people are more tolerant than previous generations, and that this form of behaviour is limited to adults. However, a denial of the prejudices that young people hold and how this impacts on negotiating multiculturalism obscures the very real fears and tensions that exist in the context of everyday life. For this reason, this study aims to focus solely on young people and address the complex and contentious issues of multiculturalism, everyday racism and targeted hostility.

The second area this study seeks to explore is the 'ordinary', everyday nature of targeted hostility. One of the central contentions for distancing the field of hate crime from the term 'hate' is the powerful connotations such an emotive phrase has on how we perceive the nature of such incidents and the people who commit these acts. There has been a growing recognition by scholars of the 'routine' (Chahal and Julienne, 1999: vi), 'ordinary' and 'unspectacular' nature of many incidents of hate crime (Iganski, 2008; Walters and Hoyle, 2012). By extension, research illustrates that the majority of hate crimes are committed not by 'hardened race haters' (Gadd, *et al.*, 2005: 9), supremacists or far-right extremists but rather, 'people like us' in the context of their everyday life (Iganski, 2008: 42). As Jacobs and Potter (1998) explain:

... the majority of hate crimes are not organised by hate groups but by teenagers, especially white males [on the basis of] underlying prejudices which on occasion spill over into criminal conduct.

(cited in Ray and Smith, 2001: 221)

Iganski (2008: 20) suggests that we need to recognise 'the day-to-day reality of how bigotry manifests in the lives of offenders and their victims'. Iganski's (2008) empirical research which focused on the lived reality of victimisation, demonstrated how important situational dynamics and social circumstances are in the commission of hate crime. Focusing on hate crimes committed within the city context, Iganski (2008) illustrated how micro-urban geographies can produce numerous opportunities for ordinary people to commit 'everyday' acts of targeted hostility.

In recognition of the 'unspectacular' nature of many forms of hate crime victimisation, academics within the field are calling for the notion of 'difference' to become a key feature in explaining what motivates ordinary people to engage in incidents of targeted hostility (Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). The adoption of this framework highlights that people become victims of targeted hostility, not because of a singular aspect of their identity such as ethnicity or religion, but rather because they stand out as being 'different' through language, dress or culture or are seen as being especially vulnerable within certain social contexts (ibid, 2012). For example, in the case of Fiona Pilkington and Francesca Hardwich, who were subjected to a decade of bullying and harassment by local young people, they were viewed as being 'easy targets' because of their learning difficulties and visible 'differences', making them especially vulnerable to victimisation (Garland, 2012). As Chakraborti and Garland (2012: 501) suggest, 'vulnerability is exacerbated through social conditions, prevailing norms and people's reactions to 'difference''. Both the concepts of 'difference' and vulnerability emphasise the importance of social context, social actors and give greater recognition of the dynamic and fluid nature of targeted hostility (Bowling, 1993; Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). Perry (2003: 5) argues that hate crime scholars:

...must define hate crime in such a way as to give the term "life" and meaning, in other words, as a socially situated, dynamic process involving context and actors, structure and agency ... This allows us to acknowledge that bias motivated violence is not "abnormal" or "anomalous" in many Western cultures, but is rather a natural extension of the racism, sexism and homophobia that normally allocates privilege along racial and gender lines.

A central contention of this study is that to understand the end product of committing an act of targeted hostility, you have to first begin with getting to know the individual, their circumstances and their opinions on the world in which they live in. It is through analysing everyday interactions and local relationships, and accounting for the context a young person comes from and their notions of identity and belonging, that starts to reveal the complexity of inter-ethnic tensions and ultimately the motivation of targeted hostility. This study aimed to contribute knowledge on the motivation and causation of acts of targeted hostility which arise within the context of everyday life and take a variety of forms including social incivility such as name-calling and jokes in bad taste to the more extreme occurrences of harassment and violence. By exploring the opinions and experiences of young White British people who live in the multicultural city of Leicester, it could provide a more empirically rooted explanation to the development and proliferation of prejudice which spills over into acts of targeted hostility. Using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as the central feature to this research engages 'more closely with lived experience and the changing cultural and material geographies of young lives' (Navak, 2003: 178)

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has built upon the previous one by introducing research exploring how 'ordinary' people view multiculturalism, diversity and 'difference'. Research demonstrates that although the majority of the general public perceive multiculturalism as being positive for the country as a whole, there are very real fears and tensions which undermine the lived reality. Specifically, this chapter considered how the increase in overt hostility and the public demonisation towards certain 'out-groups' such as immigrant communities and the Muslim population, could explain the increase in xenophobic views amongst young people. In particular this chapter focused on the concept of 'difference' and how the Othering process, evident in modern society, has contributed to cultural differences being exaggerated and consequently, seen as incompatible with the British way of life. Social identity theory was introduced in order to understand the development and motivation for prejudiced attitudes. This

theory specifically is regarded as highly relevant in explaining why young White British people who lack a stable identity, sense of belonging and recognition may denigrate and dehumanise particular out-groups.

The second part of this chapter focused on what motivates and causes underlying prejudices to spill over into acts of targeted hostility. Such incidents are officially defined as 'hate crimes' and this chapter provided an overview of the literature within the field. There exists a limited amount of research focusing explicitly on hate crime perpetrators and this is even more evident when it comes to young offenders. Scholars within the field are calling for greater recognition of both the 'banal' and 'routine' nature of hate crime, and also by extension the 'ordinariness' of hate crime offenders. This chapter concluded by highlighting two main gaps within existing research: first, studies focusing explicitly on young people; and second, the use of a more comprehensive analytical framework which connects more closely to the everyday lives of real people. This study sought to develop knowledge which addresses these existing gaps by exploring how living everyday multiculturalism and the immediate situational context can diminish, generate and exacerbate underlying prejudices and manifest into acts of targeted hostility. A more detailed analysis of these 'lived environments' (and how such experiences can aggravate underlying tensions), could provide a more comprehensive and empirically rooted understanding of everyday racism and targeted hostility.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The literature review aimed to contextualise this study by demonstrating how the concept of everyday multiculturalism could offer a more empirically rooted understanding of how young people interpret and engage with diversity and 'difference'. In order to explore the complex themes of multiculturalism, everyday racism and targeted hostility, it has been essential to develop a reliable, inclusive and sensitive methodological approach. This chapter provides an in-depth explanation of the methodology used within this study. The chapter begins by detailing the use of a grounded theory framework and offers a brief overview of how the grounded theory philosophy emerged, its original form and finally, the two more 'contemporary' modifications of the methodology. This discussion provides both the historical context and main principles of grounded theory in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach to the current research.

One of the strengths of using an exploratory and flexible framework is that it allows the researcher to regularly reflect and adapt their approach whilst in the field. This chapter traces the progression of the methodology by firstly illustrating why an ethnographic strategy was viewed as being the most appropriate and effective approach to explore views on multiculturalism and involvement in targeted hostility. I spent three months with a subgroup of young White British, socially and economically disadvantaged young people in Leicester and within this time extensive field notes detailing observations and discussions with the subgroup were taken. As grounded theory studies rely on a cyclic process of data collection and analysis, this first stage was used to inform the next phase of data collection. The ethnographic strategy facilitated an in-depth understanding of the participants' life histories, their views and experiences of engaging with diversity and 'difference' in Leicester and their

involvement in targeted hostility. However, to specifically explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism in greater depth, the next phase of data collection needed to involve a larger sample of White British people from Leicester and Leicestershire. In total 425 questionnaires were collected from self-defining White British people who were between the ages of 14 and 19 years old. This chapter details and justifies the methodological decisions, whilst being transparent about the potential flaws.

It is worth stating from the outset that auto-ethnography was a central source of data throughout this research process. Writing reflectively and documenting my personal experiences, emotions and observations helped me deal with the challenging and complex situations that arose. Conducting research on multiculturalism has always been an inherently personal and emotive topic for me. As expected, the difficult nature of this research produced multiple barriers and challenges within the data collection process. This chapter aims to infuse a 'human side' to the methodology by discussing the importance of reflexivity and drawing on auto-ethnographic memos and field notes which were kept throughout the research process. The concept of everyday multiculturalism, everyday racism and targeted hostility have yet to be explored through employing a grounded theory framework which uses a mixed methods approach to enable young people to express their own opinions and reflect on their own experiences. Evaluating the effectiveness of this methodology which is empirically rooted in young peoples' lives, could inform the findings on how best to develop programmes to address the challenges posed by prejudice, everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility.

4.2 Using a Grounded Theory Framework

Typically, grounded theory research begins with outlining either a field of study, a phenomenon or specific research questions. The previous chapters of this thesis illustrated that the research focus for this study concerns young White British people, and aims to explore their opinions and experiences of everyday multiculturalism and

targeted hostility. Three research aims were generated to investigate the themes discussed in the previous two chapters:

- 1) To use the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explore how young White British people living in Leicester interpret, manage and engage with diversity and 'difference'.
- 2) To explore the extent to which the concept of everyday multiculturalism helps to understand what motivates and causes young White British people to commit acts of targeted hostility.
- 3) To use the research findings to consider what research, theory and policy developments could help to address the challenges posed by prejudice, everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility.

Qualitative research has established itself as a holistic approach to achieving an in-depth understanding of the lived experience of those being studied (Creswell, 1994; Lamont and White, 2005). Employing a qualitative methodology is seen as being appropriate for exploratory studies into participants' opinions, feelings and life experiences (Lamont and White, 2005; Williams, 2011). This thesis has provided two 'literature' chapters in order to introduce the central themes of age, social status, ethnicity and identity, and analysed these concepts in relation to everyday multiculturalism and prejudice. This has illustrated how fixed, abstract understandings of multiculturalism fail to account for the lived reality of ethnic and religious diversity, and therefore ignores the challenges and complexities facing young people in forming a stable identity and sense of belonging in young people. The present study wishes to go further than simply identifying the weaknesses or limitations of existing policy and research into this phenomenon, and to instead explore these themes with young people living multiculturalism as a reality. The broad question of how young people live together is taken further to investigate how gaining these experiences could provide insight into the phenomenon of targeted hostility, whereby people act upon their underlying prejudice and intolerance. Employing a qualitative methodology enabled this research to explore the 'everyday' experiences within a multicultural microcosm in Leicester. A qualitative approach facilitated a greater understanding of the group dynamics, social norms and values in a specific group of young White British socially and economically disadvantaged people, and the cultural and social context in which they live (Lamont and White, 2005; Noaks and Wincup, 2004). As Kirk and Miller

(1986: 12) state '... qualitative research involves sustained interaction with the people being studied in their own language, and on their own turf.' Developing a grounded theory framework provided the most effective qualitative approach to explore everyday multiculturalism and expressions and enactments of racist and religiously motivated prejudice. What follows is a brief discussion on how the grounded theory philosophy emerged, its original form and finally, two more 'contemporary' modifications of the methodology.

When trying to understand the motivation for developing grounded theory and its underpinning philosophy, it is best to consider the historical context in which the methodology emerged. There are said to be two factors which motivated Glaser and Strauss (1967) to develop grounded theory in its original form. Firstly, researchers at the time were frustrated that quantitative methodologies dominated social science research, so much so that studies failing to follow the tradition of testing deductive, grand theories were seen as unscientific (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). McCracken (1988:14) argues that this 'winter of positivism' led to qualitative research being labelled as 'impressionistic, anecdotal, unsystematic and biased' (cited in Charmaz, 2006: 5). Secondly, there was a growing outcry from qualitative researchers for systematic guidelines to provide methodological clarity and research rigour (Dunne, 2011). Glaser and Strauss sought to challenge the prevailing epistemic justification in social science research by demonstrating that generating theories rooted in experiences of the 'real world' could be as scientific as theories based on *priori* knowledge. Dey (2004: 82) suggests that grounded theory was an attempt to 'liberate theory from the seductive comforts of the armchair and empirical research from the uninspiring and restrictive confines of analysing variable or verifying hypothesis'. In the simplest of descriptions grounded theory is 'the discovery of theory from data' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967: 1). By combining the principles of quantitative research such as logic, rigour and systematic analysis, with the depth and richness of raw qualitative data, Glaser and Strauss sought to bridge 'the embarrassing gap between theory and empirical research' (1967: viii). Since the creation of grounded theory, it has been subject to multiple definitions and interpretations, resulting in the ideological split of Glaser and Strauss and an ensuing confusion amongst practitioners and researchers.

The section outlines the differing ontological foundations to emerge from three strains of grounded theory. These fractures differ in principles, design and practicalities and therefore, can be confusing for researchers interested in using a grounded theory framework (Hunter, Murphy, Grealish, Casey and Keady, 2011). The three versions which were of interest to this study were:

1. Classic Grounded Theory
2. Straussian Grounded Theory
3. Constructivist Grounded Theory

Highlighting the core principles and the subsequent pitfalls of each strain of grounded theory facilitates the justification for using the specified methodology to frame this research. Classic Grounded Theory is the label given to the original methodology developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The inherent principle of this early theoretical framework was that theory and theory development are rooted in empirical data and acts of everyday social life (Covan, 2007; Stern, 2009). Glaser and Strauss proposed that researchers must strive to interact with the focus population and analyse and interpret their social world in order to understand intrinsic processes (cited in Hunter, *et al.* 2011). Data collection within Classic Grounded Theory relies on interviews, transcribing text, and detailing, storing and referring to memos. Glaser and Strauss (1967: 29-30) noted that ‘discovery gives us a theory that “fits or works” in a substantive or formal area ... since the theory has been derived from data, not deduced from logical assumptions’. Following the principles and design of Classic Grounded Theory gives the researcher a systematic approach to theory generation that is grounded in rigorous data collection. However, what is lacking within this original methodological approach is a detailed and illustrative account of how to turn this philosophy into research practice.

The first ‘fracture’ to come from the Classic Grounded Theory has become known as the Straussian Grounded Theory. Strauss opted for a modified version of grounded theory due to the multiple ways in which the original methodology was being

implemented. Importantly the two strains of grounded theory differ markedly on the researcher's role, activity and level of interaction with research participants (Walker and Myrick, 2006). For this study this distinction was very important, as the way in which I interacted with the research participants and the way in which they perceived me, would be pivotal to acquiring rich, valuable data. In addition, embarking on such a large-scale study where the onus is on the researcher to analyse and interpret micro-level interactions prompted the need for more structured and detailed guidance on how to follow a grounded theory methodology, which Straussian Grounded Theory delivers. Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) provided instruction to researchers on how to systematically structure data collection and analysis. In contrast to Classic Grounded Theory, Strauss and Corbin (1998) emphasise the importance of the researcher's professional and personal experience and how this should be drawn upon in order to engage with the study's participants. Additionally, Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) recognise the role in which an initial literature review can provide in the research process, which is the antithesis of the 'open', literature free approach in Classic Grounded Theory.

One of the flaws in both Classic and Straussian versions of grounded theory is that the methodologies are 'ontologically and epistemologically misguided' (Birks and Mills, 2011). This philosophical absence in the first generation of grounded theory methodology paved the way for contemporary theorists to develop and integrate such principles within their versions. It is from this second generation of grounded theorists that a final, noteworthy strain of methodology emerged. Charmaz (2006) developed the Constructivist Grounded Theory, which emphasises again the importance of the researcher's role, but more specifically the collaborative work between the researcher and the participants. Constructivism assumes that there are multiple social realities simultaneously and denies the existence of an objective reality (Mills, Bonner and Francis, 2006). This epistemological view point was a central driving force in not only choosing a grounded theory methodology but also, deciding on how to employ it too. This research embeds the principle that the 'only through listening and hearing what children say and paying attention to the ways in which they communicate with us will progress be made towards conducting research with, rather than simply on, children'

(Christensen and James, 2000: 7). Charmaz (2006) urges the researcher to develop in-depth relationships with research participants, in contrast to the traditionally objective standpoint. By ensuring reciprocity between the researcher and the study's participants, a theory is generated which is rooted in both parties' experiences (Mills, Bonner and Francis, 2006). One of the developments in the Constructivist Grounded Theory from the first generation of methodologies is bringing attention to the need to address power imbalances between both the researcher and the participants (Charmaz, 2000: 2006). This notion is central to developing an inclusive and sensitive methodology in which young people feel comfortable and trusting enough to share their views and experiences on multiculturalism and targeted hostility.

One of the main reasons for the evolution of Classic Grounded Theory methodology was the need to aspire to the reliability and validity that can be achieved in quantitative research. Both the Constructivist and Classic Grounded Theories fail to provide clear steps to guide the researcher through applying the core principles practically in a study, especially in terms of data collection and analysis. In particular, it could pose significant ethical issues when trying to engage in an 'equal partnership' with young people who could be considered vulnerable, without clear guidance on how to collect the data and analyse it reliably. What became increasingly clear, after consulting the abundance of material on grounded theory and all its variations, is that adhering to a dichotomous position of either one strain or the other restricts a researcher's flexibility and autonomy. It is therefore necessary for the researcher to use their own experience and influence to implement a grounded theory approach which is in tune with the researcher's philosophies, objectives and ethical considerations. For the reasons outlined above, this study combined the principles and guidance from both Straussian and Constructivist Grounded Theory and aimed to apply them in a flexible, tailored approach to studying everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility. One of the core ontological principles underpinning this study was constructivist epistemology; understanding the influence a researcher can have on the study, particularly when it involves participants who are young people, was very important. By taking an active involvement in the research process and documenting auto-ethnographic feelings and experiences, this study strove to achieve rich,

empirically rooted data through collaborative engagement with the participants. By beginning the research process with an acknowledged inclusion and active participation, the researcher tends to be more alert and focused on emerging dynamics and micro interactions between the research participants and outside influences (Birks and Mills, 2011).

Grounded theory, and qualitative approaches more generally, have been criticised for many reasons (Jones and Alony, 2011). Qualitative techniques although integral to studying micro-phenomenon and contexts, are renowned for being time-consuming. Although the participant sample tends to be few in numbers, the need for detailed data collection and analysis consequently means employing a qualitative approach is labour intensive. A further area in which qualitative research is often criticised is the lack of generalisability from the research sample to the wider population. This lack of reproducibility, although an initial concern, became overshadowed by the potential for this research framework to explore a phenomenon occurring naturally within a subgroup in a multicultural city. It also provided an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of this design to understand everyday multiculturalism and the motivation for acts of targeted hostility. Focusing specifically on grounded theory, critics often argue that when this method is used within a PhD study it often fails to generate a substantial theory (Jones and Alony, 2011). Glaser (1978) stated that research limited by time, resources or experience could result in the data collection and analysis failing to yield the level of insight required to develop a significant theory. For this reason, it is advantageous to openly address this criticism with the present study. This research although based on the underlying philosophy of theory generation, recognises that this is a long-term goal, and therefore aims to use this study as the platform to begin collecting and analysing data in the process of developing a more substantial theory. It is through acknowledging the limited resources and time, that this research is based on the realistic aim of generating insightful, valuable and rich knowledge to contribute to the existing body of academic research.

4.3 The Sample

After identifying the central themes for exploration, it was necessary to consider from whom and how the data should be collected. This study follows the Straussian principle of selective sampling so as to identify the study's target population prior to collecting any data (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973; Draucker, Martsof, Ross and Rusk, 2007). Schatzman and Strauss (1973) explain that by using selective sampling researchers are able to take a more active role in choosing their target population which is often based on an informed decision from their experience, problem area and possible restrictions. Selective sampling within this study was seen as sequential and aimed at phenomenological variation which would then proceed to theoretical sampling (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973; Birks and Mills, 2011).

As Strauss and Corbin (1987) stress, it is important for researchers if they plan to draw upon their personal or professional experience, to reflect on this process so as to bring to the forefront all potential biases. The use of past work experience is common practice within grounded theory research such as Glaser and Strauss' (1967) work with doctors, nurses, social workers and patients, and the same with Nathaniel (2007) with nurses who were in direct contact with patients. By taking a more active role in the sample selection, I used my own experience and informed decisions in order to gain access to a subgroup of young White British, socially and economically disadvantaged people whom were known to engage in acts of targeted hostility. Often young people who are from a socially and economically deprived background and who engage in anti-social behaviour are considered 'hard to reach', with gatekeepers often preventing access to those who are perceived as 'problematic' and/or vulnerable. In line with previous grounded theory studies, I used my experience of working for the Youth Offending Service which involved being dispatched into areas with high levels of anti-social behaviour, to consider the different groups and communities I had come into contact with. I had been working within many different areas on the periphery of the city, which were regarded as being socially and economically disadvantaged, and had high levels of antisocial behaviour being committed by young White British people.

Classical Grounded Theory promotes the concept of 'theoretical saturation', which occurs when there is no possibility of new ideas or theories to emerge on a substantive phenomenon. This was an unachievable principle within this study, and as much extant literature suggests, it is important to consider and recognise such issues as accessibility, time and resources and how this can impact on a study (Babbie, 2008; Flick, 2009). For this reason a more constrained, purposive sampling strategy was devised to avoid iteration and recognise resource limitations. It became apparent that selecting a micro-group of the target population was a necessity to reaping the benefits of a grounded theory framework. This potential group of young people needed to possess the important characteristics of the target population such as being White British, both male and female, between the ages of 14 and 19 years old, from a disadvantaged economic background and known to engage in anti-social behaviour. It was with this subgroup of young people that considerable time could be spent observing and interviewing to explore their opinions and experiences of ethnic and religious diversity, and their motivation for committing acts of targeted hostility. Using my past experience, staying focused to the research area and being open and aware of the possible restrictions of the sample, enabled me to make informed decisions on selective sampling (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973).

As stated previously in the chapter, in order to gain access to this initial subgroup of young people, I used my position within the Youth Offending Service to approach the gate-keeper and discuss the aims and intentions of the research. The gatekeeper was very enthusiastic but also had ethical concerns about the research topic (a more detailed discussion on these issues is provided later on in this chapter). After these initial issues were addressed, the gatekeeper granted me permission to approach young people within the areas in which I had already been working. Reflecting on this process, it was evident that being known to the Youth Offending Service, demonstrating my knowledge on the topic, and being open and honest about the research intentions, influenced the positive outcome. Without this prior relationship there would have been a range of barriers which may have prevented me from gaining access to a subgroup of young people. After much deliberation I chose a group of

young people who I had been working with in the borough of Charnwood. The area specifically is on the periphery of the city and touches the border of a highly populated minority ethnic area. The site location will be discussed in detail within the next section. In order to form a core group of young people that I could develop good relations with, observe and who were happy to be interviewed, it was necessary to use existing contacts within the research location. I selectively approached young people whom I had worked with before and thus already had a good foundation to work on. Almost immediately the contact with young people within the area began to snowball. Key to achieving effective participation was engaging core members of a friendship group, who were trusted and valued, to encourage others to become involved in the research. In total, the subgroup consisted of 15 White British young people, between the ages of 14 and 19 years old, with four females and 11 males (further detail on the subgroup is provided within the next chapter).

4.3.1 Leicester: A Multicultural Utopia?

Leicester is widely predicted, within the next five years, to become the first city in Europe with a majority non-white population. Nowhere else in Britain has proportionally fewer White British residents.

(cited in Simpson and Finney, 2007: 1)

The people of Leicester are a beacon for diversity and tolerance.

(People United, 2013: n.p.)

From the outset Leicester was the chosen site to conduct this research. Leicester provides a unique social environment, due to its diverse and multicultural population (Roberts-Thomson, Clarke, Coulter, and Robertson, 2008; BBC News, 2012). As the quotes above suggest, Leicester is widely known as being a multi-ethnic, faith and cultural city. Bonney (2001: n.p.) notes that 'there is greater diversity in two or three square blocks here than anywhere I can think of in Europe' (cited in Bonney and Le Goff, 2007: 4). This section illustrates why Leicester is an opportune research location to explore the lived reality of everyday multiculturalism, particularly with the city being

regarded internationally as a successful model of social and cultural cohesion. Bonney and Le Goff (2007: 4) observe that Leicester is a unique city in the way it prides itself on its acceptance of a multicultural population, and even promotes the benefits that diversity brings to the city. Even the community cohesion report produced in the wake of the riots in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham in 2001, noted that Leicester had developed with the growth of people coming to the city:

Unlike many towns and cities elsewhere, diversity in Leicester is widely recognised as a positive asset and a defining characteristic of the City. Leicester has a strong reputation for promoting positive community relations through people of different cultures and faiths coming together with local government and other key agencies to address key problems.

(cited in Bonney and Le Goff, 2007: 4)

Population records suggest that it was in the nineteenth century when Irish and Eastern European Jewish people, regarded as being the first wave of migration to the city, settled in Leicester (Simpson, 2007). However, it was not until after World War II and the subsequent labour shortages which required an influx of workers, that notable levels of immigrants began to arrive in Leicester. The largest populations to arrive to Leicester in the 60s and 70s, which is referred to as being unpopular and unplanned, were from the African and Asian subcontinents (Willmott, 2003). This is said to have contributed to Leicester having the largest Indian population in the whole of Britain (Institute of Public Care, 2009; ONS, 2012a). Although immigration from these countries steadily continued, one of the most marked changes in Leicester's population began at the turn of the 21st century. Since the 2001 census, local estimates suggest that one of the largest population immigrations has been Dutch-Somalis. Estimates collected from community leaders suggest that population figures of the Somali population are around 13,000 to 15,000, equating to five per cent of Leicester's total population, with Trevor Phillips suggesting that this happened within one year (Commission for Racial Equality, 2006). Reports suggest that Leicester also experienced some of the highest waves of migration from Poland, Iraq, Afghanistan, Zimbabwe, Kosovo and Iran (Leicester City Council and Leicester Partnership, 2007;

Leicester City Council, 2008; Leicester Mercury, 2012). One of the reasons for the surge in Leicester's diverse population has been the accession of Eastern European countries into the EU from 2004 which further increased immigration from Slovakia, Portugal, Vietnam, Montserrat, Bosnia and Turkey (IDeA, 2003).

Using the most recent Census statistics, it is estimated that of Leicester city's 330,000 inhabitants just over a third of the population define themselves as being Christian, much lower than the 59 per cent average for the rest of the country; 19 per cent identified as being Muslim substantially higher than the five per cent nationally which makes the city the 11th highest population percentage of Muslims; 15 per cent of Leicester's inhabitants stated that they were Hindu compared to two per cent nationally, equating to the city having the third highest population percentage of Hindus in England; and finally, four per cent of the city's inhabitants identified as Sikh, compared to one per cent nationally (ONS, 2012b; Leicester Mercury, 2012). Smaller, more marginal faiths including Buddhism, Jainism, Judaism and Evangelism are also represented in Leicester:

Religion	Percentage for Leicester	Percentage for England
Buddhists	0.4%	0.5%
Christian	32.4%	59.4%
Hindu	15.2%	1.5%
Jewish	0.1%	0.5%
Muslim	18.6%	5.0%
Sikh	4.4%	0.8%
Other religions	0.6%	0.4%

Source: 2011 Census Data from the Office of National Statistics.

The last 50 years of continued immigration to the city has contributed to Leicester being one of the most ethnically, religiously and culturally diverse places in the world.

Projection rates have been used by the BNP who state on their website that the 'native British people' will become an ethnic minority in sixty years whilst Migration Watch (2007) claim that White British people will become a minority in Leicester,

Birmingham, Bradford and Oldham 'by 2016' (cited in Simpson and Finney, 2007). Such highly emotive and sensitive claims had been refuted by academic research which instead uses population projections to suggest that by 2016 Birmingham will still have a White British population of 56 per cent (Simpson, 2007) and Oldham and Bradford at 77 per cent (Simpson and Gavalas, 2006). However, the most recent Census statistics showed that in fact the city of Leicester has become the first plural city which means that no one ethnic group forms the majority of the population (Simpson and Finney, 2007). The Census also demonstrates the considerable difference in the ethnic composition within the city where the White British population makes up 45 per cent, compared to the county where White British people comprise 89 per cent of the population (Leicester Mercury, 2012). Leicester provides a fertile research location site as Simpson (2007) suggests that multi-ethnic cities and particularly the issue of plural city status are contentious issues. Simpson and Finney (2007: 2) argue that the preoccupation with which cities and what year they will achieve a plural status, is a 'crude expression of fear'.

The considerable ethnic, religious and cultural diversity within Leicester has transformed the geographical landscape of the city. Bonney and Le Goff (2007) comment that the visual landscape of Leicester truly demonstrates its multicultural population with places of worship being prominent features within the city, and increasingly, within the county:

In the 40 years since, Leicester has become the poster city for multicultural Britain, a place where the stunning number and size of the minorities – the 55 mosques, 18 Hindu temples, nine Sikh gurdwaras, two synagogues, two Buddhist centres and one Jain centre – are seen not as a recipe for conflict or a millstone around the city's neck, but a badge of honour.

(Popham, 2013: n.p.)

It is suggested that although Leicester should be praised for its management of diversity, it has tended to separate communities geographically on the basis of their ethnicity. Evidence suggests that new immigrants seek at first to share the same cultural space as their peer group for natural reasons of cultural affinity and security,

as demonstrated with the most recent arrivals of Somalis (Bonney and LeGoff, 2007). Although the geography of urban Leicester provides a more realistic picture of its multicultural nature, it is divided into distinct locales for different ethnic groups. One could easily identify micro-spaces that are associated with a specific community such as Somalian, Indian, Eastern European and White British. Although Leicester has never experienced significant racially or religiously-motivated disturbances, it could arguably be 'sleepwalking' its 'way to segregation' (CRE, 2005), with it being the tenth most segregated city in Britain (State of the English Cities Report, 2005, as cited in Leicester City Council, 2008). All of these factors make Leicester a unique environment to explore how 'ordinary' young White British people interpret, encounter and negotiate ethnic and religious diversity in the mundane social spaces of everyday life.

There have been several surveys commissioned on social cohesion and the sense of belonging in Leicester which are worth noting. One in particular is the Community Cohesion Assessment Instrument, which was developed by Leicester City Council and the Centre for Social Action at De Montfort University, to explore the nature of community cohesion in selected areas of Leicester. Boeck, Cardoza, McCullum, Bell, and Skinner (2008a) found that 60 per cent of their respondents 'definitely' or 'tend to agree' that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get along. Interestingly, the study found that this dropped to 46 per cent when the respondent lived in the city's deprived outer estates, compared to 76 per cent in the more affluent areas. This illustrates the themes raised in the previous two chapters in needing to recognise the importance of social and economic status, and in particular the opportunities and stability that social mobility brings. In terms of a sense of belonging, the report stated that 78 per cent of their respondents had a strong sense of belonging to their local area, Leicester and Great Britain, with no significant differences between White British people and minority ethnic communities.

Boeck *et al.* (2008b) also conducted a Community Cohesion Assessment focusing on young people, and received surveys from 541 respondents. They found that 67 per cent stated that their local area 'is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together'. There was a noteworthy difference between Asian/Asian British

and Black/Black British respondents, of which 72 per cent agreed with the above statement, and White British respondents, with only 58 per cent of the latter agreeing with the same statement. This is interesting to note, as the high levels of immigration over the last half a century have contributed to Leicester having a minority ethnic population of 54 per cent within schools and colleges in the city (Leicester City Council, 2008). Therefore, many of the young people within the city of Leicester and surrounding areas have grown up with ethnic and religious diversity being the norm. Within the survey ethnic and religious difference was not highlighted as being a challenge or concern when socialising with other young people, but in focus groups there was more openness about the presence of racism in some areas (ibid, 2008). Boeck *et al.* (2008b) concluded that although there are issues with people 'sticking to their own', Leicester is not a city where communities live parallel lives. More recently Leicester City Council (2011) used a representative sample of approximately 7,500 people to gauge community cohesion in the city. The study found that 87 per cent of respondents thought that people in Leicester got on well together regardless of being from different backgrounds and different areas of the city. It is worth noting that both studies found that those living in the outer areas of the city, and young people specifically are most likely to report low levels of community cohesion.

The area selected in which to access a subgroup of young people was located within the borough of Charnwood, situated on the periphery of the city. Charnwood is one of the largest boroughs in the county, with a population of over 166,000 people, and the specific area where the subgroup was located is also one of the most socially and economically disadvantaged. Furthermore, it is directly next to the largest concentration of Indian people in Leicester (Community Cohesion Project Team, 2006). In terms of selecting a subgroup which were engaging in anti-social behaviour and specifically, targeted hostility, it is worth noting that Leicester itself has the third highest reported number of religiously motivated crimes in the country, and is the ninth highest in terms of the total number of hate crimes nationally (Home Office, 2012). Home Office (2012) recorded 880 racially motivated crimes and 77 religiously motivated hate crimes for Leicester in 2011-2012 (Home Office, 2012). The area selected in Charnwood not only has the highest rates of anti-social behaviour in the

borough but additionally, the highest rates of hate incidents and crimes throughout the whole county (Hate Incident Monitoring Project, 2009). As highlighted, hate crimes and incidents are considered enactments of underlying prejudices, and these statistics suggest ethnic, religious and cultural hostility may be prevalent within the area.

After considering the appropriateness of the research site in terms of its ethnic composition, socio-economic demographics, anti-social behaviour and hate crime levels, and its geographical location bordering the multicultural city of Leicester, the next stage was to consider the most effective approach to data collection.

4.4 Data Collection: Ethnography, Observations and Interviews

Qualitative research is described as an unfolding model that occurs in a natural setting and enables the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of a given phenomenon through actual lived experiences (Creswell, 2003). Researchers must pragmatically consider the most appropriate forms of instrumentation to ensure relevant data is collected on the topic of exploration (Locke, Silverman and Spirduso, 2004). Qualitative methods of data collection are often flexible and allow for reflexivity and are therefore compatible with the explorative nature of a grounded theory framework (Flick, 2009). If one were to systematically evaluate the use of data collection methods in grounded theory research they would come across two core approaches; first person observation and face to face interviews. From the outset of grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss (1968) used both of these conventionally accepted forms of data collection during their original studies exploring dying in hospital. However, Charmaz (2000: 514) highlights the broadness of data collection methods used in more contemporary studies such as ‘observations, conversations, formal interviews, autobiographies, public records, organisational reports, respondents’ diaries and journals’.

The starting point for choosing the most appropriate methodology was to consider the barriers between the identified sample of young White British, socially and economically marginalised people, the research topic and myself. Highly influential in

this decision was my previous work experience with hard to reach communities and knowing that key to meaningful engagement was factoring in time to enable service users to get to know me before broaching a personal or difficult topic. It was therefore necessary to use an approach which facilitated the subgroup becoming familiar with me, the intentions of the research and which also provided me with the opportunity to get to know the group's dynamics, forms of communication and norms, values and customs. Employing an ethnographic strategy which incorporated a 'softer' engagement approach was seen as being more likely to facilitate the collection of valuable, empirically rooted data in comparison to using a more formulaic methodology. Within the field of hate studies researchers have tended to rely on quantitative methodological approaches such as official sources of data and statistics, and this over-reliance has been criticised for failing to account for the historical context, social situations and social actors integral to understanding targeted hostility (Bowling, 1993: 1999; Perry, 2010). As Bowling (1993: 238) explains:

Conceiving of racial violence and other forms of crime as processes implies an analysis which is dynamic; includes the social relationships between all the actors involved in the process; can capture the continuity across physical violence, threat, and intimidation; can capture the dynamic of repeated or systematic victimization; incorporates historical context; and takes account of the social relationships which inform definitions of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour.

Using an ethnographic strategy provided a more sophisticated approach to gaining the necessary insight on the social contexts and situational dynamics which give rise to prejudiced views and acts of targeted hostility.

It is important to make the distinction between the use of an ethnographic 'strategy' as part of a data collection method in contrast to an ethnographic study. Ethnography, which has a long history in symbolic interactionist approaches, and social sciences more generally, has been used predominantly to research subcultures and gangs (Noaks and Wincup, 2004). Cresswell (2003: 14) defines ethnography as studying 'an intact cultural group in a natural setting over a prolonged period of time by collecting, primarily, observational data'. Ethnography, very much like the principles of grounded

theory, focuses on everyday behaviours to identify norms, beliefs, social structures, and other factors (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001). Specifically, the researcher is examining interactions and complex social processes by listening, observing and collecting documents which relate to the phenomenon they are interested in. This method usually involves the researcher observing their sample, overtly or covertly, for a sustained period as they go about their daily routine (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Conducting covert ethnographic research requires a great deal of experience, time and resources and can be an ethically dubious approach (Atkinson, Coffey, Delamont, Lofland and Lofland, 2001). For these reasons, the present study did not use ethnography as a covert method for data collection, but rather, as a strategy.

In order to get to know the group of young people, to develop trust and to understand their group dynamics I needed to spend considerable time with them within their natural setting. Key to gaining access to this group of young people was the previous contact I had with the group as a youth worker, so the ability to immerse myself covertly within their daily lives as 'one of them' was never an option. Additionally, I would not have felt comfortable personally and ethically in deceiving a group through covert ethnography over a sustained period with participants who were under 18 and in vulnerable situations. For this reason I used an ethnographic strategy which involved spending three evenings a week, each meeting lasting between half an hour to three hours over a period of three months with the subgroup of young people.

Employing an ethnographic strategy meant that I was able to collect data in various forms through observational field notes, informal conversations and both one to one and group based interviews. This approach involved a highly interactive role from both the researcher and the participants to generate bonds of trust and rapport, and the group welcomed my honesty in being a researcher who wanted to know their opinions, feelings and experiences on these topics. This ethnographic strategy enabled me to gain much more of an empirically rooted insight into the daily lives of a group of White British, socially and economically disadvantaged young people. It is only through using more flexible methods of engagement and data collection which explores

interactions and perceptions of how different groups get along together, that we can begin to better understand the experience of everyday multiculturalism.

One of the most important data collection methods used within the ethnographic strategy was participant observation. As Bow (2002:267) explains, 'participant observation is one of the most flexible techniques' and helps the researcher to consider which other data collection methods will be effective with the participants involved in the study. Employing the ethnographic strategy meant that I was able to begin making notes and memos on observations and informal conversations with the subgroup from the first interaction, which is conducive to the cyclic process of data collection and analysis within a grounded theory study. Although this method of data collection was most effective in engaging with young people and probing the difficult topics of multiculturalism, everyday racism and targeted hostility, it is not always straightforward. Particularly in both the early stages and latter part of the three months, participants within the group could be very unpredictable, sometimes not turning up to where we had arranged to meet and often not responding to calls. This meant that periods of the fieldwork were spent waiting with little reward. I had arranged for the fieldwork to commence during spring and summer in the hope that this would maximise the amount of time in which the group were 'hanging out' in the local area. However, this could not account for the spells of poor weather during which time none of the group members would come out.

Despite the poor weather I had decided from the outset not to cross the boundary of going to meet a young person at home. Again, this is a situation I would not have felt comfortable with, especially as time went on and the group really began to accept and welcome me into the group. To take the relationship a step further into personal environments could have raised potential issues. A further challenge with employing an ethnographic strategy which I had not especially anticipated, was that sometimes group members did not want to talk and at times could even be quite rude and hostile. Although this prevented conversations on the specific focus of multiculturalism, it was still important for gaining an in-depth understanding of the subgroup's lives more generally. Furthermore, the group could be quite fluid and sometimes young people

from different areas would be out with the subgroup, or older members who used to figure more regularly within the group, would re-appear. This did create some awkward situations with young people asking who I was and on two occasions these individuals became quite hostile and consequently, led me to leave the research site entirely.

One of the most effective aspects of employing an ethnographic strategy is that the research is engaging with young people in 'their' space. As Walford (2008: 17) explains 'ethnography demands a focus on one or a very small number of sites'. This is integral to gaining the necessary contextual data to understand the importance of an area and belonging to it. For the young people within this study 'their' area was significant not only to their identity but also to act as a visual reminder of the multicultural population that surrounded them, and in this respect restricted their access to other parts of the city. There were several sites in which I would meet participants, the most regular being the local park and the grounds of the leisure centre. We would also spend a lot of time simply walking the streets around the area or standing outside the house of one of the subgroup members, or the corner shop. These are places I became very familiar with because I was able to experience first-hand the narratives of these spaces, such as past fights, accidents and even 'break ups'. Spending time with the subgroup within 'their' area also facilitated observations of the subgroup engaging with the youth workers, particularly those from the Youth Offending Service. Although the views and experiences of youth workers was not the central focus of this study, it was an invaluable opportunity to explore how the youth workers attempted to engage with the group and tackle their underlying prejudices and offending behaviour. With the permission of the youth workers, these observations and discussions were also noted within the field diary, and where appropriate are used to support both the survey and subgroup findings.

After the first two weeks, during which the group were getting used to my presence and began to fully understand what the research focus was, they visibly relaxed and started including me within more of the discussions. What became evident early on was how the group responded to the Dictaphone; introducing the recorder into the

conversation would either cause the group to become embarrassed, irritated or it would completely halt the conversation. It meant that I had to rely heavily on written notes for the observations and conversations between participants. Although this raises potential issues in terms of the reliability and validity of the data collected, my experiences led me to believe that if I had pursued using a Dictaphone then the mutual respect and trust we had developed would have been significantly damaged, and therefore very few of the discussions I was privy to would have taken place. Conversely, using this alternative approach could add weight to the data collected as the detailed field notes were generated through 'real' discussions between young people rather than being influenced or artificially generated by the researcher. The informal interviews conducted in a group setting provided a rare opportunity to understand certain issues from the participants' point of view and provided a context or understanding of how their opinions had been formulated, which I was then able to probe further. In the end it became a 'joke' amongst the participants that I would be making notes whilst with them and even led to me becoming nicknamed as a 'geek'. On reflection, this method was the most effective approach with this group of young people who would be categorised as being 'hard to reach' and difficult to engage with.

From the outset I found it important to adopt an interview and communication style that the participants could relate to. Even so, it was often challenging trying to conduct one to one interviews with the participants as they were either reluctant to be seen on their own with me and/or could not understand why I would want to speak to them individually. This often showed the participant's lack of self-esteem, with participants not believing themselves to be interesting or important enough to justify a one to one interview. One of the strongest characteristics of this group of young people was their allegiance to each other and by attempting to speak to a participant individually the focus shifted from the group to them specifically, and therefore became more personal. Often group members were reluctant to have their personal lives exposed, particularly if there were problems and they felt embarrassed or ashamed about these issues.

It was evident, particularly within the first two months, that although I was welcomed within the group and could join in on the 'banter', I was still regarded as an 'outsider'. Despite this the female members within the group were much more comfortable in opening up. When walking along the streets with the group I could find myself in a one to one situation with a female participant who was much more willing to share extracts of their life history. It was within the final month that three of the males within the group opened up and shared very personal and emotional stories about their upbringing. Although I was not able to gain detailed life histories from each member, I was able to capture data on family set-ups, educational attainment and employment prospects for every participant. One area which the group were particularly forthcoming in offering their opinions and experiences on was the topic of this research and in particular the 'issue' with multiculturalism, 'foreigners', 'immigrants' and 'Muslims'. Individuals within the group would often comment on having never been asked for their opinions on these issues and if they were to voice their opinions then they were automatically labelled as being racist. It was evident that by employing an ethnographic strategy which facilitated a 'softer' and longer engagement approach, the group grew more comfortable in opening up and expressing their opinions on topics considered highly sensitive and contentious.

4.4.1 Auto-Ethnography

During the three months spent with the subgroup I kept an auto-ethnographical field diary. Auto-ethnography is seen as combining both autobiographic and ethnographic elements and acknowledges that it is important to reflect on the process of '*doing*' research. In terms of its epistemological foundations, this methodological approach is rooted in relativism and symbolic interactionism. Through prolonged observation, this approach helps to assign meaning to social actors, interactions and relationships. Writing reflectively and documenting my personal experiences and emotions helped me deal with challenging situations which arose during the fieldwork phase. As Jewkes (2012: 63) suggests:

Criminology has largely resisted the notion that qualitative inquiry has autoethnographic

dimensions and remained quiet on the subject of the emotional investment required of ethnographic fieldworkers studying stigmatized and/or vulnerable 'others' in settings where differential indices of power, authority, vulnerability, and despair are felt more keenly than most.

Often the personal journey and more specifically, the emotions a researcher experiences whilst in the field are underappreciated and fail to feature within the final product (Jewkes, 2012). Although there has been a growing recognition of how a researcher's personal interests and life history may influence their research focus (Liebling, 1999), exploring the emotional investment of conducting a study is often shied away from. More recently, Fleetwood (2009) and Jewkes (2012) have been vocal in urging researchers to acknowledge and use the subjective experience more prominently within the writing up phase. Building on Jewkes's (2012) article, Farrant (2014: 1) suggests that the 'story of "doing" research' which highlights the 'concerns, fears, thrills, and frustrations involved in the research process' should be embraced as it helps us understand the complexity of human behaviour and the importance of 'contaminated' research relationships. As Hunt (1989: 42) argues 'fieldwork is, in part, the discovery of the self through the detour of the other'.

The topic of racism had always been an area that I had been fascinated by and found inherently emotive. Exposure to racially and religiously motivated prejudice whilst I was growing up in Leicester caused me considerable confusion and irritation. I was always perplexed by why young White British people who had grown up within the same multicultural city as I had, felt so hostile towards diversity and threatened by 'difference'. Before beginning the first phase of data collection with the subgroup I recorded my own views on living in a multicultural city, my initial assumptions about those who express racist and religiously motivated prejudice and my thoughts on why people might commit acts of targeted hostility.

The process of documenting auto-ethnographically my views, feelings and experiences throughout the research process facilitated a reflexive understanding. Reflexivity is not a new concept and within qualitative research, has formed a crucial part of the process

of collecting and analysing data (Heath, 2006). Robson (2002: 22) suggests that reflexivity is 'an awareness of the ways in which the researcher as an individual with a particular social identity and background has an impact on the research process.' Reflexivity has been criticised for being a principle which is difficult to achieve, can permit researchers to be self-indulging and can be a distraction from what the research is actually about (Maynard, 2002; Phillips and Earle, 2010). Firstly, for the present study thinking reflexively was key to openly acknowledging my inability to separate feelings and emotions from conducting research on such a difficult and emotive topic; secondly, using the concept of reflexivity made me consciously aware of my participation in the research process and how my identity, be it gender, age, ethnicity, sexuality or social status, influenced the study.

One way of achieving this open and reflexive way of thinking throughout the research process is to use 'memoing'. McCann and Clark (2003: 15) state that memos 'reflect the researcher's internal dialogue with the data at a point in time'. The process of memoing can become a valuable form of data when explored through constant comparative analysis with other forms of data collection (Cutcliffe, 2003; McGhee, Marland and Atkinson, 2007). I documented my observations and experiences with the subgroup, and also my personal feelings, through extensive field notes and memos. Although researchers are often told about the importance of objectivity particularly when it comes to tackling researcher bias, by not acknowledging the subjective emotion and research experience, valuable and insightful data can be lost. I had many concerns with auto-ethnographically documenting both my feelings towards and my experiences with a population who are marginalised and regarded as 'problematic'. Expressing feelings of compassion or understanding could have left me vulnerable to criticism as it may have been interpreted as excusing or condoning everyday prejudice and even acts of targeted hostility. However, this clinical, objective view of such a population ignores the complexity of an individual's personality and the multiple identities they have. This objective standpoint could explain why some academics and politicians may be out of touch with, or even fail to understand young people's perceptions of everyday multiculturalism and their involvement in acts of targeted hostility.

4.5 The Survey

One of the downsides of qualitative research and ethnography specifically, is the limited population that the researcher can engage with. The first data collection phase helped to develop core themes and concepts addressing the research aims. However, to specifically explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism in greater depth, the next phase of data collection needed to involve a larger sample of White British people from Leicester and Leicestershire. The most effective tool in order to meet the study's analytical needs and obtain a large amount of data was through a survey. Although qualitative research is central to exploring micro-phenomenon and contexts, such as in the present study, it has a limited scope in terms of sample size. For this reason a mixed method approach was employed, promoting triangulation in both the data collected and the methods used (Bechhofer and Paterson, 2000; Brewer, 2000; Walklate, 2000; Jupp, 2001). For this research, a questionnaire provided not only an achievable way of accessing a wider sample pool, but also an effective tool to explore the concept of multiculturalism, exposure to racism and religiously motivated prejudice, and experiences of targeted hostility with young White British people from Leicester and Leicestershire.

Questionnaires have an array of strengths, particularly in that they are standardised and require only a relatively small amount of time and resources to produce and quantify (Russel-Bernard, 2002; Locke, Silverman and Spirduso, 2004). However, if the questions are not constructed or phrased appropriately, the data collected can be inadequate or lack relevance. For this reason, I used the emerging themes and concepts from the first stage of data collection and replicated these through a mixture of open and closed questions so as to gain relevant quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire asked respondents for their views on the biggest issues facing Britain, multiculturalism, the level of social cohesion between different ethnic groups, exposure to racism and religiously motivated prejudice and finally, participation in targeted hostility (see appendix). The questionnaire was first distributed to the

subgroup of young White British people, as this acted as a pilot and a means of obtaining their survey data. This highlighted certain important issues such as the majority of the group's literacy difficulties and more generally their lack of confidence in reading and writing. This therefore led to alterations to the survey where, for example, questions were made shorter, the language was altered to be more straightforward and simple, and some of the answers were pre-coded.

The most effective and simple way of accessing a large sample of 14 to 19 year old White British young people is through schools and colleges. Gaining access to these environments posed more difficulties than the first stage of data collection. Initially, emails and letters informing potential gatekeepers of the research were sent to three schools. All but one of the requests for meetings to discuss the research in further detail was declined; this consequently led to a modified approach. A likely explanation behind the lack of response from the schools I approached is that the topic of focus was considered too sensitive. Within the meeting with the gatekeeper who had agreed to meet with me, I was taken aback when they stated that there was little point in involving their institution within this study as they did not have a problem with racism. The reason offered in explanation for this statement was that over 90 per cent of their student population identified as being White British and therefore, few instances of targeted hostility took place. This comment left me bewildered and frustrated as it illustrated both a denial of everyday racism and complacency towards acts of targeted hostility. As with gaining access to the subgroup of young White British people, previous research and work contacts were drawn upon to meet with informal contacts and gatekeepers, including subject teachers and welfare staff. On meeting and liaising with the staff members who were facilitating the survey completion, informal conversations were documented through extensive field notes (with the permission from the teacher). These informal discussions provided an insight into the sample of young White British people who were completing the surveys and therefore, are used within the next two chapters to support the data collected from the questionnaires.

Within Leicestershire I was able to gain access to two schools which both had sixth forms. According to recent Ofsted reports, the schools have significant White British

student population and have been evaluated as 'average' in terms of attainments levels at GCSE and A-Level. Although initially the aim was to replicate the sample from the county and collect surveys from two schools within the city, due to the lack of response, I only gained access to one. This school promotes a multicultural and diverse student population with over two-thirds of the population being from a minority ethnic background and of this, a large proportion are new arrivals to the country. I asked all three schools if it would be possible for me to come in and present to the students who might participate in the study in order to explain the research topic and its aims. To me, this was regarded as an important stage in the research process as I am well aware of how many questionnaires young people at school are asked to fill in. Meeting respondents also helps to give a 'human-side' to a research project and to personalise the study's intentions to that group of participants. However, only one of the schools permitted me access to present about the study in an assembly.

Although these schools were chosen through purposive sampling, the informal gatekeepers were asked to employ a convenience sampling procedure. The process of administering the questionnaires was made as simple and straightforward as possible, to ensure a high participant rate. All students were given an information sheet informing them of the study's aims and were made aware of their right to withdraw, and the anonymity and confidentiality of the data collected. One of the weaknesses of using a school sample is the influence of location and the presence of a teacher. However, respondents were not asked for any identifying details and once they had finished the survey, they were asked to come up to a locked box and post their survey within it. One of the dilemmas with administering the survey was that the target population was White British students and within all three schools, particularly the one located within the city, classes had a mixed ethnic population. It was seen ethically and practically dubious to only ask those who self-defined as White British to fill out a survey. For this reason all of the students who were in the class at the time were asked to fill in the survey. Of the 466 questionnaires that were returned, minority ethnic students filled in 41 and these were separated and kept in a locked cabinet. In total, 425 questionnaires were filled out by young White British people who were between the ages of 14 and 19 years old, of which 47% (201) were female and 53% (224) were

male.

4.6 Data Analysis

Within a grounded theory methodology, participant interaction, data collection and analysis are processes which occur in a cyclical manner. Conventionally data analysis in quantitative studies happens towards the latter part of the research process. However, the decision to employ a grounded theory methodology requires the research to consider data collection and analysis from the outset. Grounded theory allows the researcher 'to develop a theoretical account of the general features of a topic while simultaneously grounding the account in empirical observations or data' (Martin and Turner, 1986: 141). One of the key concepts when it comes to analysing qualitative data in a grounded theory methodology is 'theoretical sensitivity' (Glaser, 1978). This is defined as 'the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn't' (Strauss and Corbin, 1990: 42). To achieve concurrent data collection and analysis, the researcher generates data with an initially purposive sample; the data from these initial encounters is coded before more data is collected.

Over the three months spent with the subgroup of young White British people, I collected a large amount of field notes from observations, discussions and interviews. The field notes were typed and put into NVivo, a software package which facilitates the coding of qualitative data. The data coding and analysis phase of grounded theory studies builds on three analytic techniques: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Open coding refers to the technique of identifying and developing categories and sub-categories in terms of their properties and dimensions. The field notes and interview transcripts were subject to open coding. The initial broad coding categories included: participant life histories; education and employment prospects; the use of racially and religiously motivated prejudice; stereotyping of in-group and out-groups; views on multiculturalism; the geography of belonging; the importance of Whiteness; and opinions and experiences of targeted hostility. Once the data had been organised into broad categories, I began

making detailed notes and memos on key themes which enabled the development of more nuanced subcategories of data analysis. As more data was collected on each meeting with the subgroup, axial coding was undertaken which involved considering the similarities, differences and relationships among the categories, and analysing these themes within the broader structural context.

One of the most important stages in the research process was reflecting on the time spent with the subgroup, the data collected and the analysis gained. The insight achieved from spending time in the field with a group of young White British people from a disadvantaged background was invaluable. The emerging themes of which out-groups the young people felt most hostile towards, what they thought of Leicester's multicultural population and how they spoke of committing acts of targeted hostility was central to understanding the experience of living everyday multiculturalism. However, these 15 participants had been purposively selected based on my existing knowledge of their geographical location, the prejudices they hold and their involvement in anti-social behaviour. To explore whether the emerging themes were specific to this group only or were applicable and relevant to a wider sample of 'ordinary' young White British people in Leicester, the data collected from the survey needed to be inputted and analysed. As the survey produced both quantitative and qualitative data, two sets of analysis were conducted. For the qualitative data, the answers to open questions were added to NVivo and underwent selective coding so as to further develop the concepts and themes generated from the subgroup. The quantitative data collected from the precoded questions was manually put into SPSS, a statistical software package. This facilitated running analyses to generate descriptive statistics. Once all of the data was analysed, both the quantitative and qualitative data from both the subgroup and survey sample were brought together under the core themes and concepts.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethics are especially important in research which involves young people, even more so

when the participants come from vulnerable and marginalised backgrounds. There has been a considerable shift in the way in which researchers consider the role of children and young people within research. Until more recently this population has been regarded as incompetent, vulnerable and unreliable (Moss and Petrie, 2002; Lansdown, 2005). As more research has been conducted *with* young people as active participants, instead of simply 'on' them as passive subjects, researchers have begun to view young people as more competent social agents who are able to comprehend and communicate their opinions and experiences. However, this shift in philosophy has not been replicated within University ethics committees. Ethics committees continue to express significant trepidation towards research involving children and young people (Valentine, Butler, and Skelton, 2001; Blackman, 2007). This section aims to highlight some of the ethical concerns that arose during the research process and how these issues were addressed and overcome.

Initially one of the main concerns expressed by both the ethics committee and the gatekeepers within the schools and at the Youth Offending Service, was the ages of participants, and in particular the inclusion of 13 year olds. Ethical considerations and obligations were a core factor in deciding the inclusion of the youngest age within the sample; the sensitive and perceived contentious nature of this research was acknowledged as a likely factor to raise concern with ethics boards, youth organisations, schools and parents and consequently, prohibit access. However, the rationale for conducting this research is that young people, and particularly those who are White British, have rarely been asked about their opinions on multiculturalism and how this affects their perceptions of identity and belonging. As highlighted within Chapter Two, young people now have the same opportunities of exposure into the social and cultural spheres, and therefore are faced with the same risks and choices as adults. By being targeted by the same media outlets and increasingly regarded as independent economic members, young people now have much more opportunity to experience the autonomy of an individualised society, as well as all of the insecurity and increased risk which comes with it (Beck, 1992; Valentine, 2003). Also Chapter Three illustrated that the development of prejudice and the ability for individuals to express it and act upon it, occurs within childhood. It could be argued that shying away

from the contentious and difficult issues of everyday racism, multiculturalism and targeted hostility, may only serve to exacerbate the underlying issues within certain marginalised and disenfranchised communities. Fortunately the gatekeepers from both the schools and the Youth Offending Service supported this rationale and their concerns were further appeased by gaining informed consent, ensuring the participant's anonymity and the confidentiality of their data.

Gaining informed consent posed its own dilemma within the subgroup of young people. It was decided that the best approach to gaining a fully informed and independent decision from the subgroup would be to sit down with the group and read through the information sheet and discuss it. This led to a frank discussion on the aims of the study, their right not to participate and withdraw at any point, and what data protection, anonymity and confidentiality meant practically for the group. Traditionally, research involving participants under the age of 18 would require consent from parents or guardians. However, from having previous knowledge of the group I was very aware of the tumultuous relationships between the young people and their family and adults more generally. In order to empower the group members and value their independence, parents and guardians were notified of the research but the decision to take part was down to the young person if they were 16 years or above. For the two females and one male who were under the age of 16, after they decided that they wanted to take part, consent was then gained from their parents. A further challenge with the subgroup was that gaining consent was a process which continued to be re-negotiated throughout the time spent with them. Sometimes individuals from other areas would join the group, siblings of the subgroup members would 'hang' out, or we would move to a different area entirely. All of these factors created particular difficulties when it came to noting observations or conducting interviews. Rather than staying covert, I chose to explicitly state why I was there with the extended group members and if they were not comfortable with taking part or did not give consent, then field notes were not taken.

When conducting research with young people one of the main concerns is the effect that the researcher will have on the participants. This is particularly relevant for qualitative research, with critics arguing that it is impossible to know whether

participants are telling the 'truth'. Within this study, it could be suggested that participants who were asked to fill out the survey, may not have believed that it would be truly anonymous. The school setting itself is known to have an oppressive and restrictive impact on students who are asked to partake in research (Alibali and Nathan, 2010; Santangelo-White, 2012). This affect could have partly been negated for the school in which I was able to address the participants through an assembly. I found one of the ways of managing the potential issues arising from the educational environment was to meet with specific teachers who would be administering the surveys and discuss the most effective strategy. It was decided that having the teacher explain the aims of the study and exactly what data protection, anonymity and confidentiality meant, could to some extent reassure students. Furthermore, as highlighted above, the participants were asked to put their nameless surveys into a locked box which was then given directly from the teacher to myself.

Schools facilitate one of the most effective means of gaining access to a large amount of participants, and it is through developing these strategies of reassurance which helps placate some of the criticism regarding the reliability and validity of the data collected. However, the same question of whether participants are telling the 'truth' could be asked of the data collected through the ethnographic strategy. This draws upon the wider philosophical debate about the 'self' and how we present a version of ourselves to 'outside' audiences. The counter argument for this potential weakness is that I was an active participant within the group, which was made up of close friends who had known each other for over ten years. The way we present ourselves to our closest friends is arguably a more accurate representation of the self, than in most other environments. Furthermore, the length of time spent with this group firstly through the youth work role, and secondly as a researcher enabled the development of relationships, rapport and trust. It is these aspects which allow the researcher and the researched to become more at ease and 'honest' with each other.

Another ethical dilemma which arose when employing the ethnographic strategy was whether or not to confront certain issues and how best to do so. Although rarely acknowledged, one of the concerns for a researcher is dealing with the unexpected and difficult discussions within the field. However, this research was focusing on

exactly that; for many people discussing the topics of multiculturalism, racially and religiously motivated prejudice and targeted hostility is inherently challenging and emotive. Interestingly, trying to engage the subgroup in these discussions was relatively easy as they were very opinionated and remarked on rarely being asked or feeling it was inappropriate to discuss these themes in other environments. What was more challenging was becoming privy to information and even observing behaviour which could be considered controversial, anti-social and even, illegal. This posed an ethical and personal dilemma in terms of firstly addressing the behaviour with that individual and secondly, whether I should be reporting these incidents to an appropriate organisation. Within these circumstances the researcher needs to weigh up a multitude of possible impacts such as how it would affect the relationship with the participants, whether the young people are causing harm to others or themselves and whether it is in fact your place to report that individual. Towards the end of my time with the subgroup, I became more included and therefore felt more comfortable to address certain issues such as expressions of racist and religiously motivated prejudice. Additionally, this became an important source of data in observing how the group, and specific members felt with being challenged. However, I used my discretion when it came to the incidents of antisocial behaviour and targeted hostility. For example, when members of the group were drinking or taking drugs, I determined that this was 'their' social space and private sphere, and therefore although underage and illegal, it was not my place to report such behaviour and add to the criminalisation of these young people. Instead, probably influenced by my past work experiences, it seemed more appropriate and arguably more effective to discuss such behaviours with them. Often I would sit with the group and talk about the harmful effects of drugs and alcohol, and attempted to make sure that they were safe when engaging in 'risky' behaviour.

There were also other sensitive issues which came to light and posed further ethical dilemmas. For example, when some of the group members felt comfortable enough to open up, they spoke of experiences of domestic abuse and relationships with much older males. Again, these confessions caused me considerable concern; protecting the participants from harm caused by the researcher is a key principle of research ethics,

but little advice is given on how to address participant harm caused by others. As I became familiar with certain individuals I felt more at ease in talking about these issues, such as making both parties in a relationship aware of the age of consensual sex, and suggesting reporting and/or accessing services which could support domestic abuse and teenage pregnancy. This was a role that I was used to fulfilling through my work roles but I had not fully anticipated that the subgroup members would see me as a source of advice and support.

My demographics were instrumental in becoming accepted by the group. The subgroup perceived me as being similar to them in terms of age, culture, personality and interests because I was a relatively young White British female who had grown up in the same city as they had. For the subgroup, interacting with a researcher who ostensibly was not too dissimilar provided them with a familiarity and a sense of safety in expressing openly racist and hostile views. At the end of the three months I had become so accepted by the group that I was afforded a level of 'protection' by some of the male groups members. For example, there was one instance where a young person, not from the area, spat on the floor next to me and one of the subgroup males stood forward and said "*don't do that near Stevie*". However, it also raised difficult situations with two of the older males within the extended group making romantic advances towards me. On the whole I was comfortable and confident with the good relations developed with the group, but wanted to ensure that a clear boundary was maintained so as not to become a 'friend' or someone they came to over rely on. It was for this reason, as mentioned previously within the chapter, that I never crossed the line of meeting up with a young person on their own or entered a participant's house. It also helped that the time I spent with the group was structured in that it happened three times a week, from half an hour up to three hours, and rarely at the weekends. This not only served to remind the group members that I was there to conduct research but it also ensured my safety.

4.8 Conclusion

This chapter began by demonstrating the various ways in which grounded theory has been interpreted, employed and modified, with the aim of conveying how this methodology was the most effective approach for exploring everyday multiculturalism, prejudice and targeted hostility with young people. Grounded theory has developed into new methodological spaces and this has shown how adopting a generative and flexible approach to this methodology can yield the best rewards (Charmaz, 2000; Clarke, 2005). As explained, this study intended to combine the principles of both Straussian and Constructivist Grounded Theory with the philosophical underpinning of symbolic interactionism. One of the core principles embedded within this research is the constructivist stance, and in particular understanding the influence a researcher can have on the study. By taking an active involvement in the research process and documenting auto-ethnographic feelings and experiences, this study strove to achieve rich, empirically rooted data through collaborative engagement with participants.

This chapter provided a step by step account of how the research methodology unfolded with each phase of data collection informing the next. This began by introducing the reader to the city of Leicester, detailing its appropriateness as site for exploring everyday experiences of multiculturalism, and finally justifying the use of a location within Charnwood to gain access to young White British, socially and economically disadvantaged people. In terms of data collection, the chapter discussed the use of an ethnographic strategy and the importance of the time spent getting to know the group of young people, developing trust and understanding their group dynamics. In the three months spent with the subgroup of 15 young White British people, I documented observations, informal discussions and interviews. For the next stage of data collection a survey was developed and administered in three schools in the city and the county. In total 425 surveys were returned from 14 to 19 year olds who self-defined as being White British. The final section of this chapter discussed the ethical and personal challenges faced during the research process such as researcher bias, re-negotiating consent and participant harm. This section highlighted the use of auto-ethnography and the importance of striving for reflexivity. It was through these strategies that I was able to acknowledge the 'human-side' of conducting research.

The concept of everyday multiculturalism and the development and expression of racist and religiously motivated prejudice have yet to be explored through a grounded theory framework which uses both an ethnographic strategy and survey to enable young people to express their own opinions and reflect on their experiences. Reflecting on what has been effective, as well as acknowledging the flaws of the methodological decisions, was in itself valuable and helped me to consider how best to develop programmes to address the challenges and complexity of prejudice, living everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. (Dis)Engaging with Multiculturalism

5.1 Introduction

This study has two main strands of enquiry; first, to use the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explore how young White British people from a socially and economically disadvantaged background interpret and engage with ethnic and religious diversity; and second, to investigate whether the complexities and challenges which arise within micro-geographies of multiculturalism could account for the development and expression of racial and religiously motivated prejudice and even the commission of targeted hostility. The next three chapters are structured so as to individually answer the research aims outlined within the Methodology. Therefore, this chapter details the participants' perceptions of multiculturalism, considers the lived reality of social cohesion and outlines the barriers preventing meaningful interaction in Leicester. The chapter draws upon the combination of survey data and the observations, memos and interviews from the fieldwork phase. The in-depth qualitative data gathered from the subgroup provides the socio-economic and cultural context which complements the findings from 425 surveys completed by young White British people in Leicester and Leicestershire. The chapter begins by addressing the participant's views on multiculturalism before discussing the themes of prejudice, immigration and the perception of entitlement which were found to be central factors affecting how young White British people understand and engage with diversity in Leicester.

The chapter uses the survey data to illustrate the disconnect between multiculturalism as an ideology and the lived reality of encountering and negotiating diversity in 'everyday' mundane social spaces. It was through a closer engagement with the subgroup's everyday life that this disconnect could be explored in greater depth. In order to understand why the subgroup members were so intolerant of and hostile towards Leicester's multicultural population, the impact of a combination of factors

such as ethnicity, age, social status and socio-cultural context had to be accounted for. This study found a significant disparity between the subgroup's perceptions of white entitlement and their lived reality, which was characterised by marginalisation and a lack of legitimate opportunities to rectify this current situation. Appreciating how the subgroup's identity and socio-cultural context intersect was central to understanding the importance of place to the group, the strength of their attachment to each other as well as their family and the 'community', and the exclusion they felt from wider society. It is through developing a more nuanced framework that identity and place can be regarded as being more valuable and providing a different function to different groups of people. It is the interplay between the individual characteristics of age, ethnicity and social status and the lived reality of their social and cultural context which contributes to the subgroup's reluctance to accept or engage with Leicester's multicultural population.

5.2 The Subgroup

Before discussing the findings, it is necessary to provide further detail on the characteristics of the subgroup so as to develop an idea of the socio-cultural environment they live in. As the previous chapter detailed, I had come to engage with this group of young people through my role as a detached youth worker at the Youth Offending Service. This group of young people had thoroughly shocked me by being so open with their resentment of Leicester's multicultural population and in admitting their involvement in targeted hostility. I could not understand why this group of young White British people were so intolerant of 'difference' and reluctant to embrace diversity. Employing an ethnographic strategy was key to gaining an in-depth understanding of the subgroup in terms of their language use, norms and values, as well as their opinions on diversity and their experiences of engaging with minority ethnic and religious communities. All of the participants came from a socially and economically disadvantaged background, with the four females and 11 males being between the ages of 14 and 19 years old. Every member of the subgroup defined themselves as being either 'White British' or 'White English'. All but one of the group

members were born within the area in which they still lived, and had multiple extended family members living in close proximity. 'Local nomadism' was a trait identified early on in the three months with the group, in which extended family members would move into different houses but within the same locale (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004). 11 of the subgroup members had close family living within the area, with four of the young people having at least one family relation in the subgroup. When I was receiving a tour of the surroundings, Steph pointed at different houses explaining:

"... that house there with the red door ... that's mine where I live with my mam [sic], ok now that one ... yeah three doors down is where my dad lives with his girlfriend and kids, and that one on the end is my aunt's and my nan just lives round the corner"¹

This also demonstrates a further common characteristic of the subgroup members, with eight of the participants living in a single parent household, one living at a friend's house and one living in a children's home. Although few of the subgroup members had 'conventional' family relationships, the participants had formed a strong attachment to their local area, knowing each other's families, as well as neighbours, community members and local business owners. The sense of inclusion offered by the peer-group, their surroundings and community, was in stark contrast to the exclusion they felt from education and employment. It was this disconnect which was found to be fundamental in exacerbating underlying ethnic and religiously motivated prejudices.

Of the nine who were in full-time education, one attended a specialist behavioural school and three had been expelled, collectively explaining that they 'rarely' attended school. The impact that school, or more aptly, a lack of qualifications, had on how the group felt about themselves and their future aspirations was very apparent. When discussing his lack of qualifications, Chris explained:

"I stopped going at 14 ... no-one did anything about it, I went to Spain to live with my dad for a bit then came back and I just never went to school again"

¹ When a direct quote is taken from the subgroup, the quote appears with double quotation marks. When a quote is taken from the survey it is displayed using a single quotation mark.

In another discussion with the same young person, he explained that he no longer aspired to his previous goal of going into the forces because *“they said they’ll just put me on the front line ... I’m not good enough for anything else”*. The six males who were not in education, employment or training (NEET) would regularly express great frustration with wider societal issues and economic conditions. As Ryan explained:

“There’s just no jobs ... I do all those things ... yeah the courses, I’ve been on all of them and I’ve not even had an interview”.

The combination of self-blame, a lack of confidence and general bitterness could explain the lack of employment aspirations. When asked in the questionnaire about what their dream job would be, the majority of the subgroup stated elementary occupations such as ‘bouncer’, ‘builder’ or ‘soldier’, with Alex commenting on another occasion that *“any would be great”*. Analysing group dynamics helped to identify the impact that ‘failure’ in terms of education and employment underachieving, had on individual members. It was evident that certain participants had internalised what they had heard from family members, teachers and other ‘outsiders’ in that they were *“useless”* and destined not to amount to much. Attachment to members in the subgroup was strong because it offered stability and security, with each individual knowing their place within the group. Communication between group members was often short and frank, and an ‘outsider’ would have regarded some of the language used as offensive, yet little offence was ever taken. Although physical altercations between the group were frequent, the duration of these acts was often brief and the cause, often forgotten. Underneath the bravado, the group members were not only very close but they also offered unfaltering support for each other, demonstrated most poignantly when one of the participant’s fathers had died. Although varying positions of power, influence and status were noted between different aged members within the group, the strength of the group’s attachment could explain why their views and therefore prejudices, were homogenised.

Although not the exclusive explanation for their actions, the involvement of the group in sexualised behaviour, criminality and substance misuse was heavily influenced by

their lack of legitimate success and recognition. Discussions with the female participants within the subgroup frequently focused on how the males in the area treated them and their belief that sexual behaviour secured their place in the friendship group. It was when this issue was pressed that it became clear how the participants actually felt about themselves. When discussing how having a baby could change your life, Steph explained that she needed *“to get pregnant”* to keep her boyfriend. When I asked her if she had any other future aspirations, she replied:

“I can’t do anything can I? I fucked up my courses so I ain’t got nothing ... if I have a baby, he has to stay with me and then I get a house”

13 members of the subgroup had been in trouble with the police, with 12 being in trouble on more than one occasion. For nine of these individuals, their altercations with the Police Service would be categorised as ‘low level’ antisocial behaviour. However, four participants who were also the oldest in the subgroup, had been involved in more serious incidents such as possession of a knife, racially aggravated assault and theft. From observations and discussions with the subgroup about their involvement in criminal behaviour, two main motivating factors were identified. The first factor was a desire for escapism from the boring, routine nature of everyday life for the subgroup. When asking the group about their involvement in criminal activity, they would often describe their experiences as being *“funny”* and *“just something to do”*. The second motivating factor was the perceived ‘need’ for subgroup members to acquire status and respect from both within the group and within the area more generally. Being involved in ‘deviant’ and criminal activity was a trait that was respected in the group and consequently an attractive avenue for young people craving recognition and acceptance. The subgroup’s perceived exclusion from education and employment, which significantly affected their transition to adulthood, and their involvement in ‘deviant’ activities, served to strengthen the attachment they felt to each other and the area they belonged to.

This section has sought to provide a brief overview of the subgroups norms, as well as individual characteristics so as to provide the necessary socio-cultural context, and to

some extent portray the everyday lived reality for this group of young White British people. For the majority of this group education and employment success was unlikely, involvement within criminal or antisocial behaviour was the norm and their friends, family and immediate local area provided their only feelings of inclusion and belonging. As outlined in the Methodology, one of the downsides of qualitative research and ethnography specifically, is the small population the researcher can engage with. The ethnographic strategy facilitated an in-depth understanding of the participants' lived reality. However, to specifically explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism in greater depth, the next phase of data collection needed to involve a larger sample of White British people from Leicester and Leicestershire. For this reason 425 surveys were collected from self-defining White British people aged between 14 and 19 years old, living in Leicester and Leicestershire. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain opinions on multiculturalism, immigration and community cohesion in Leicester, as these themes featured prominently in the data collected from the subgroup. Although basic descriptive statistics from the survey are used within this chapter, the focus is predominantly on the qualitative data produced from the questionnaire. The qualitative data was vital in allowing young people to share their thoughts and feelings on these complex and challenging themes, an opportunity which is often denied for this sample. It is when the two data sets are combined that a more accurate picture of how young White British people in Leicester and Leicestershire interpret, engage and negotiate ethnic and religious difference is achieved.

5.3 Views on Multiculturalism

The survey began by asking participants to consider whether England's multicultural population was a positive characteristic to which 71.8% ($n=299$) agreed. The explanations provided often adhered to Berry's (2006) 'multicultural ideology', with participants suggesting that:

With more cultures comes more knowledge.

People can learn about religion better.

There's more different things like shops and food.

We can all feed off one another and learn new things such as different cuisines.

It is nice to have influences upon our society e.g. fashion and art from other cultures.
It gives us a rich culture and should promote understanding and acceptance.

There was a strong feeling amongst this sample that England's multicultural population was a source of pride because *'it shows that we are a welcoming country'*, *'it gives the country a better name'* and *'it shows we're a leading country'*. There were many respondents who expressed that ethnic and religious diversity benefited the country as a whole as *'people from different countries are driving the economy'* and that multiculturalism *'adds more variety to the English culture'* as *'we get a bigger variety of foods, clothes and music'*. Explanations also referred to how having a multicultural population was advantageous for the 'native' British inhabitants because it makes people more *'understanding'*, *'open-minded'*, *'accepting'*, *'tolerant'* and *'less racist'*. Similarly, there were those participants who felt that multiculturalism facilitates acceptance of 'difference', as a diverse society *'teaches people that it's ok to be different'*, and that we are the *'same'* and *'equal'*. Within both the sample of 71.8% ($n=299$) who agreed that multiculturalism was positive for England and the 4.6% ($n=19$) who were unsure², there were participants who offered more cautious and tepid responses. Though agreeing that having a multicultural population was positive, some of the explanations urged that *'England's culture shouldn't be pushed aside to please them'* and that the country should still contain a *'majority of British people'*.

As outlined in Chapter Three, Tyler (2003) conducted a similar study in the former mining town of Coalville by employing an ethnographic strategy to explore 'white working-class' racialised discourses. Although her research was conducted over a decade ago, the findings are similar in that the younger generation appear to accept and embrace multiculturalism. In particular, Tyler (2003) noted that compared to older generations, younger people found the changing multicultural geography in Leicester and Leicestershire as *'routine, banal and unremarkable'* (Tyler, 2003: 297). To some extent this was mirrored within the survey findings in the present study whereby participants remarked that because of *'how people were brought up'* multiculturalism *'has become the norm'*, and everyone is *'familiar with each other's background'*.

² This category includes those respondents who ticked both 'Yes' and 'No'.

Ostensibly, the findings from this first question suggest that nearly three quarters ($n=299$) of the young White British participants involved in this study feel that England's multicultural population is both accepted and positive.

The themes of loss and perceived threat were central to the explanations offered by those who responded negatively to England's multicultural population. Of the 23.6% ($n=98$) who disagreed that having a multicultural population was positive, many of the respondents felt that multiculturalism had a detrimental impact on England's culture, traditions and national identity. For example, ethnic and religious diversity:

Changes our national culture.

Stops England being English.

We no longer have an English country belonging to English people.

British spirit has been taken away.

We're losing British values.

We are losing that traditional British die-hard attitude.

The sense of threat was further demonstrated by participants who felt that multiculturalism '*needs to be controlled*' because '*immigrants*' were '*over populating the country*'. There was a strong feeling amongst the sample that multiculturalism was detrimental to the opportunities and societal resources for the '*native*' British population. Participants felt that diversity '*contributes to job losses*' and '*unemployment*', with '*Too many White people not getting jobs*', and that people come to England to '*claim benefits*'. The existence of fear and the perception of threat were also themes found in a study conducted by Pagani and Robustelli (2010: 252), who explored young people's opinions of multiculturalism in Italy. They found that those who expressed negative views on multiculturalism and in particular '*immigrants*', were motivated by fear; fear for their own safety and for their welfare, fear of loss of identity, and fear of losing other people's affection (Pagani and Robustelli, 2010: 252). Finally, compared to the 71.8% ($n=299$) of the sample who felt that multiculturalism developed understanding and tolerance, there was a small percentage within the 23.6% ($n=98$) who felt that diversity actually caused conflict. These respondents

expressed concern that multiculturalism '*causes controversy*', '*conflict*', '*arguments*', '*tension*' and even '*increases racism*'.

Although it is difficult to extrapolate meaning from such a small sample of surveys, it is interesting nonetheless that all 15 members of the subgroup felt that England's multicultural population was not a positive attribute. There was a small minority within the school sample who mirrored some of the more extreme views expressed by the subgroup, including making the country '*all White again*', '*get Pakis out*', '*only English/British people in the country*' and an '*all English community*'. Compared to the 410 surveys collected from schools within the city and the county, the qualitative data provided by the subgroup was much more direct, honest and hostile. For example, when asked to provide an explanation as to why they disagreed with multiculturalism being positive for England, the subgroup provided answers such as:

Need to go and make room for White people.

Immigrants take jobs.

It should only be British people living in England.

Should be White because Pakis take over.

The openness of the explanations could be explained by the subgroup members filling in the survey within their own environment as opposed to a school context and also, because I had developed a trusting relationship with the group. When I initially asked the subgroup to fill in the survey they had questioned whether they could be totally honest and then expressed great enthusiasm in being asked for their opinion on such matters. The hostility expressed within the subgroup's survey responses was unsurprising, as during my three months with the group they had openly shared their opinions on and experiences with Leicester's multicultural population. Employing an ethnographic strategy was key to understanding why this group were so vehemently against multiculturalism, and it is this context specific approach that could explain some of the fears and hostility expressed by 23.6% ($n=98$) of the survey sample. The next section draws upon observations, memos and conversations with the subgroup. Specifically it focuses on the underlying tension and hostility towards specific minority ethnic communities to consider how this impacted upon their views on

multiculturalism and engagement with diversity. Achieving this context specific focus highlighted that opinion on ethnic and religious plurality both affects *how* young people encounter and interact with diversity in everyday life and is also affected *by* these engagements.

5.4 Patterns of Prejudice

Although the focus of this section is to explore the subgroup's opinions and experiences of engaging with minority ethnic communities, it is worth briefly noting that the group also expressed prejudiced views more broadly. From the early stages of observations and interactions with the group, terms such as "*gay*" and "*retard*" were frequently voiced. It could be due to the excessive use and normalisation of such terms that the words had little strength as an offensive remark. What was quite insightful in terms of assessing the group's prejudices was that Will who was one of the subgroup members, had sustained a head injury when he was younger, resulting in quite significant learning difficulties. There was a clear contrast in the treatment he received from the females within the subgroup who often pitied him and did things for him, and the males who saw him as a low status member of the group and an easy target. It was for this reason that the majority of males in the group viewed making fun of him acceptable. Throughout my time spent with the group, it was difficult to observe the treatment he received from his 'friends', and to continually hear the insults of "*spag*" and "*retard*". Will had clearly internalised the abuse he received as he often described himself as "*stupid*", and simply accepted the frequent taunts without reacting. It may be because this was one of the few interactions the subgroup had with a disabled person that this form of prejudice never gravitated to being more serious than the use of such terms to describe each other. In comparison to the expression of disabilist and homophobic views, racially and religiously motivated prejudice was much more common, derogatory and emotionally significant. The subgroup openly expressed everyday racism from the very first time I met them.

What became apparent was that my age, ethnicity and to some extent gender, influenced the members of the subgroup to think that I held the same views, as demonstrated by this exchange:

Claire: *We're off now anyway.*

Researcher: *Where are you going or should I not ask what you're getting up to?*

Claire: *Going up Paki land to see some mates.*

Researcher: *Do we need to call it that?*

Claire: *What?*

Researcher: *Paki land.*

Claire: *Why not? ... That's what they are ... like where they're from.*

Researcher: *Not necessarily and I find it offensive.*

Steph: *Why? ... You're not one of 'em (laughing).*

Researcher: *You don't have to be Asian to find it offensive ... (pause).*

Claire: *Are you not racist?*

Researcher: *No ...*

Claire: *I don't think I've ever met anyone not racist (both Claire and Steph start laughing).*

This created an intriguing conflict in that the participants were aware that these views were not to be expressed to 'outsiders'; however, if you were from their community or were engaging with them on a regular basis, then they assumed that you must share their views and hold the same prejudices. For this group of young people, the majority of their close network of friends, family and community members held the same opinions as they did, as found in Sibbit's (1997) research.

It was the perceived normalcy of these views that was most shocking. In the beginning hearing the term "*Paki*" would make me flinch, but the group used it so frequently by the end of the three months, I had, in truth become somewhat desensitised. It is for this reason that definitions which describe prejudiced views as 'faulty', 'irrational', or 'unjustified', as outlined in the literature review, underplay or even ignore the relativistic nature of prejudice. To this group of young people holding racist and religiously prejudiced views and even expressing them was nothing irrational, exceptional or out of the ordinary. When Charlie stated early on within the fieldwork that everyone was "*well racist around here*" I had not quite appreciated how honest

the statement was. As the exchanges below illustrate, the subgroup were part of a cycle in which grandparents, parents and older siblings held and expressed the same 'prejudiced' views:

Researcher: *Where do you hear it (racist language) then?*

Luke: *My Nan uses all of them ... it's everything that she's grown up with. That's just what they were called. And now me and James live with her so we just hear it from her.*

James: *It's so funny...*

Luke: *She'd never let a Black or Asian in her house.*

And:

Researcher: *Would you say you were racist?*

Alex: *Yeah ... I'm not ashamed. I'll tell anyone ...*

Shane: *My parents vote BNP and I'm going to do it when I can.*

And:

Mo (youth worker engaging with the subgroup): *I think if people are racist then they will be forever in some ways.*

Researcher: *Do you not think you can change a young person's view?*

Mo: *Well ... yeah I mean it's not just their views though ... it's their upbringing and all the influences still around them ... like the BNP, they will have listened to that propaganda ... it's providing young people with an informed choice that will ... challenge their beliefs ... But they need to have a reason to, like if they're surrounded by people with the same view which all of these are ... why would they want to change?*

Research: *I guess so.*

Mo: *This group (the subgroup) of young people look at difference and they see it as just negative, they need to be shown that it's not something that they need to be scared of or there's anything wrong with it*

There are a range of sociological and criminological theories which help to explain group prejudice and the transmission of 'hate' from one generation to the other. Hopkins-Burke and Pollock (2004) suggest that when Sutherland's (1939) theory of differential association is combined with Cohen's subcultural theory, a more comprehensive understanding of how people become socialised into a specific world-view can be achieved (cited in Hall, 2013:113). Sutherland's (1939) theory builds upon

Cohen's observation in that individuals come together as groups with shared views and cultural values, to explain that these strong associations make young people more likely to offend via a process of social learning. As found in both Sutherland's (1939) and Cohen's (1955) work, social learning and group association become ever more prominent when young people come from marginalised and disadvantaged backgrounds. The subgroup were characterised by socio-economic deprivation, group loyalty and homogeneity and this could account for the transmission of prejudice and hostility between family members and friends.

Understanding the relativistic nature of prejudice enables a better understanding of the intergroup perception of minority ethnic communities in Leicester. To this group of young people, their opinions and beliefs are considered rational and correct, due to the socio-cultural and economic context in which they have grown up in and find themselves within now. The subgroup's geographical location bordered areas with highly visible minority ethnic groups and they frequently observed members of these communities having "*better*" houses, cars and jobs. It is this context which provided the validation for the stereotypical and prejudiced views they heard from their friends and family.

It was apparent that the existence of racially and religiously motivated prejudices and the homogeneity of these views, was further strengthened by the group's reluctance to engage with anybody from outside the local area. As highlighted in the literature review, social capital has been used to understand 'the values that people hold and the resources that they can access, which both result in and are the result of collective and socially negotiated ties and relationships' (Edwards, Franklin and Holland 2003: 2). The subgroup belonged to a community that was incredibly insular and which could be described as gaining its social capital through Putman's 'bonding' networks. Disadvantaged communities are often found to rely on 'bonding' networks as a result of the unequal distribution of economic and cultural capital within society (Putman, 2000). The subgroup's community lacked social capital from external networks which therefore generated low levels of trust and an unfamiliarity with 'outsiders'. Subsequently, this group of young White British people rarely interacted with

individuals from different ethnic or religious backgrounds or even anyone who held a different opinion. This served to strengthen the homogeneity of the group and perpetuated the myths and stereotypes which underpinned their prejudiced views:

Researcher: *Do you know any Muslim people?*

Matt: *Fuck no ...*

Researcher: *Does anyone know any Muslim people or even Asian people? (group shakes head)... school or anything?*

Dan: *We had one in our class 'dint we?*

Connor: *I remember her (laughing).*

Matt: *Yeah (name) or something, she fucking stunk so no one talked to her or sat next to her.*

Connor: *She had the hairiest arms ever (laughing).*

The over-reliance on information provided by friends and family and the subgroup's reluctance to question the validity of this information, could explain why the group was so ignorant and unfamiliar with ethnic and religious diversity. The below exchanges characterises many discussions showing the subgroup's lack of knowledge and understanding of ethnic and religious plurality:

Kyle: *You can't trust any of them (referring to Muslim people).*

Aaron: *You can't ... there all terrorists.*

Kyle: *Like when they're wearing that bin bag thing (group starts laughing) you don't know who's under there.*

Claire: *My Dad says all they want to do is keep women liked locked up ... and (directed at researcher) did you know they marry them off at like 12?*

Researcher: *Really? ... how do you know this?*

Claire: *That's what my Dad told me ... but everyone knows it anyway.*

And:

Emma: *What do we call that pig round here?*

James: *(laughing) You mean the turbinator? (group starts laughing).*

Ryan: *I fucking hate him ...*

Emma: *You call him Muzzy as well.*

Arguably naively, I had assumed that 14 to 19 year olds who had grown up living on the periphery of one of the most diverse cities in the country would know the visible difference between a Sikh and Muslim person. During the discussion my face had conveyed the shock I felt at this remark, which the group had noticed. Although this led me to explain the difference between Sikhs and Muslims, the explanation I offered only resulted in James saying, *"So? ... they're all the same"*.

Throughout the three months spent with the subgroup I continually struggled with the dilemma of whether or not to challenge the prejudiced and hostile views that were expressed. Predominantly I was most concerned with the potential repercussions of challenging these views such as the subgroup no longer welcoming my presence. This became easier as time went on and I developed stronger connections with the group and with it a level of rapport and trust. During my time with the subgroup it became apparent that the dilemma I faced of whether to share my opinions, which often differed significantly to that of the group, was also felt by other participants. In particular, discussions with Steph and Claire illustrated the concern they felt with expressing a view in opposition to the rest of the group or associating with an 'outsider':

Claire: *To be fair we ain't even that racist compared to some of these lot ... (pointing to other members of the subgroup)*

Researcher: *Really?*

Steph: *No ... I had a halfcast boyfriend ... didn't tell anyone about it like! (laughing).*

Researcher: *Why?*

Claire: *Can you imagine everyone round here? They'd go fucking mental!*

Steph: *I don't really like most of them anyway ... like most (Steph was about to say Pakis) ... sorry (laughing) Asian lads are horrible like proper perverts and they hate us anyway!*

Claire: *Yeah ... I don't mind some black lads ... they can be alright.*

Researcher: *But you wouldn't tell anyone if you had ... a Black boyfriend?*

Claire: *(animated) No, god ... they'd go mad.*

Steph: *Be worse if it was a Paki though.*

Claire: *I just wouldn't even like one though (pulls a face of disgust).*

Steph and Claire both feared that if they did not share the same views to the same strength, or if they were to begin a relationship with someone not living within the

area, it would significantly upset or anger the other subgroup members, and worse still, it could lead to them becoming 'outsiders' themselves. Within Thrasher's (1927) work on gang involvement, loyalty and group solidification were identified as traits which were central to gang formation and often highly valued in terms of cementing ones place within the group. Although there were only a few incidents which came to light during my time with the subgroup, group members faced serious repercussions if they voiced an opinion that was contrary to the majority of the group. This was particularly apparent when it came to opinions on multiculturalism, and views towards minority groups more generally:

Charlie: *Ok this one is if you think multiculturalism is alright ... which means letting different people into this country.*

Will: *Yeah that's OK.*

Charlie: *No it's not Will ... so you think it's OK letting the Pakis and terrorists in? (6 members of the subgroup stop and look)*

Will: *Oh no that's not ok.*

Charlie: *So I'll put no then.*

Will: *Yeah.*

Connor: *You're such a fucking retard (group laughing).*

This altercation had been tense and as an observer, I could feel the pressure that Will was under to answer the question correctly. In part I felt guilty as Will had been unable to fill in the survey individually due to his inability to read and then had faced ridicule and the possibility of physical assault because of his answers. Although the instances of a subgroup member expressing a view to the contrary of the group as a whole were rare, it demonstrated the importance of the homogeneity of the peer group.

As outlined in the literature review, the peer group we identify with is seen as having a negative and confounding impact on prejudiced views, especially in young people. Young people are more likely to be tolerant of prejudiced attitudes and to modify their opinions and behaviour, if a friend expresses that view or acts in that way (Lun, Sinclair, Glenn, and Whitchurch, 2007; Paluck, 2010). This influence has been explained by using social identity theory which suggests that the strength of peer and familial

attachment is dependent on how significant preserving that social identity is to the self (ibid, 1979). Key to upholding a positive social identity is emphasising that 'in-groups' are superior and the norm, and this is achieved by reinforcing that 'out-groups' are 'different', subordinate and unwelcome. This could explain why the subgroup so unanimously denigrated and dehumanised the surrounding Muslim population, as well as the new and emerging immigrant communities.

To the participants within this study, being part of the friendship group was highly valued and the consequence of not belonging to it was beyond comprehension. Due to their disadvantaged social and economic circumstances and their lack of opportunity to gain social and cultural capital, being White British and belonging to specific place was a significant and stable part of their identity. The group's overwhelming prejudice towards Leicester's multicultural population appeared to be fuelled, and continually exacerbated by their individual circumstances and the socio-cultural context in which they lived. The unwillingness to engage with ethnic and religious diversity and the expressions of prejudice towards the 'Other' must be recognised against the backdrop of young people grappling to form a stable adult identity, feelings of failure and the basic desire to belong.

5.4.1 A Hierarchy of Hostility

From discussions with the subgroup it became evident that Black British people were seen as 'acceptable' because their culture, norms and values were seen to be in line with the subgroups, such as speaking English and wearing western clothes. However, the group still held stereotypical views about Black British people as demonstrated when a Black youth worker came to the area to try and set up a sports group, and the subgroup refused to engage with him. The subgroup proceeded to ask me why the youth worker was in the area and whether he was there to sell drugs or because he was "*after*" one of them. Again, the association between the youth worker being 'Black' and therefore "*hard*" and involved in criminality, illustrated how little understanding and interaction this subgroup had with 'difference' and diversity in everyday life. Compared to the prejudice and hostility expressed towards Asian people

and specifically those perceived to be Muslim, there was significantly less hostility and fear directed towards Black British people, demonstrating a hierarchy of 'out-groups':

Tyler: *You should get him (12 year old younger brother of Emma) to fill one (survey) out.*

Researcher: *Why?*

Tyler: *Be well funny ... he's a right little racist ain't you?*

Emma: *He ain't anymore. He moved schools dint he? Since then he's got himself his own little Paki friend (group begins laughing and abusing participant).*

Connor: *Have you?*

Brother: *Yeah ... I don't care. Got an Indian and Jamaican friend.*

Connor: *Who is it?*

Brother: *(name)*

Connor: *He ain't a proper one ... ain't he got a White mum or something?*

Emma: *Yeah.*

Connor: *He's alright.*

And:

Researcher: *So it's just immigrants you have an issue with?*

Matt: *Yeah ... the Asians ... just everything about them.*

Researcher: *But what about Ruth (youth worker in the area)?*

Matt: *Yeah she's alright ... and she's Black which ain't as bad.*

From the frequency with which racist remarks were aired, and the adjoining emotion, it was apparent that within this subgroup Asian looking individuals, whether Hindu, Sikh, Muslim, born in Britain or not, were the target of the majority of hostility. The subgroup's hostility towards 'Asians' and 'Muslims' could be because geographically the subgroup were next to a large concentration of Indian and Bangladeshi communities, with the nearest schools being majority Asian British. This created a context specific, visible object of 'difference' for their frustration and prejudice. In particular the subgroup appeared to have an issue with the 'culture' and lifestyle of the surrounding 'Asian' and 'Muslim' community, echoing Barker's (1981) observation of a 'new racism'. It was perplexing to hear older males within the subgroup who were engaged in sexual and to some extent, exploitative relationships, with much younger

females, talk about what they perceived to be a lack of women's rights in Islam.

Often when discussing the local Asian community the subgroup would use the terms "*Muslim*", "*Asian*" and "*Paki*" interchangeably, and referred to minority ethnic people as being "*terrorists*", who wanted to "*take over the country*". This supports wider thinking in that the climate of Islamophobia and cultural intolerance has led to 'Asian' looking individuals being mistaken for 'Muslim' and by association, being perceived to be a 'foreigner' or 'terrorist' (Bloch and Dreher, 2009). This was also mirrored within a small percentage of the survey responses with respondents associating the problem of 'immigrants' with the Muslim community, suggesting that they were '*everywhere*' and wanted to '*bring Sharia Law to the UK*'. The comments from both the subgroup and survey respondents embodied the myths and stereotypes often espoused by the tabloid media. It is evident that the more extreme views expressed by young people are an extension of the prejudices held by society as whole, which exaggerate Islamic customs and traditions as being substantially different and incompatible with the 'native' British culture (Fekete, 2009; Mythen, *et al.*, 2009).

During the three months with the subgroup it became possible to identify different motivations to explain why participants expressed racism or religiously motivated prejudice. Even the act of expressing extreme racist views served to provide certain members with respect and superiority within the group (this point is discussed in more detail within the next chapter). It was well known within the subgroup which members were especially racist and which were involved in targeted hostility. Some of the younger female and male subgroup members appeared to admire those who held and voiced extreme racist views:

Charlie: *You need to speak to Ryan (laughing).*

Researcher: *Yeah ... why?*

Emma: *He hates 'em ... do you know what he said he would like to do on his last day on earth ... go down to Melton Road with a baseball bat and kill them all.*

Researcher: *And he's your boyfriend? (directed at Charlie)*

Charlie: *Yeah he's my boyfriend (smiling).*

Researcher: *And you don't mind when he says things like that?*

Charlie: (animated) No! He's well hard and he proper means it you know? Like he's been in so many fights with Pakis and stuff and he always wins.

This exchange, as with many others, demonstrated the difference between the subgroup members in terms of the strength of their views, the emotional significance and the frequency in which they were voiced. Often the younger members would tell racist and religiously biased jokes, reeling off 'funny' rhymes and derogatory comments of Asian people who "*smell*", are "*curry munchers*" and "*hairy*". Using Aboud's prejudice typology, the majority of the younger individuals in the group would be labelled as 'conventionally' prejudiced (Aboud, 1988). Due to their early socialisation in which they would have become familiar with the words and views of their parents and now in later life, with the strong attachment and influence of their peer group, their prejudices had assimilated (Allport, 1954; Aboud, 1988; Verkuyten, 2002). Although this group of young people believed in the negative stereotypes and myths of all "*Pakis*" being "*terrorists*" and "*Blacks will just stab you*", observations of the younger members illustrated that there was a lack of aggression, with most incidents being motivated by a desire to impress their friends. In contrast, the prejudices held by the four oldest members of the group could be identified as being within both the 'authoritarian' category and the less prevalent grouping, in which prejudiced views are borne out of a frustration with personal and social circumstances (Aboud, 1988).

Employing an ethnographic strategy facilitated observations on both the tone and manner in which statements were made and also the accompanying body language. When discussing the Asian community or multiculturalism within Leicester, the four older individuals verbalised "*fucking Pakis*" with real venom, becoming agitated and animated in what they were saying. The difference between the younger members and the four older participants, who would be categorised as NEET, was that the latter were now in an ambiguous position between youth and adulthood and had few opportunities to generate social capital and achieve social mobility. As Chapter Two outlined, Giddens (1991) suggests that the culture of risk in modernity 'produces difference, exclusion and marginalisation' (1991:6). Research demonstrates that

opportunities to achieve and generate social mobility have actually reduced for young people in the last decade, even though globally lifestyle choices are now less constrained than previous generations (Thomson, Flynn, Roche and Tucker, 2004; Gentleman and Mullholand, 2010). This lack of opportunity and the resultant feelings of failure and frustration, are not experienced equally by all young people in Britain. Rather, research illustrates that for the majority of white, non-disabled, middle class young people, the transition from youth to adulthood is more straightforward than it is for minority ethnic and/or economically disadvantaged youth (MacDonald, Shildrick, Webster and Simpson, 2005; Gentleman and Mullholand, 2010). From spending time with the subgroup, it was evident that there were limited legitimate opportunities for the older members within the group to change their current situation. It was within this milieu that feelings of shame and isolation manifested into outward frustration towards the surrounding multicultural population.

5.4.2 The Issue with Immigration

Immigration emerged as a pertinent issue for both the subgroup and the survey respondents. Within the survey, participants were asked to consider what they thought were the biggest problems facing Britain so as to assess how aware participants were of current societal, political and economic issues. This was to explore whether such opinions were influencing perceptions of multiculturalism and social cohesion on a local level in Leicester. As outlined within the literature review, there has been a tendency to view young people as being 'incomplete, vulnerable beings' (Mayall, 1994: 3) who are excluded from the realm of socio-economic politics and global events. The survey results convey that the sample of young people within this study identified unemployment (66.7%) and the economy (53.3%) as being the biggest challenges facing England. The majority of respondents' explanations articulated thoughtful views, for example the '*Iraq and Afganistan wars*', '*justice system*', '*climate*', '*benefit system*' and the '*prime minister*' were the most frequently cited social and political concerns from the school sample.

Following closely behind unemployment and the economy was the 'problem' of immigration. 50% ($n=208$) of the questionnaire respondents spoke of the perceived negative and detrimental impact immigration is having on Britain. Analysis of the qualitative data conveyed that participants thought that migration to Britain was acceptable '*As long as they come to work and make a living then it should be allowed*' and '*as long as they don't come for the sole purpose of getting benefits*'. There was also a clear association between immigrant communities being in the country and the loss of opportunity and resources for the native British population. This perception may be exacerbated within the current economic climate with many of the respondents stating that 'immigrants' are the reason '*why most of us can't get jobs*', '*causing us unemployment*' and more generally, '*they use and abuse the country*'. Overwhelmingly these participants commented on '*less immigration*', only letting people in '*with something to offer*' and making '*it harder to immigrate into the country*' when asked what changes they would make to the country.

Amongst the survey responses were those who offered more direct hostility towards having a diverse population in Britain such as '*get pakis out*' and '*get rid of immigrants and make it all White again*' with '*White English people*' deserving '*priority over foreigners*'. In the process of conducting this study I spoke to a teacher who had administered the survey to her class. The class comprised of 15 and 16 year old White British people and the school was located in Leicestershire within an area characterised by significant socio-economic disadvantage. The teacher explained that whilst the class were filling in the questionnaire, one student made a negative comment about immigrants out-loud and then looked directly at her asking, "*Why do they all come over here?*" Although Hannah teaches English she found herself using the rest of the lesson to discuss immigration and the different reasons why people might come to Britain, such as asylum seekers and refugees. Shockingly, none of the students within the class knew the meaning of the terms asylum seeker or refugee. Hannah spoke of the disbelief she felt on realising that 15 and 16 year old students knew nothing about immigration further than the myths and sensationalised stories they had heard from their friends, family and the media.

Hannah also recalled another experience where an exchange student came into the class she was teaching:

Hannah: *I remember one time, we had exchange students and it was for people doing their A levels to go to Nigeria or Rwanda, and then students from there came to here. You should have seen the reactions of some of the pupils, they were just in shock ... asking questions like why are they so black, and why do they speak funny. I couldn't believe that they were like that ... do you know what though, it's even British born minorities. There is a teacher who is like South East Asian or something and the pupils during Ofsted did everything to try and jeopardise her lessons.*

Researcher: *That's shocking.*

Hannah: *It is, but then you have got to think of the area that the kids are from.*

Again, the above exchange illustrates the lack of interaction the student sample has with 'difference' and diversity in the context of their everyday life. As demonstrated through the questions asked by the students, young people tend not to differentiate between people based on a singular aspect of identity such as ethnicity or religion, but instead pick up on the visible 'differences' in skin colour, language and dress (Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). In addition, the foreign exchange student would have been regarded as vulnerable due to being in a numerical minority position, and therefore an easy target to make fun of and bully. This conversation with the teacher exposes the everyday racism and intolerance expressed by the students within her class. The student who made the negative comment about 'immigrants' saw nothing wrong with voicing this opinion to other students in front of the teacher within a school environment. As with the subgroup, there appears to be an understanding amongst the students that their peers would at least tolerate, if not share the same view and therefore expressing everyday racism is considered banal and unexceptional. Hannah's last comment attempted to explain the views and actions of this group of students by highlighting where they came from. This could be interpreted as Hannah suggesting that the young people within her class were exposed to this form of everyday prejudice because of where they lived and therefore, their views were seen as an extension of those held by their friends, family and the wider community.

When the subgroup engaged in a discussion on immigration it was evident that they were heavily influenced by societal stereotypes and myths, and were unable to

distinguish between 'immigrants' and British-born minority ethnic communities:

Researcher: *So if they come over and work then that's OK?*

Luke: *Yeah ... well there's still loads of shit that's caused by them.*

Researcher: *Like what?*

Luke: *If you got rid of immigrants like all of them, there would be more jobs and crime would go down loads, wouldn't it?*

Researcher: *Do you think?*

Luke: *Yeah like all robberies ... and stabbings from Blacks. Everything would go down if they went back to their own countries ...*

The time spent with the subgroup on 'their' turf provided a deeper understanding of why there was such resentment and intolerance towards 'immigrants' and 'foreigners'. Using the concept of everyday multiculturalism provides an analytical lens which enables a researcher to become more attuned to local tensions and conflicts. The subgroup spoke about "*immigrants*" in Leicester and often referred to the Asian, Polish and the Somalian communities. This could be explained by the high visibility of these minority ethnic groups in local public spaces, the geographical segregation preventing everyday contact between the subgroup and these communities, the unstable economic climate and finally, the heightened political context towards immigration. It is these conditions which Hjerm (2007) believes facilitates and exacerbates feelings of group threat. The present study supports the research outlined in the literature review which found that when it comes to the 'issue' of immigration, young people voice high levels of everyday prejudice and xenophobic views (Walker and Taylor, 2011). The younger respondents in Bartlett's *et al.* (2011) study expressed great frustration about what they perceived as a loss of national identity and a lack of opportunities in education, employment and housing, both of which were deemed to be caused by 'immigrants' coming to Britain.

This underlying tension was conflated by the belief that minority ethnic groups were receiving preferential treatment over the 'native' White British population:

Researcher: *Why would you get Muslims out?*

Tyler: *Just hate 'em.*

Researcher: Any reason in particular though?

Tyler: No (laughing).

Ryan: Why not? They're fucking terrorists and take all our fucking jobs.

Researcher: And you think that you haven't (got a job) because of Muslim people?

Ryan: Just all the fucking immigrants.

And:

Will: I think we have too many of 'em ... but it's the ones that don't have visas to come here like the Polish.

Researcher: Right?

Will: They don't do anything. They're just here to get the houses and all the free stuff they can from us.

And:

Steph: They (local Asian community) get everything though like down there they've got this new like Centre where you can do DJ-ing and play loads of sports and it's like open all the time but only for Pakis.

Researcher: So you think this area hasn't got anything because you're all White?

James: Fuck yeah, they get everything.

Researcher: But it's not that far from here, why don't you guys go try it?

Connor: No way ... why would we want to be around a load of curry munchers ... there'd be so many fights.

Steph: God imagine the smell (laughing).

These exchanges illustrate that the frustration and bitterness felt by the subgroup was exacerbated by observations and experiences within their daily life. For example, Ryan did not have any educational qualifications, had never succeeded in getting a job interview and had been on benefits since turning 16 years old. As found in both Ray and Smith's (2001) and Gadd and Dixon's (2005) studies, young, unemployed males attributed the inability to secure employment and improve their standard of living to the presence of 'immigrants' and 'foreigners'. Due to the geographical location in which Ryan lives, he was confronted by people with visible markers of 'difference' and 'foreignness' in the mundane spaces of everyday life. In some ways this generates a double sense of shame. Firstly, Ryan was 'hanging around' with people who were much younger than him and at 19 years old there is a societal expectation that he

should either be in further education or secure employment. Secondly, Ryan had grown up within a socio-cultural context which has denigrated and dehumanised specific groups of 'Others', yet it is these 'Others' who he routinely observed as doing better than himself. Of the subgroup members Ryan was the angriest, held the most extreme racist views, and most frequently acted upon underlying prejudices and frustrations within the context of everyday life.

5.4.3 Perceptions of Entitlement

Finally, the underlying tension and hostility felt by the subgroup towards 'immigrants', 'Muslims' and diversity more generally, was further exacerbated by their expectations of entitlement. As outlined in Chapter Three, it is presumed that being White in a multicultural context is a protective and normative attribute (Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011). However, research illustrates that this sense of safety and security is dependent on your status within society and your group's numerical presence within a given geographical space. Sachdev and Bourhis (1991) found 'dominant high-status members in society who find themselves in numerical-minority contexts were highly discriminatory toward subordinate low-status, numerical-majority group members' (cited in Kumar, Seay and Karabenick, 2011). The present study mirrored the findings in Sachdev and Bourhis's (1991) research, in that because the subgroup were in a numerical minority position within a super diverse micro-geography, it strengthened their White racial identity and emphasised their distinctness to the ethnic 'Other'.

For the subgroup, emphasising their normalcy through belittling minority groups' 'differences', such as their skin colour, dress, language and other cultural practices, created a distance and perceived superiority over ethnic and religious 'Others'. Being White British provided a rare source of pride within the subgroup. They held the view that the 'native' White British population were more deserving than minority ethnic communities, irrespective as to whether a minority ethnic person was born in the country or not. The subgroup struggled to conceive that British born minority ethnic people were as entitled to societal resources as they were and members of the group often remarked that even if Asian and Black people were born in the country, they

were still “*not English*”. It was within these discussion that the subgroup would use the term “*English*” rather than “*British*”, as compared to the concept of ‘Britishness’ which is seen to embody a plurality of identities, the term ‘English’ is still somewhat synonymous with Whiteness. The need to prove their Englishness or rather stand up for what they perceived to be the loss of English patriotism was starkly evident. When the group were speaking to their youth workers about arranging a football match with a local team, the following discussion took place:

Youth Worker: *Yeah so it’d be a football match against (name) ... we’d get the transport sorted and give you a lift over there.*

Connor: *What? (animated) We ain’t fucking playing against them.*

James: *I’ll take my fucking England flag down there!*

Researcher: *Why? ... Why wouldn’t you play against them?*

Will: *(laughing) Yeah show them what it’s like to be English!*

Connor: *(laughing) Probably can’t even play football anyway ... Paki’s play cricket don’t they? (group laughs)*

Researcher: *But I’m confused ... why wouldn’t you play a match against (name)?*

Alex: *(directed at interviewer) You know we ain’t allowed to wear England shirts now ‘cos of the fucking Muslims?*

Researcher: *What? ... Where have you heard this?*

Chris: *He’s actually right, we’re not allowed to wear England shirts in the pubs for the world cup ‘cos it might offend them?*

Alex: *It really fucks me off ... they ain’t even English!*

Researcher: *So where did you hear this from?*

Alex: *Everybody’s talking about it.*

This theme also emerged from the survey data, where certain out-groups such as the Muslim population and immigrant communities were perceived as not being proud of being in England, with one respondent stating that ‘*they find it offensive to hang the English flag in the window*’. Spending time with the subgroup exposed the layers of intolerance and hostility directed towards specific groups of ‘Others’. Firstly, ‘immigrants’ and the Muslim community were perceived as a threat, coming to Britain to take employment away from the ‘native’ hard-working population. Secondly, these out-groups were perceived to be coming to Britain solely for the purpose of sponging from the state, receiving benefits and local authority housing, which was also at the

expense of the 'native' hard-working population. Both of these beliefs were exacerbated by the perception that these groups of 'Others' were coming to the country and not only refusing to assimilate to the British-way of life but also, were preventing 'native' British people from celebrating their own history, traditions and customs.

It is amongst this backdrop of underlying tensions that everyday interactions in which a minority ethnic person was perceived to be rude, ignore or look down on a subgroup member, generated further resentment. Discussions with subgroup members illustrated that although they were frustrated by the belief that 'immigrants' were taking what they perceived to be 'theirs', it was even more infuriating that minority ethnic groups were not giving the 'native' White British community respect. There was almost an assumption that 'foreigners' and the Muslims community should know *their* place and accept that the 'native' White British population are superior and therefore, more entitled than them:

Researcher: *So it's because of not getting a job?*

Ryan: *Ain't even that, it's just the way they are. They're so fucking rude ... Like I was riding my bike and two Pakis were in front of me ... they both turned to like look at me and then fucking turned back around and didn't move ... Does my head in.*

And:

Ryan: *That's the thing with fucking Muslims they walk around like they fucking own it ... like him, he puts his fucking turban on and things he's the fucking dogs.*

Connor: *It's like he comes up to us and tells us what to do ... he gets so much fucking abuse (animated).*

In the context of their everyday life the subgroup were made to feel inferior and in their own way, made to feel 'different' from the wider society. Inequality, and the resultant frustration at occupying a disadvantaged position, was central to Cohen's (1955) explanation of youth delinquency. Cohen (1955) suggests that when young people experience social and economic deprivation they are likely to use outward hostility and criminal behaviour to symbolise their frustration at being unable to rectify

the situation. Cohen's (1955) subcultural theory can be used to explain why the group expressed such aggression towards certain 'out-group' and engaged in general level offending. Both within education and employment the subgroup felt a sense of failure and a lack of hope in rectifying the current situation. As I walked around the local area with the group, I could feel the stares which often conveyed feelings of fear and disgust. Occasionally group members would talk about the ridicule they faced because of how they dressed, the jewellery they wore and the tattoos they had:

Steph: *I get it like walking down the streets and like someone shouts "Slag" or "Chav."*

Researcher: *Really?*

Steph: *Yeah loads ... I've been in fights because of it like from girls who shout abuse.*

Researcher: *But what about from adults?*

Claire: *There well bad ... they just like say something quiet and just look at you like you're a piece of shit on the floor.*

And:

Ryan: *You just know you aint gunna get a job as soon as you walk in and they just bare stare at you.*

Alex: *Yeah and they see me like shaking with my tattoo on my neck.*

Ryan: *It makes me just wanna knock 'em out cuz they don't know me.*

Charlie: *That's why I walked out the job interview I had. They were just bitches like staring and saying stuff. I was like I'm gunna like start a fight so I just went.*

This group of young people felt that they were being perpetually looked down on, made to feel as if they had failed and were consciously aware of the limited opportunities they had to achieve legitimate success and recognition. As Chapter Two highlighted, research suggests that young people from a disadvantaged White British background have become an ostracised group, suffering a unique form of public ridicule and stigmatisation. The subgroup saw themselves as being the 'real victims' of a society which excludes and belittles them, as found in Sibbit's (1997) research. As Mo, a Youth Worker engaging with the subgroup explains:

Mo: *It's clear with the young people I work with around here that they are different themselves or think they are different from the norm ... like with Dan, his ADHD and self-harming ... that makes him different and he knows this but he just deals with it by becoming the bully ... he's been a victim himself and it's*

just how he channels his emotions... I think all of these young people have insecurities about themselves ... but they find other people's vulnerabilities and focus on those ... and they just channel their anger and their hatred ...

Importantly, the attachment the group felt to each other, their families and the immediate community, emphasised specific aspects of their identity, and strengthened the importance of their distinct culture and views. Being White British and maintaining the 'traditional' customs and values provided the group with their validation and perceived superiority over ethnic and religious 'Others'. Living within a multicultural micro-geography produces and reproduces feelings of 'difference' and hostility which increased the importance of identity and place to this group of young people.

5.5 Exploring the Lived Reality of Multiculturalism

This study aimed to explore the lived reality of everyday multiculturalism for young White British people in Leicester. This chapter so far has highlighted that nearly three quarters ($n=299$) of the sample felt that England's multicultural population is a positive trait. However, analysis of the survey responses and the fieldwork phase with the subgroup, identified the presence of underlying tension towards multiculturalism and specific minority groups such as the Muslim community and 'immigrants'. This could be interpreted as highlighting existing fault lines between different ethnic and religious groups in Leicester. To explore this in more depth the questionnaire respondents were asked whether they thought different ethnic groups within Leicester got on well together, of which 34.1% ($n=141$) answered 'Yes', 41.0% ($n=170$) said 'No' and 24.7% ($n=102$) stated 'Sometimes'. Compared to the first question pertaining to their thoughts on multiculturalism, this question divided the survey sample. For those who answered 'Yes', a range of explanations were offered:

It has become the norm to live amongst different ethnicities so there is less discrimination.

Leicester has such a mix and we are always exposed to each other.

Everyone has learnt to be tolerant.

It is accepted that different coloured people are allowed to be living in Leicester.

We have been brought up to get along.

Because we all get on well.

Because they have learnt to live together peacefully.

Most ethnic groups get on most of the time.

The majority of people in Leicester are polite and respectful and work well as a community.

Many respondents within the survey commented on the perceived normalcy of the ethnic diversity in Leicester: *'they are all people and it doesn't matter what ethnicity you are'* and *'they are all the same just a different colour or religion'*. There was also the suggestion that different ethnic groups get along within Leicester because *'they have to' 'otherwise it's not legal'*. Participants within this sample referred to the visible, everyday examples of social and community cohesion in Leicester:

People from different ethnic groups go to the same school.

I have friends who are.

You always see everyone working together, going to school together and hanging out together.

Because we get on well in football teams and rugby.

They are in each other's company constantly.

They all seem to talk to each other.

You don't hear of mass fights or arguments.

They go to school together and grow up together and are used to seeing them.

Within the 24.7% ($n=102$) of respondents who offered an explanation of why they thought different ethnic groups only get along some of the time, geographical division and segregation emerged as significant theme:

Large areas with one ethnicity, too much segregation.

In schools they get on but where everyone lives it is quite divided.

Each community seems to keep themselves to themselves.

Depends where you live in Leicester.

They segregate themselves.

There are some areas where friction is apparent.

Too much clash between cultures. People don't feel it necessary to integrate in society- speak English etc.

Some areas are predominantly just one ethnic group.

They do most of the time because they never interact with each other.

I think some white people find themselves outnumbered by other ethnic groups.

This could be interpreted as supporting Bonney and LeGoff's (2007) observations that

although Leicester is one of the most multicultural cities and should be praised for its management of diversity, it has tended to disperse different communities on the basis of their ethnicity. Micro public spaces in Leicester, such as the town centre and supermarkets, give an indication of the city's super diverse population. However, the urban geography of Leicester in terms of housing is occupied in a more divided manner. One could easily identify areas within the city which are inhabited predominantly with a specific community such as Somalian, Indian, Eastern European and White British. As stated in the previous chapter, Leicester is reported to be the tenth most segregated city in Britain (State of the English Cities Report, 2005, as cited in Leicester City Council, 2008), and for this reason could be regarded as 'sleepwalking' its 'way to segregation' (CRE, 2005).

Of the quarter ($n=102$) of young White British people who felt that different ethnic groups only get along some of the time, a significant proportion situated the 'blame' within minority ethnic communities who do not want to integrate with the 'native' White British population. Undoubtedly this perception will impact on everyday interactions with diversity; firstly, living in a segregated city means that young White British people may not come into contact with minority ethnic communities in the mundane social spaces of everyday life, and therefore will be unfamiliar with 'difference'; and secondly, if young White British people hold the view that minority ethnic people do not want to mix with 'native' White British people, then it is likely to undermine the ordinary encounters and interactions which take place in the context of everyday life.

41.0% ($n=170$) of the questionnaire respondents felt that different ethnic groups did not get on well together in Leicester. Of this sample 47% ($n=81$) thought that 'racism' was the cause. As one respondent explains:

Racism creates barriers and nobody knows if one person is racist or not, so the different groups are wary of each other.

Many of the young people who felt this way referred to a sense of 'hostility', a 'lack of respect' and 'tension' between minority ethnic communities and the 'native' White British population. Compared to the 34.1% ($n=141$) who felt that Leicester was socially

cohesive because they did not see any physical manifestations of racism, the young people within this sample (41% (n=170)) spoke of *'lots of racist fights/crime happens', 'they are always fighting' with minority groups 'causing a lot of conflict' and that 'people are either violent due to religion differences or try to dominate others'*. Compared to the other two categories, this sample focused more explicitly on the tensions between particular minority ethnic groups:

There is a great divide between White and Asian people and a lot of racial tension.

White people don't like Asian people.

Most Whites don't get on with others, however most Asian and Black people get on.

Because Whites are mostly racist and Asian and Black tend to get along.

A recurring theme within this sample of 41.0% (n=170) was that *'everyone sticks to their own race'*, with ethnic groups *'staying clear of each other'*, *'Indian culture all live in one community together and don't tend to mix with White people'* and *'They keep themselves to themselves, e.g. Whites, Blacks, Indians'*. Of the total sample who felt that people from different ethnic backgrounds did not get on well together in Leicester, there was a small proportion of respondents who offered a more direct and hostile explanation. This sample of young people explained that people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds:

Just don't get on.

They hate each other.

We don't like them.

The White people don't like Black people.

Do they fuck cuz [sic] White people don't like Black people and Black people don't like White people.

They are not from here and they're different. They don't dress or speak English and it annoys people.

There is too much difference and people don't like it.

Although a small minority, there were respondents who stated that ethnic and religious diversity was a central factor as to why they did not like living in Leicester. The questionnaire asked respondents whether they liked living in Leicester, to which 55.2% (n=235) answered 'yes' because their *'friends live here'*, it has a *'good shopping centre'* and simply, because it is *'home'*. Of the 38.3% (n=163) of respondents who

answered 'No', the majority provided general comments of there being '*nothing to do*', '*no facilities*', the city being '*dirty*' and that there are '*too many crimes*'. However, a small minority of young people within the sample of 38.3% explained that they did not like living in Leicester because:

It's a dump, too many immigrants.

It's too multicultural and tension builds between racial groups.

There are too many Asians living in the country and city.

Everyone speaks a different language.

More non-English, you feel out of place.

Too many illegal immigrants.

There lots of crimes and terrorists.

In minority.

Let's too many people in and not enough room.

Because there is hardly any British now living there.

Too many coloured people than Whites (makes me nervous).

It is evident that for some young White British people the reality of living amongst diversity in Leicester impacts significantly upon their routine, everyday life.

Providing the Leicester specific context was paramount to exploring whether the abstract notion of multiculturalism is different to the lived reality. Legrain (2006: 276) explains that White British people are often accepting of the label of a multicultural society as long as it is not visually apparent within everyday spaces. The central themes raised by the sample appeared to focus on the notion of 'difference' and geographical segregation preventing successful and meaningful interaction. The qualitative explanations began to create a picture of a significant proportion of young people struggling to negotiate and engage with multiculturalism because of the real or imagined geographical, language and cultural barriers. Providing the Leicester specific context required participants to draw from their own, personal perceptions and experiences of engaging with ethnic and religious diversity. It is the relativist nature of everyday multiculturalism which illustrates a different lived reality to that of Leicester being a multicultural utopia and highlights the very real challenges and complexities that exist. In reality multiculturalism is a dynamic, fluid and lived field of action within

which people try to manage and negotiate ethnic and religious difference, through ideas of national belonging and identity. It is through engaging more closely with the lived experience and the changing cultural and material geographies of young lives that one can begin to explore the challenges and complexities they face when engaging with diversity.

5.5.1 Disengaging with Diversity and 'Difference'

After observing, and for a short time being part of the participants' lived reality, it became necessary not to explore how the subgroup *engaged* with 'difference' and diversity, but rather how they *disengaged* with it. The subgroup openly admitted to rarely travelling outside of their 'local' familiar area. Although often said in a jovial manner, certain members spoke of the likelihood of being "*stabbed up*", or even "*blown up*" if they were to go to certain areas of Leicester. The responses from the subgroup had shocked me, as geographically they were less than ten minutes from the city centre, yet rarely, if ever would travel into 'town'. When asked more directly why they would not engage with minority ethnic people, even if they were in the same area, often very basic explanations were offered such as they "*eat weird food*", "*smell*", "*don't wash*" and "*don't speak English*". The fact that the subgroup consciously avoids interacting with multiculturalism could explain why they offered such simple, direct responses to why people from different ethnic background 'just don't get along', '*they hate each other*', '*we don't like them*' and '*stay clear of each other*'. As the following exchange demonstrates, the subgroup were reluctant to even venture to areas "*down the road*" because of the ethnic and religious population they were likely to encounter:

Kyle: *It's like just down the road though ... you just wouldn't go on your own.*

Matt: *Fuck no.*

Kyle: *Have you been (name)? (directed at researcher)*

Researcher: *No, where's that?*

Kyle: *It's just down the road.*

Researcher: *Oh ok no ... why do you ask?*

Matt: *I hate going down (name). It's like an ant farm or something ... with them all scurrying about (group laughs).*

James: *That's where you play that game (laughing).*

Researcher: *What game?*

James: *Spot the White person (group laughs).*

The group would often pass up opportunities to take part in activities that they were interested in because it might involve them engaging with a particular minority ethnic community:

Researcher: *So you wouldn't play a football match against a group of Asian lads?*

Connor: *Fuck no ... actually if there weren't going to be no ref I would (laughing).*

James: *The smell of curry would make me not want to play! (laughing).*

Ryan: *They'd probably try and fucking blow us up or something.*

Researcher: *I don't think you're thinking of the right area anyway ... you're thinking of (name) and I mean playing against young people in (area)...*

Connor: *So there all White there?*

Researcher: *Well probably.*

Connor: *Thank fuck for that! (group laughs)*

Over the three months spent with the subgroup it became apparent that they had developed a mental map based on the 'safe' and 'unsafe' areas in the local vicinity. This finding is similar to Thomas and Sanderson's (2013) study exploring perceptions of social and community cohesion with the White British population in both Oldham and Rochdale. They found that the young men within their study had constructed a mental picture which was often based on racialised notions of ownership, belonging and territory (Kintrea, *et al.*, 2008; Thomas and Sanderson, 2013). As with the subgroup in this study, Thomas and Sanderson's (2013) research found that the young White British people perceived the town centres as being unsafe because of the significant Muslim populations within these areas. The thought of consciously restricting my travel around a city in which I had grown up because there might be a chance of interacting with minority ethnic groups was incomprehensible.

For this group of young people, their locality generated a geography of inclusion around which they constructed a sense of pride, cultural identity and belonging. By not

addressing the meaning and feelings of prejudice and 'difference', this group of young people, their family and community will continue to self-segregate. As Ouseley (2001: 16) explains, 'comfort zones' create contracultures which produce both virtual and real boundaries of exclusion, thus preventing any opportunity for contact and the development of community relations, tolerance and trust. For young disadvantaged people territoriality can be seen as a form of cultural capital, where a sense of isolation from wider society enhances a sense of place attachment (Pickering, Kintrea and Bannister, 2012). Harris (2009) amongst others, suggest that micro-territories such as schools, shop corners, parks and places of entertainment can become symbolic representations of identity and ownership to disadvantaged and marginalised young people. To this subgroup of young people, their local park, underpass, leisure centre and corner shops provided their comfort zones, places they claimed ownership over and felt a sense of belonging. When the importance of location is understood in conjunction with the existence of stereotypes and prejudices which are exacerbated by their current socio-economic situation, it offers a greater understanding of why the subgroup actively disengaged with Leicester's multicultural and diverse population.

The unwillingness to travel outside of their 'safe' space also served to constrain their opportunities for economic and cultural capital and social mobility, compounding and reproducing the stereotypes and tensions towards people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Being part of the lived reality of this group of young people even for a short time, brought to the fore how different my own upbringing and current circumstance were. The social and economic disadvantage in which this group found themselves in and the geographical nearness to super diversity, is not an environment experienced by the more wealthy White British population. It was this aspect that exemplified Beck's (1992:34) statement that 'the wealthy (in income, power or education) can *purchase* safety and freedom from risk'. At the end of each outing I was able to return to a majority White British area, knowing that I had job security and at any point had the opportunity to change different aspects of my life. Developing a more nuanced understanding of why some people are more willing than others to accept and engage with multiculturalism, can only be achieved through adopting a framework which captures the lived reality.

This study explored whether it was the socio-economic context and exposure to racist and religiously-motivated prejudice which undermined how young people came to engage with multiculturalism, or whether the lived reality of ethnic and religious diversity perpetuated the intolerance and hostility towards the 'Other'. Perhaps a more realistic conclusion is that the two cannot be separated, and in fact it is the cyclic process of these views and experiences which come to influence how young people feel about their multicultural city.

5.5.2 A Silver Lining?

Although the majority of the group expressed an unwillingness and reluctance to engage with diversity, there were some individuals within the group who were in situations that facilitated a 'softer' engagement with minority ethnic communities. Effective engagement over a sustained period can have a significant impact on a young person who feels marginalised, isolated and uncared for. This was most poignantly demonstrated through conversations with Dan who was sent back and forth from his parent's home to a children's home. Dan had been arrested for racially aggravated assault in an incident involving a security guard (discussed in detail within the next chapter) and would frequently voice extreme racist views. In a discussion with Dan it became apparent that a relationship he formed with an Asian support worker at the children's home had been pivotal in the reduction of his racist views:

Researcher: *So you don't say as much racist stuff now?*

Dan: *What's the point? They're still gun' be here ain't they? ... some ain't even that bad to be fair like Jit he's like my worker at the home, he's safe. He's like not like how I thought they were.*

Researcher: *What Asian people? (Dan nods) ... So you think that meeting an Asian person and seeing they're ok, that changes your mind about them?*

Dan: *Yeah he's well funny ... he has sick clothes and like last night I went mad like smashed up my room cuz' they found my weed and took it and he like just came in and just sat with me ... he helped me like clear up.*

As explained through contact theory (Brewer and Brown, 1998; Schalk-Soekar, *et al.*,

2004), meaningful interaction with a youth worker, teacher or support worker from an out-group in the context of everyday life can lead to a greater understanding of 'difference', and therefore becoming more tolerant of and familiar with diversity. This point is further supported in a discussion with a detached youth worker who found that working with Alex, who openly expressed racist views, helped to challenge his underlying prejudices and stereotypes:

Jazz: *I worked one to one with a young girl, she was 18 and had a serious hatred for Black people and would use such words as 'nigger' all the time and I challenged her on this...like to find out where this had come from ... and she'd had so many bad experiences in her life but one of them was being robbed by a Black man when she was younger and now she didn't trust them ... it's like one bad experience and now she was prejudiced against Black people.*

Researcher: *So you think experiences play a big part in someone becoming prejudiced?*

Jazz: *Huge ... but also the other way with positive experiences like Alex with me, he was so racist and really hated Asian people ... and working one to one with him changed his opinion a bit I think ... It's just challenging their stereotypes like the 'bud bud ding ding'... although they may have had one bad experience on the whole they don't mix ... like White young people especially have little experience with different ethnic groups.*

Researcher: *Yeah?*

Jazz: *They won't have had an Asian or a Black friend or had anything to challenge those stereotypes they have.*

Jazz alludes to young people living 'parallel lives' (Cantle, 2001) whereby young people from different ethnic backgrounds live within a given city in yet rarely have meaningful interaction, such as the subgroup within this study. It is the lack of contact with 'difference', as identified throughout this chapter, that enables myths, stereotypes and prejudices about the 'Other' to pervade. This is not to suggest that 'contact' is the panacea; scholars within the field of everyday multiculturalism have been vocal in distinguishing between 'contact' and meaningful interaction, and emphasising the impact that the latter can have on reducing levels of prejudice (Valentine, 2008). For example, Amin (2002:969) uses the term 'prosaic negotiations' to describe the micropublics of everyday social contact and encounter such as workplaces, schools, colleges and youth centres. These micropublics require habitual engagement and facilitate social actors negotiating and managing 'difference' in their everyday encounters. The ideal sites, according to Back, are those where 'prosaic negotiations'

are compulsory (cited in Amin, 2002: 969). As Valentine (2008) explains, mere co-presence does not guarantee contact, exchange or deep engagement and in some instances, it can even cement prejudice. Importantly, the kinds of places imagined by these scholars as sites of prosaic, compulsory negotiations are those which are frequented by young people: schools, colleges, youth centres, sports clubs and music clubs (Amin, 2002; Navak, 2007). These places, the micro-territories of youth geographies, are ones where people are obliged to associate and to interact with one another in conditions of both learning and leisure. Although the relationship between Dan and Alex and their support workers is not always easy to facilitate, it indicates that even with a group of young people who appear vehemently against multiculturalism and are unwilling to engage with 'difference', there is still a chance for meaningful and successful interactions leading to a reduction in levels of hostility.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter sought to explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism by comparing the ideology of multiculturalism to the lived reality of social cohesion between people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds in Leicester. Initially, this chapter detailed the findings from a questionnaire which had been designed to collect opinions on current British affairs, multiculturalism and to explore the capacity in which members of different ethnic, religious and cultural groups engage with each other in Leicester. In total 425 surveys were collected from self-defining White British people aged between 14 and 19 years old who lived in Leicester and Leicestershire. The responses demonstrate that although the majority of young people are aware of the positive attributes multiculturalism can bring to a country, understanding of the ideology is very different to their context-specific experiences of ethnic and religious diversity in Leicester. The survey findings suggest that real and/or imagined geographical divisions and cultural differences could be undermining social cohesion and engagement in Leicester and Leicestershire. However, analysis of the survey findings, without detailed participant demographics and an investigation of the socio-cultural context in which they live, is limited in its explanatory ability. It is for this

reason that further insight is gained from the data collected from the fieldwork phase with the subgroup of young, White British people.

One of the most important aspects of this research was the appropriateness and effectiveness of employing an ethnographic strategy. It was this strand of methodology which enabled me to explore the concept of everyday multiculturalism in-depth and capture the daily challenges and complexities facing young White-British people living in Leicester. This study found that the disconnect between the subgroup's expectations of White entitlement and their means of achieving social mobility and success, produces feelings of insecurity and bitterness. After observing, and for a short time being part of the participants' lived reality, it became necessary not to explore *how* the subgroup interpreted and engaged with difference and diversity, but rather *why* they did not.

This chapter specifically illustrated the importance of location to the members of the subgroup, the strength of their attachment to each other as well as their family and the wider community, and the exclusion they felt from education, employment and the wider society more generally. Exploring the subgroup through a more complex framework highlights that identity and place have more 'emotional resonance' with this group of young White British people (Ipsos MORI, 2005: 5). To this group, holding racist and religiously prejudiced views and even expressing them was nothing irrational or out of the ordinary. The group's overwhelming hostility towards Leicester's multicultural population appeared to be fuelled, and continually exacerbated by their individual circumstances, the socio-cultural context in which they live and the limited interaction they had with ethnic and religious difference. It is the interplay between these individual characteristics and the lived reality of their social and cultural contexts which contributes to the subgroup's reluctance to accept or engage with Leicester's multicultural population.

CHAPTER SIX

6. Targeted Hostility in Context

6.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the involvement of young White British people in acts of targeted hostility; incidents in which the victim is selected based upon their actual or perceived ethnic or religious identity. Specifically it aims to address the second research question, which considers whether the concept of everyday multiculturalism is effective in helping to understand the contexts and situational cues that can motivate and cause young White British people to act upon underlying prejudices. The previous chapter considered how multiculturalism as an ideology can differ from the everyday, lived reality of engaging and negotiating with ethnic and religious diversity. Combining the survey findings and fieldwork data highlighted that there is an underlying fear and hostility towards specific groups of 'Others' such as 'immigrants' and the Muslim community, and perceived barriers preventing meaningful interaction in the context of everyday life. This hostility was most evidently felt by the subgroup of young White British people who actively chose to disengage with Leicester's multicultural population. It appeared that their prejudices and intolerance towards ethnic and religious 'difference' was fuelled, and continually exacerbated by their individual circumstances and the socio-cultural context in which they lived. It is within this lived reality that this chapter seeks to explore expressions and enactments of targeted hostility.

The chapter again combines the survey findings and fieldwork data to explore the sample's exposure to prejudice and involvement in racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility. As identified throughout this thesis, researchers tend to shy away from conducting research with young people, particularly when the participants are considered to be vulnerable or hard to reach and the topic is perceived to be contentious or challenging. Therefore, this chapter also provides a platform to convey

what young people themselves think motivates individuals to target someone based solely on their actual or perceived identity. This complements the observations and discussions with the subgroup of young White British people who openly admitted their involvement in targeted hostility. Finally, the chapter argues that the concept of everyday multiculturalism and specifically a greater recognition to the challenges and conflicts which arise within these contexts, can further enhance our understanding of targeted hostility.

6.2 'Everyday' Racism

As outlined in Chapter Three, targeted hostility is more commonly attributed to the label of 'hate crime', a term which has been plagued by criticism. Particularly pertinent for this chapter is that the term 'hate crime' conveys behaviour which is extreme in nature and therefore, by extension those who commit such acts are thought to be far-right, hate fuelled individuals (Gadd and Dixon, 2005). It is for this reason that this thesis has instead used the label targeted hostility in order to emphasise that the majority of such acts are motivated by unfamiliarity and intolerance towards 'difference'. Growing up within an environment in which racially and religiously motivated prejudices are common place and whereby specific groups of 'Others' are blamed for threatening the 'native' inhabitants rights to employment and societal resources more generally, is seen as facilitating a resistance to difference. As the previous chapter detailed, both the survey findings and subgroup data highlighted stereotypical and prejudiced views towards 'immigrants' and the Muslim community in particular. The prejudice and frustration directed towards these groups cannot be disconnected from the current socio-economic and political climate, whereby such groups are used as scapegoats for the ills within society. Racially and religiously motivated prejudices and the associated feelings of fear and hostility towards the 'Other', are seen as being key factors in the commission of targeted hostility. As the last chapter illustrated, the subgroup were positioned within an insecure socio-economic context in which "*everyone*" was perceived to be racist. The next section

explores whether the young White British student sample were as exposed to racially and religiously motivated prejudice, how often they heard such views and from whom.

Due to my observations and discussions with the subgroup over the three months fieldwork phase it came as little surprise when 14 members reported hearing racist views on a 'Daily' basis, with one answering 'Regularly' in the survey. I think many 'outsiders', like myself initially, would have been shocked to hear that expressions of everyday racism and religiously motivated prejudice were still so frequently voiced in a city such as Leicester. The questionnaire was designed so as to explore whether the subgroup's experiences was a lived reality more broadly for young White British people in Leicester. Of the 425 participants who were asked if they had ever heard racist views or religiously motivated prejudices 86.9% ($n=346$) answered 'Yes'. 36.2% ($n=122$) answered that they had heard prejudiced views 'Under Five Times', whilst 28.8% ($n=97$) ticked 'Regularly' and 15.1% ($n=51$) stated 'Daily' exposure to racism. Of the 43.2% ($n=142$) who stated that they heard racist views routinely, this was most frequently expressed from family members and friends³. This frequent exposure to racist and religiously motivated prejudice could have had a significant impact on the ways in which this group interpreted and engaged with multiculturalism. It is when challenges and contestations arise within the context of everyday life that prejudices may surface and be interpreted as targeted hostility. Although the survey data conveys that there is a significant proportion of young White British people in Leicester who are regularly exposed to racism, it is limited in being able to provide the contexts in which underlying prejudices may manifest into acts of targeted hostility.

The auto-ethnographical fieldwork with the subgroup of young White British people was key to understanding the relationship between exposure to prejudice, living within a multicultural micro-geography and the contexts in which targeted hostility takes place. Although this section primarily focuses on the experience of engaging with the subgroup, the survey data is drawn upon to consider whether the motivations for committing targeted hostility are supported within a wider population of young White British people in Leicester. As the previous chapter illustrated, the subgroup were

³ This has been calculated by combining both the 'Regularly' sample and the 'Daily' Sample.

overwhelmingly hostile and prejudiced towards minority ethnic groups and more generally, Leicester's multicultural population. Social psychological research has documented widely that contact with those who are different to ourselves is central to combating prejudice and stereotypical views. However, as already mentioned, the subgroup openly admitted to actively disengaging with the multicultural population surrounding them. The heightened importance of their local area to their identity and sense of belonging, contributed to the subgroup rarely travelling outside of their 'local' familiar area. It could be because the subgroup had so little engagement with the multicultural population around them that when asked if they thought people from different ethnic groups get along well together in Leicester they offered basic answers of *'they hate each other'*, *'we don't like them'* and *'they stay clear of each other'*⁴. Although the subgroup actively tried to disengage with those considered 'different' to them, there were certain multicultural spaces where they came in contact with ethnic and religious diversity. It was often within these micro-geographies that the subgroup's overwhelming prejudice and frustration surfaced through acts of targeted hostility.

6.3 Understanding Targeted Hostility

One of the micro-territories in which the subgroup openly admitted to engaging in targeted hostility was at school. For many within the subgroup school represented an unhappy and unwelcoming environment and a source of failure. Although the majority of the school student population could be characterised as being White British, some of the teachers were not. The conversation below demonstrates how the subgroup saw targeted victimisation as a means of alleviating boredom at school, and although openly admitting to giving "*abuse*" to most teachers, it was qualitatively different if they were from a minority ethnic community:

Researcher: *I haven't seen you in ages.*

Claire: *I know ... I've been going down (name) to see my boyfriend.*

Researcher: *How is everything? ... Like school and everything.*

⁴ These answers were taken from the subgroup's survey responses.

Claire: *(laughing)* Got fucking expelled again dint I?

Researcher: Not again ... what for?

Claire: Basically nothing *(smirking)*.

Researcher: Hmmm ... really? *(two other members from the group come over)*

Claire: He got expelled with me *(pointing at Connor)*.

Connor: *(laughing)* ... It was well funny.

Researcher: So ... come on, what did you do?

Connor: I walked into her classroom *(pointing at Claire)* and the teacher was in this like little office *(laughing)*.

James: Fucking hilarious.

Researcher: Yeah?

Connor: We locked her in this room *(looking at the researcher, animated)*.

Researcher: Seriously?

James: That's not all they did *(laughing)*.

Researcher: What else?

Claire: Nothing *(laughing)* ... all we did was like ask her who she was 'gun be voting for.

Researcher: Right ...

James: No ... *(laughing)* they started chanting BNP.

Connor: And she's a Paki teacher...*(laughing)*.

Researcher: No wonder you got expelled.

Although I had already spent two months with the group when this discussion took place, I was still utterly shocked by the openness of Claire and Connor in describing the incident, and visibly how much they revelled in the event. Claire and Connor had seen the opportunity for a “*well funny*” experience at the expense of “*a Paki teacher*”. In targeting the teacher they exposed their underlying prejudices but also by taking such enjoyment from making her “*cry*”, they displayed a complete lack of empathy. The animated way in which the group described the incident illustrated the thrill they felt in targeting someone and the insignificance of being “*expelled again*”. This was compounded by the reaction of their parents to this event. On continuing the discussion to assess how their parents had responded to their expulsion, Connor nonchalantly stated that his “*Dad found it funny*” because “*he hates Pakis too*”.

This incident of target hostility is seen as the end product of an interplay between the socio-economic context in which the subgroup live which legitimises and exacerbates their underlying prejudices and the immediate context of being bored within an

environment where the group feel frustrated and marginalised. For this group and their family, an act such as this is nothing exceptional or extreme, it is one of many incidents which take place within the context of everyday life. The contrast between the impact targeted hostility has on the victim to the intent of the offender is significant. The subgroup have been brought up within an environment which exaggerates the differences between people based on a range of factors, including skin colour, religion, dress and appearance and language, which leads to certain groups being seen as 'foreign', inferior and legitimate targets of prejudice and intolerance. This resistance to accepting difference and diversity significantly impacts on the ability for this group of young people to feel empathy with the target of their hostility. In order to understand what motivates a young person to target someone because of their identity, the immediate micro and lived macro context must be taken into account.

The majority of incidents of targeted hostility took place within the subgroup's own 'territory' and was primarily directed at Asian British residents and shop-owners through verbal abuse and 'low-level' attacks such as egg throwing and 'knock-a-door-run'. In the retelling of these experiences, the group saw nothing remarkable about these events. Within the context of their everyday lives, targeting a house, shop or individual on the street, based solely on the victim's perceived ethnicity or religion was no different in terms of acceptability, to them engaging in other forms of anti-social behaviour. Importantly though, if the subgroup engaged in targeted hostility then a more significant psycho-physiological reinforcement was experienced. Knowing that the group's actions had hurt somebody who was a 'foreigner', 'immigrant' or 'Muslim', contributed to a heightened sense of excitement and respect from other subgroup members. As found in similar studies with older perpetrators, the subgroup often committed acts of targeted hostility when multiple members were together, further reinforcing the homogeneity of their prejudices and sense of belonging to the group (Sibbit, 1997; Ray and Smith, 2001; Gadd and Dixon, 2005). The following extract details another conversation in which several participants recalled an experience in which the whole group had taken part:

Tyler: *Before you were here we did a proper like attack on this guard who was working at the flats.*

Researcher: *Yeah ...?*

Tyler: *Yeah it was well bad (laughing).*

Researcher: *Why, what happened?*

Tyler: *We were all there like proper shouting abuse at this black man.*

Researcher: *Was he the security guard?*

Alex: *Yeah ... we hated him didn't we?*

Tyler: *Yeah he was always having a go like telling us to move and all this shit.*

Researcher: *So were you shouting racist abuse at him?*

Alex: *(laughing) Yeah man it was sick.*

Tyler: *And he like came fucking running out proper after a fight.*

Alex: *Yeah yeah ... Dan just like smashed him.*

Chris: *They were proper fighting.*

James: *Then the feds came and we pegged it (laughing).*

Again, this act of targeted hostility took place within the context of everyday life, within a territory the subgroup perceived as being 'theirs' and when the group were all together. These factors are seen as contributing to the normalisation and perceived justification of this behaviour. This finding could be explained by using Matza and Sykes's (1957) work on neutralisation techniques. Of the five neutralisation techniques identified by Matza and Sykes (1957), they found that young people often justify their behaviour by explaining that they were 'appealing to higher loyalties'. In the three months I spent with the subgroup, nearly every incident of targeted hostility I observed or was told about involved three or more members of the subgroup. The works of Thrasher (1927), Sutherland (1939) and Cohen (1955) were used within the previous chapter to illustrate why young people views can become homogenised, why loyalty is a trait valued so highly within a 'gang' and why gang activity is so prominent within disadvantaged communities. For this group of young people engaging in targeted hostility was normalised because their friends were also committing such acts, and the incidents were seen as an extension of the prejudices expressed by their parents.

The use of neutralisation techniques has already been supported within the field of hate crime by research conducted by Byers *et al.* (1999) who explored the use of such

strategies by young people who committed hate crimes against the Amish community. They found that behaviour was a form of group bonding; a means by which group members secured their place within the group (Byers, *et al.*, 1999). As outlined in the previous chapter, due to the subgroup's disadvantaged social and economic circumstances and their lack of opportunity to gain social and cultural capital, being White British, belonging to 'their' area and being part of this friendship group was highly valued.

The incident detailed above, as with many others committed by the subgroup, demonstrates another of Matza and Sykes's (1957) neutralisation techniques in which there is a 'denial of the victim'. As Byers *et al.* (1999) found when applying Matza and Sykes's (1957) theory to hate offenders, young people involved in committing hate crimes often believe that either the victim got what they deserved, or that the harm caused to that individual was insignificant due to the perceived inferiority of the victim. When I had initially met the subgroup in my capacity as a youth worker I had been utterly perplexed as to how this group of young White British people not too dissimilar to myself, could target someone solely based upon their ethnicity or religion. However, central to trying to understand how the subgroup were able to commit acts of targeted hostility was to recognise the strength of their prejudiced views and complete lack of meaningful engagement with diversity. As previously addressed, the strength of the group's prejudice towards out-groups dehumanises and exaggerates 'difference', and therefore reinforces the view that the White British population, their friends and their family are positive, distinct and the norm.

As with the incident involving the teacher, targeting the security guard conveys the group's lack of empathy towards minority ethnic communities and perceived justification for the incident. The group felt entitled to racially abuse the security guard because he was a Black African male who had no right to ask them to move from 'their' territory. Although this incident led to Dan being arrested for racially aggravated assault, the group saw the event as a success as the security guard subsequently quit his job. The group recalled this story with such animation and pride. I was told about this incident towards the end of my second month with the group; I remember feeling

incredibly torn as to whether to express my disdain for this behaviour. It was these situations which I found most difficult as I did not feel as though I had gained sufficient respect and standing within the group to challenge such views without serious repercussions. This dilemma was further tested when witnessing acts of targeted hostility first-hand.

During my time with the subgroup there were occasions when incidents of targeted hostility were committed while I was in the group's company. On one of the occasions I had been walking with the subgroup from a corner shop to a leisure centre when they encountered the new detached youth workers in the area. The group had not warmed well to the youth workers, particularly as one of them was Asian British. The youth workers were talking to the group about the English Defence League as one of the member's older brothers had attended a demonstration in Leicester. Connor loudly stated that when he was old enough he would "*vote BNP*". Although voicing such a statement was nothing new in terms of demonstrating the group's knowledge of and inclination towards this party, the manner in which Connor made the comment was of interest. When pressed about why he would vote this way, unwaveringly he stared directly at the Asian youth worker and replied, "*They're the only ones who are going to get the Pakis out*". As I watched Connor I observed the mix of hostility, excitement and desired provocation in his actions. The youth worker continued talking without reaction and this exacerbated Connor's frustration. I could sense the anticipation from the group, who were like myself, bystanders to this tense exchange. As Connor realised that the youth worker was not going to rise to the taunt or convey any sign of hurt, he shouted at the top of his voice "*Fuck off home Pakis*". With this he, and the other members of the group, ran off. I was left standing with the two youth workers who, when asked about the incident casually stated, "*We're used to it*". Observing this 'low-level' incident, as with many others where the group opportunistically targeted an individual they deemed to be 'different' or unwelcome within 'their' area, conveyed the importance of the emotional experience this behaviour enabled. The group thrived on exciting experiences which broke up the mundane, routine nature of their days, and if this could be gained at the expense of an ethnic or religious 'Other', then it was especially gratifying.

As this section has highlighted, there are a range of motivating factors involved in acts of targeted hostility and such opportunities evoked a host of emotions within the subgroup. These observations only involved a group of 15 members and therefore, it was limited in its applicability and generalisability. For this reason, the survey was used as a means of gathering data from a much broader sample of young White British people living in the city and the county of Leicester. The final section of the survey asked the school student sample whether they had ever engaged in targeted hostility and what had motivated them to commit such acts. When designing the survey I was wary of how honest students would be due to the environment in which the sample was filling in the survey⁵. Although filling in the survey at school may have influenced participants to be not quite as honest as they might have been out of that context, I was still surprised that 25.7% ($n=104$) admitted to targeting someone because of their ethnicity. This finding paints quite a bleak picture, as the reality of the prevalence in which this sample had engaged in acts of targeted hostility may be even higher. Of the 25.7% ($n=104$), 84 offered a reason for committing acts of targeted hostility through predefined answers and in a space for writing further thoughts. The top three reasons given for targeting someone because of their ethnicity were: 'It was funny' (39.3% $n=33$); 'They deserved it' (38.1% $n=32$); and 'My friends were doing it' (22.6% ($n=19$)). As illustrated above, all three of these motivating factors had been identified through observations and discussions during the three months spent with the subgroup. Of those who offered a further explanation for committing acts of targeted hostility there were respondents who put the blame on the victim, stating that:

I don't like them, they scare me.

Sometimes their beliefs annoy me.

I felt very bad at the time but only if they didn't deserve it.

Only use it if they piss me off - get what they give.

They called me something first.

⁵ All of the students were given an information sheet informing them of the study's aims and were made aware of their right to refuse, the anonymity of the survey and confidentiality of the data. Although the teacher was present, participants were not asked for their name and once they had finished the survey they came up to a locked box and put the survey in it so that they teacher could not see their answers.

There was also a small minority of respondents who expressed more extreme views with one explaining that they *'hoped it offended and laughed'* and several participants who felt *'happy'* and *'good'* with the intended outcome *'to insult'*. The survey findings supported the data collected from the subgroup in that the two most prevalent motivations for young White British people committing acts of targeted hostility are the 'thrill' that these incidents provide and the perceived provocation and justification.

As previously highlighted, there has been limited research conducted with young people to find out their opinions on why people target someone because of their perceived ethnic or religious identity. For this reason the survey was designed to broaden out the sample in gauging perceptions of target hostility in the non-offending population. 53.2% ($n=226$) of respondents provided an opinion in an open text box which was then categorised thematically. One of the most prominent themes to emerge, mirroring the top motivation provided by the offending student sample and the subgroup, was the perception that people commit acts of targeted hostility because *'They think it's funny'*, *'They use it mainly as a joke'* and *'To make people laugh'*. As with the offending population, 'Perceived justification' also emerged as a significant theme with respondents stating that:

They are annoyed at them for coming over to our country and for many other reasons.

They are angry at the way immigration works and get angry when they let us hold Diwali but we aren't allowed Christmas because it celebrates Christ.

Because they take over the country and steal our jobs.

Because they are proud to be British and want England to stay English.

To be truthful and/or fed up that they are everywhere.

These responses demonstrate the existence of a 'conventional' form of prejudice, identified as an area for further exploration in the next chapter. The third theme to emerge put the onus on the offender with participants explaining that people commit acts of targeted hostility because of their own *'insecurity'*, *'jealousy'*, and *'lack of education'*, and that they are *'intolerant'*, *'racist'* and *'narrow-minded'*. The final theme to arise from the non-offending population identified the emotional and psychological motivation for offenders who commit incidents of targeted hostility. Participants

suggested that people 'intend to hurt someone' because it makes them '*feel better*', '*feel good*', '*It makes them look big*', '*cool*' and '*hard*'. Collectively the survey data highlighted four key motivating factors which supported the findings from the offending student population and the subgroup sample. However, it was the fourth emerging theme conveying the emotional significance of committing targeted hostility which was of particular interest. This had been found to be a significant factor distinguishing the motivation for the younger subgroup participants and the older members.

6.4 Targeted Hostility as an Outlet

For certain members of the subgroup the motivation for their involvement in incidents of targeted hostility was borne out of frustration, perceived injustice and the desire to gain respect. As identified within the study conducted by Sibbit (1997), there was an observed age-related typology for the motivation and nature of targeted hostility. As stated in the previous chapter, older members within the group were known for being "*well racist*" with Ryan in particular "*hating*" minority ethnic people and wishing that on his last day on earth that he could "*go down to Melton Road with a baseball bat and kill them*". This vented aggression towards ethnic and religious 'Others' cannot be detached from his frustration at not being in education, employment or training (NEET). He was incredibly vocal amongst the group in blaming Leicester's multicultural population, 'immigrants' and the Muslim community for his inability to get a job or a house. Being an older member of the group and highly regarded for his involvement in criminal behaviour, he made a significant impression on the younger members. Therefore, although the 14, 15 and 16 year olds were still in school, they recited the same socio-economic reasons as the older members and their families for "*hating*" specific groups of 'Others'.

Within the context of their everyday life Ryan, Dan and Alex came across opportunities to vent their frustration and act out their feelings of blame. Again, these incidents often took place within 'their' territory. The following discussion illustrates an incident

which took place outside of the ASDA supermarket located within the area. It highlights the layers of motivation involved in engaging in targeted hostility:

James: *They just walk around here like they own it and they don't.*

Researcher: *So have you got into fights about it?*

Ryan: *(laughing) Yeah ...*

Chris: *Like that one up ASDA.*

Ryan: *That was nothing, I've done loads worse (group laughs).*

Researcher: *Like what?*

Ryan: *Like just loads of fights with Pakis and stuff ... and then the Feds turn up.*

James: *He is well bad (group laughing).*

As James stated, the motivation underpinning the fight was that a group of Asian lads were in 'their' area acting as if "*they own it*". Although Leicester has had a diverse and multicultural population for decades, the group were unable to see 'Asian' people as being British and therefore, unable to see them as being equally entitled to live in the same area and occupy the same spaces. As identified in the previous chapter, due to their feelings of marginalisation from school, employment and the cultural norms of wider society, the subgroup's identity was forged around being White British and belonging to that area. For the older members of the group who were now experiencing the reality of having limited opportunities to change their circumstance, their sense of purpose and respect came from their involvement in illegitimate means. Incidents of targeted hostility were one way that Ryan could engage in an immediate visceral experience and continue to confirm his reputation as being "*well hard*" amongst the group. Winning contestations over 'who belongs more' or who owns the local area can be seen as a product of the ambiguity of his perceived White entitlement, his actual lived reality and the visual presence of minority ethnic individuals. By actively not engaging with minority ethnic communities within Leicester due to the underlying prejudice and intolerance directed at these groups, the subgroup fail to see people of different backgrounds as being anything other than a threat or an object of vilification. Living everyday multiculturalism for this group involved actively not engaging with diversity and negotiating conflict with 'outsiders'.

Although the majority of the group were primarily motivated by the emotional by-products of targeted hostility such as feeling excitement and reinforcing their perceived White British superiority, underlying prejudices and an unfamiliarity with 'difference' was a central contributory factor in this behaviour. However, there were certain members within the group who engaged in more extreme forms of targeted hostility, and taken on face value their behaviour would suggest feelings of hatred rather than prejudice. Living within a multicultural geography provided numerous opportunities to target someone perceived to be different for many underlying reasons. In particular, conversations with Dan exposed the sad reality of why some young White British people may target someone based on their ethnicity or religion. Dan had recently been sent back to a children's home by his parents and began attending a specialist school for behavioural issues after being expelled on many occasions. Although within the group he was often mocked for his parents not wanting him and for his appearance, he still remained extremely loyal to his friends. The following discussion took place on a park bench towards the end of my three months with the group:

Researcher: *What happened to your face?*

Dan: *(laughing) What do you think?*

Researcher: *Got into a fight?*

Dan: *Yeah ... well nothing really. This group of lads started shouting stuff at us ... everyone else ran off and I just thought what's the fucking point? ... (laughing) like I know what its 'gun feel like to get me head kicked in and couldn't be arsed to run.*

Researcher: *That's awful ... did you go hospital?*

Dan: *No ... wouldn't do anything.*

Researcher: *What did your home say?*

Dan: *Nothing ... as if they give a shit.*

Researcher: *I'm sure they do.*

Dan: *They hate me there.*

(long silence)

Researcher: *It's not been that long since I saw you with like cuts and bruises on your face ... how long ago was that fight?*

Dan: *Shit me ... that was bad. About month or something (laughing) ... that was where I just went mad, dint' I? I got smashed.*

Researcher: *What did you do again?*

Dan: *Just went up to some Pakis started shouting shit like BNP and fuck off home.*

Researcher: *Why?*

Dan: *Dunno ... I was just angry like I just really needed a fight ... so I knew that'd get me one.*

Researcher: *Are you actually racist?*

Dan: *I dunno ... well yeah (laughing) ... but like with Pakis n' stuff I'm not as bad as I was ... I was proper racist. I used to just start on any Paki or anything that walked by me.*

Researcher: *But why?*

Dan: *Dunno ... just hated them and it was just like something to do*

Although Dan openly admitted violently targeting minority ethnic people and had expressed explicitly racist and religiously motivated prejudice to me, I never got the feeling he actually 'hated' people solely because of their ethnicity or religion. Dan's current circumstance had a significant impact on me and it saddened me to realise how deeply rooted and multifaceted his motivations for committing such acts were. Within the group, different motivations and context factors could influence certain members to engage in targeted hostility. For Dan, his motivation for committing incidents of targeted hostility could not be detached from his feelings of being unwanted, the importance of his reputation within the group, the existence of pervasive prejudices and the micro multicultural context which provides many visible targets of 'difference'. This group of young people faced being vilified for being 'Chavs', had unhappy and unstable home lives and were aware of the perception that they were not going to amount to much. Although this group would be described as difficult to engage with and would often partake in anti-social behaviour, writing them off as being racist only exacerbates their feelings of marginalisation and isolation. Within the group there were some great characters who demonstrated positive attributes of loyalty and protection to each other and even to myself. During the three months spent with the subgroup I was able to get to know the young people behind the expressions of prejudice and acts of targeted hostility. I realised that to understand, engage with and challenge these views, this behaviour must not be allowed to define them. This is not to belittle the impact that such incidents have on the victim or to excuse their behaviour, but rather to recognise that to move forward in understanding and engaging with young people who are hard to reach, there needs to be a greater emphasis on the intersections of their lives.

6.5 Explaining Targeted Hostility in a Multicultural Context

From the three months spent with the subgroup I was able to identify a range of inter-connected factors which motivated them to engage in racist and religiously motivated targeted hostility. More often than not, verbal abuse towards minority ethnic people occurred due to a minor frustration in the context of everyday life such as not being served cigarettes or alcohol. These 'low-level' incidents convey the important role prejudice plays within the context of everyday life, whereby ordinary interactions with ethnic and religious 'Others' can produce challenges due to the existing unfamiliarity, intolerance and hostility towards Leicester's multicultural population. Additionally, there were those within the group who went out of their way to target households and corner shops owned by minority ethnic people. This often occurred in times of boredom, and therefore verbally abusing or harassing a 'Paki' would provide a thrilling experience. Finally, there were older members within the group who were motivated to begin fights with minority ethnic groups of males within their area as a means of ownership and reinforcing their perceived superiority over those considered 'foreign'.

Spending three months observing and discussing prejudice and targeted hostility with the group provided me with an in-depth insight into the process and context in which such incidents take place. Data from both the survey and the fieldwork phase enabled me to develop an inter-disciplinary theoretical explanation as to why young people commit targeted hostility. This section concludes by suggesting that incorporating the concept of everyday multiculturalism, which recognises the importance of the immediate context, could enhance current thinking on hate crime motivation and causation.

6.5.1 The Role of Failure and Frustration

Merton's 'strain' and Cohen's 'status frustration' are seen as being particularly useful in bringing together the literature outlined in Chapter Two, which highlights the impact

that a fragile and insecure socio-economic context can have on a young person. This is particularly relevant when people occupy a marginalised and disenfranchised position within society as they often lack the social, economic and cultural capital to change their status. Merton argued that social order, stability and integration are conducive to conformity whilst disorder and malintegration are contributory factors in crime and deviancy (Merton, 1968). At the core of Merton's theory is the concept of 'anomie', which was initially introduced by Emile Durkheim to demonstrate that economic crises and fluctuations could drive people to suicide. Merton (1968) argued that inherent in most Western societies is the institutionalised desire and need to achieve a certain standard of living and status, epitomised by the 'American dream'. Using this construct, Merton explains that anomic social states can occur when there is a disconnect between culturally aspired goals and the availability of legitimate opportunities to achieve these (*ibid*, 1968). The inherent inequalities in income, education and general societal resources can create 'strain' for certain sectors of society. There are a number of illegitimate ways in which individuals can respond to the feeling of strain, but of particular interest for this research is deviant and criminal behaviour.

Cohen's work on status frustration emerges from a similar logic by emphasising that not being able to achieve goals can produce feelings of frustration. Cohen developed Merton's 'instrumental' view of lower class crime by introducing emotion and anger into strain theory. He sought to explain the group phenomenon of deviant behaviour and crime with 'status frustration' (Cohen, 1955). Cohen suggested that frustration was a product of a perceived failure to achieve positive reinforcement and respect from the outside world, particularly from teachers and family members for young people. Cohen believed that young people from deprived socio-economic backgrounds would overcome this status problem with 'reaction formation' which meant replacing the traditional norm of gaining respect from acquiring a hard-working job to more deviant, illegitimate means. As Jensen (2003: 8) explains: 'a delinquent contraculture was a collective solution to lower-class status frustration'. This acknowledged failure and subsequent 'frustration' has been evident within many youth crime studies whereby young people who have become marginalised from mainstream society come

to rely heavily on their immediate peer group and community, using deviant and criminal behaviour as a means of gaining respect (Evans, Rudd, Behrens, Kaluza, and Wooley, 2001; Howarth, 2002; Zdun, 2007). Additionally this is a common theme within hate crime research whereby offenders are described as being 'aware that others perceived them as cultural and economic failures-as losers-and that, try as they might, there was little they could do [to] counter this evaluation' (Gadd and Dixon, 2009: 85).

Strain and status frustration are regarded as offering theoretical explanations as to why the subgroup, particularly the older members, felt angry and bitter towards their current socio-economic status and their subsequent involvement in criminal activity. Arguably, the use of both these theories could be criticised, firstly because whilst many people within society experience socio-economic deprivation, not all engage within criminal activity. However, Agnew (1992) developed a more comprehensive version of Merton's original theory which accounts for individual difference in the affective response to socio-economic/cultural 'strain'. The core principle of general strain theory, which overcomes a limitation of Merton's perspective, is that people differ in their subjective evaluation of the same objective strains (Agnew, 2001). Secondly, the theories could be criticised for being adultcentric in nature and the use of concepts such as the 'American Dream', being out of touch with current societal ideals. In contrast, it is suggested that now more than ever young people are aware of the disparity between those who have and those who have not. As identified in Chapter Two, young people are now targeted by the same media outlets and are increasingly regarded as independent economic members and therefore, have much more exposure to consumerism and economic materialism. For the subgroup having money, owning the latest model of phone and wearing designer clothes were all deeply desired but unachievable through legitimate means.

Understanding the juxtaposition between the illusion of White entitlement, to the reality of society's inherent class and cultural inequality, offers a new approach to exploring everyday multiculturalism and the development of ethnic and religious prejudice. Research exploring hate crime motivation has suggested that rather than

hate crime being solely driven by an underlying hatred for the victim's race or religion, it may be rooted more in the perceived failure or inadequacy of the offender (Sibbitt, 1997; Green, *et al.*, 1998; Ray and Smith, 2002). As Ray *et al.* (2004: 355) explained, the offenders within their research:

... saw themselves as weak, disregarded, overlooked, unfairly treated, victimised without being recognised as victims, made to feel small; meanwhile, the other—their Asian victims ... —was experienced as powerful, in control, laughing, successful, 'arrogant'.

The intersectionality approach detailed in Chapter Two embodies the key principles of both Cohen's status frustration and Merton's strain, and helps to explain the subgroup's feelings of frustration and failure. The subgroup were in an ambiguous position of being disadvantaged in the social divisions pertaining to class and age, and yet conversely in a perceived position of privilege and entitlement due to their ethnicity. The subgroup spoke bitterly about not being in education, employment and training and the harsh reality of unemployment:

Researcher: *So what have you been doing since you left school?*

Ryan: *I ain't done anything ... I've not even had one fucking job.*

Alex: *Mate that's only like two years ... man I stopped going school at 13.*

Researcher: *So you haven't been in education or work for 6 years?*

Alex: *Yeah.*

Researcher: *Why did you leave school so young?*

Alex: *I hated it ... I was getting fucked off my head.*

Researcher: *On drugs?*

Alex: *Yeah like every day ... that's why I fucking shake now...I kept getting chucked out ... everything. The teachers hated me saying I'd never do anything and I used to just abuse them.*

Researcher: *Is that when you started getting in trouble like ASB?*

Alex: *Yeah ... that's why now I can't walk down the street with my bird without the pigs stopping me. Like all these things with my ASBO mean they can stop me whatever.*

Researcher: *Do you think having that on your record is what's stopping you get a job?*

Alex: *Could be ... like who's 'gun want to take on a 19 year old who has never worked and has no qualifications?*

Ryan: *It's just so fucking boring.*

As explained in the previous chapter, for the majority of this group education and employment success was unlikely, involvement within criminal or antisocial behaviour was the norm, and their friends, family and local area provided their only feelings of inclusion and belonging. Observations from the subgroup convey a group of young people who feel 'different' to wider society, demonised for being 'Chavs', perpetually reminded of their shortcomings in school and employment and unable to face up to their part in their failings. What exacerbated these underlying feelings of failure and resentment was that older members within the subgroup saw few legitimate opportunities to change their current situation and attain the level of living they desire and more importantly, expect.

In explaining how these underlying feelings of frustration and bitterness manifest into acts of targeted hostility Agnew's extended general strain theory could be applied. Agnew suggests that negative relationships with 'Others' who are perceived to pose a threat or impinge on resources, motivate people to 'present or threaten to present individuals with noxiously or negatively valued stimuli (e.g. verbal insults, physical attacks)' (Agnew, *et al.*, 2002:44). As Walters (2011) suggests, combining both Merton's theory of Strain and Agnew's use of negative relationships gives a greater recognition of how the socio-economic instability in an offender's own life can give rise to expressions and enactments of targeted hostility. As Treadwell and Garland (2011:1) explain, 'internalized negative emotions of disillusion and anger ... manifest themselves through externalized hostility, resentment and fury directed at the scapegoat for their ills'. Societal failure, often referred to as unacknowledged shame (Walters, 2011), is said to increase the attachment and sense of belonging to an immediate friendship group and facilitate the emergence of archaic beliefs of entitlement. It is for this reason that in areas experiencing economical strain, 'visible' minority communities come to be accused of taking jobs, homes and societal resources away from the more deserving 'native' population (Levin and McDevitt, 2002; Walters, 2011; Hall, 2013). Due to the subgroup feeling/being marginalised because of their lack of employment, status and power within society, being White British, belonging to their friendship group and 'owning' their area were sources of great pride, and therefore highly important. As discussed above, the subgroup

resorted to 'externalized hostility, resentment and fury' when they felt ethnic or religious 'Others' were being disrespectful or threatening 'their' territory.

In terms of explaining the subgroup's underlying feelings of frustration and bitterness which were identified as key factors in the expression of targeted hostility, strain and status frustration are seen as effective. However, what is lacking within the theoretical explanation so far is why specific ethnic and religious groups are the targets of such hostility. Both the findings within this chapter and the previous one have identified how important prejudice and intolerance to 'difference' is in the commission of targeted hostility. It is through combining this multi-level strain theory with Perry's theory of 'doing difference' that the unequal distribution of socio-economic and cultural capital can be seen to exacerbate underlying prejudices and perceptions of entitlement for certain young White British people.

6.5.2 The Myth of White Entitlement

It is through applying Perry's theory of 'doing difference' that the development of prejudice, and the contexts in which these feelings spill over into acts of targeted hostility can be further explained. Central to Perry's theory of 'doing difference' is acknowledging that prejudice, discrimination and oppression towards difference and diversity is apparent throughout England's history (Gilroy, 1982; Perry, 2001; Hall, 2005). Perry (2001) explains that institutionalised prejudices and relationships of oppression prioritised the rights of certain members of society, creating and reinforcing what is perceived to be the 'norm' within society: White, heterosexual, male and masculine (Perry, 2001). Perry (2001) suggests that once the dominant norm is established, individuals are evaluated, categorised and social hierarchies based on gender, race, sexuality and class are constructed (Perry 2001). Those who are viewed as differing from the norm identity group will be regarded as inferior to the dominant sectors within society, thus creating a perceived 'entitlement' and 'right' for certain 'indigenous' groups over minority individuals. This theory recognises the importance of the structural and cultural context in which the offender is situated and what influence this has on the intolerance towards ethnic and religious 'Others' (Bowling, 1993; Perry,

2001). Perry (2001) believes that integral to understanding the development and expression of prejudiced views is acknowledging that for certain groups these views are not regarded as being biased or irrational (Perry, 2001; Brown, 2010).

Perry's theory is particularly relevant to the concept of everyday multiculturalism and the impact that living within a micro multicultural geography can have on targeted hostility. Perry's theory embodies the literature on prejudice and social identity theory in particular as it shows that cultural characteristics and homogenised stereotypes of different ethnic groups dehumanise the 'Other' and reinforce the normalcy of being White British (Perry, 2002). Perry (2001) proposes that a 'visible' individual or group difference, whether it is ethnicity, religion, lifestyle or dress and appearance, can be viewed as being disrespectful and in conflict with the customs and values of the dominant group (Perry, 2001:46). This underlying fear towards the unknown can manifest into feelings of resentment and frustration when minority individuals are perceived not only of encroaching on 'native' traditions and culture but also of stealing resources, status and wealth from the 'native' population, thus demonstrating the links with strain theory (Messerschmidt, 1997; Perry, 2001). Perry (2001) suggests that forms of targeted verbal and physical abuse can be used in an attempt to suppress this threat, and her definition of hate crime embodies this principle:

(Hate Crime) ... is a mechanism of power intended to sustain somewhat precarious hierarchies through violence and threats of violence (verbal or physical). It is generally directed towards those whom our society has traditionally stigmatised and marginalised ...

A central tenet of Perry's theory is that acts of targeted hostility are motivated by ethnic and religious 'Others' 'doing difference' in public. Therefore, targeted hostility can be seen as a means of sustaining the hegemonic identity of the perpetrator, reinforcing the distinct differences between the dominant and subordinate groups, and sending a message to the victim in that they are inferior and do not belong.

Perry's theory of 'doing difference' has not been without criticism. Conceptually the theory could be regarded as ambiguous given that the vast majority of hate crime

offenders come from low socio-economic backgrounds and therefore are already disempowered within the structural hierarchy. This aspect again, relates directly to the intersectionality approach which recognises that young White British socially and economically disadvantaged people are members of different social divisions within society at any one time, and therefore acquire different levels of status dependant on the specific hierarchy (Baca Zinn and Dill, 1996; Burgess-Proctor, 2006; Trahan, 2011). Perry (2001) suggests that a key aspect of 'doing difference' is the subjective and relativistic nature of the offender's socio-structural perception. Therefore, although a young person may hold a relatively low position on a hierarchy pertaining to class/wealth, they may instead focus on their perceived power from the institutionalised dominance of White ethnicity and culture (Perry, 2001; Hall, 2005). This is particularly important for certain groups such as the subgroup who regularly highlighted how important it was to maintain the 'native' White British norms, customs and values, and the perceived entitlement their ethnicity and nationality granted them.

As detailed in the previous chapter, the subgroup had grown up within an environment in which prejudiced and stereotypical views about certain minority groups were the norm. This in turn made the subgroup reluctant to engage with difference, which in a cyclic manner exacerbated the underlying prejudice, fear and intolerance. As highlighted through the use of strain theory, the subgroup lived in a low socio-economic area and were characterised by educational and employment failure which contributed to feelings of shame and frustration. Due to the subgroup's limited opportunities for respect and achievement from outside audiences and through legitimate means, their ethnicity and belonging to 'their' area were highly important. The subgroup live within a multicultural micro-geography where minority groups 'doing difference' in public is a daily visual reality. The visible difference in clothes, language and culture of the surrounding minority ethnic community and the group's observations of these communities with better houses, jobs and cars, generate feelings of threat and provides an outlet for their socio-economic frustrations. As with the incident involving the security guard, the subgroup felt utterly affronted by being asked to move by an 'immigrant', someone who they have been brought up to view as

different, inferior, unwelcome and a potential threat. By racially abusing the security guard and consequently forcing him to quit, the act reinforced their perceived superiority and White hegemony.

Combining both strain and status frustration with Perry's theory of doing difference is regarded as providing the macro context which facilitates feelings of socio-economic failure and which produces potential targets for offenders to exercise underlying prejudices and frustrations. However, these are contexts in which many members of society experience and are exposed to, and yet do not act upon them. Additionally, although both strain and doing difference provide the socio-cultural contexts necessary in the commission of targeted hostility, this thesis contends that thrill seeking and the emotional experience of such acts plays a more prominent role in explaining young peoples' motivation for targeted hostility. Although requiring further exploration, the use of individual trait theory and psycho-physiological research could move the field of hate crime forward in understanding specifically what drives young people to engage in targeted hostility.

6.5.3 Understanding Thrill Seeking Behaviour

Using both the survey data and fieldwork phase with the subgroup, this chapter illustrated that one of the primary motivating factors for young people engaging in targeted hostility is that such behaviour is considered 'thrilling'. A third of the survey sample stated that they had committed an act of targeted hostility because '*it was funny*'. On asking the subgroup why they engaged in targeted hostility, the participants would explain that they were "*bored*" at the time and involvement in this form of behaviour was "*something to do*" and "*funny*". This is by no means a new finding; Levin and McDevitt's (1993: 2002) widely used typology of hate offenders conveys that the majority of such offenders are driven by thrill seeking. This typology was based on the analysis from the Community Disorders Unit of the Boston Police Department and from interviews with police officers who interviewed the offenders. Originally Levin and McDevitt proposed a 'three-category hate crime offender typology: offenders who act for the thrill of it, those who perceive themselves as defending their turf, and those

offenders who are a mission to 'rid the world of evil' (McDevitt, Levin, Nolen and Bennett, 2010:131). After McDevitt, Levin and Bennett (2002) tested the hypothesis further, they revised the typology to include 'retaliatory violence'. Thrill seeking was found to be the most frequent motivating factor (66%), applicable to over half of all hate incidents (Levin and McDevitt, 1993; 2002). They suggested that these crimes are committed for 'excitement' and 'thrills' by youths who are bored and looking for something to do, mirroring both the observations from the subgroup and the survey data (McDevitt, *et al.*, 2010). In summarising these incidents Levin *et al.* (2002:308) stated that thrill seeking offenders were 'triggered by an immature desire to display power and to experience a rush at the expense of someone else'. This finding has been widely supported, with Ray and Smith (2001) identifying gratification and excitement as a key motivator in hate crime offending, and Byers *et al.* (1999) noting that 'An ideology of hate is typically absent... Rather... offending rests largely with the thrill or excitement experienced' (1999: 84). Similarly, Franklin's (2000) study into homophobic harassment identified 'thrill seeking' behaviour as the predominant motivating factor for young men.

Whilst recognising the strength of Levin and McDevitt's typology, this thesis aims to further this debate by proposing theories that could explain what produces the feelings of gratification and excitement, and why certain young people crave these experiences whilst others do not. Walters (2011) attempted to understand this link by using self-control theory to develop a more holistic understanding of hate crime motivation and causation. This could be taken further by combining Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory of low self-control with psycho-physiological research findings to explain individual level offending. This study did not set out to test whether self-control, 'fearlessness' and 'sensation seeking' could explain why certain young people are more impulsive, more likely to engage in 'risky' behaviour and less empathetic. However, becoming an active participant within the subgroup's everyday life permitted an in-depth exploration of the forms of behaviours they engaged in and the immense gratification they experienced from this behaviour, their inability to pass up on anti-social activities, and how quickly ordinary, banal interactions would manifest into explosive verbal and physical conflicts. Based on the observations and

conversations with the subgroup over the three months fieldwork phase, this section provides a preliminary explanation for their involvement in targeted hostility, and why emotional gratification both motivated the subgroup to engage in this behaviour and also, reinforced it.

Self-control is regarded as being fundamental to successful social interaction and cohesion within society (Gleason, Jensen-Campbell and Malcolm, 2004; Vohs and Ciarocco, 2004). Based on this premise Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) emphasised how important self-control, or more accurately a lack of self-control, is in committing crime. 'A General Theory of Crime' suggests that the majority of people within society are able to control their thoughts, feelings and behaviours by utilising their developed knowledge of anticipated outcomes and consequences. The outcome of this self-imposed restraint is avoiding short-sighted acquisitions in favour of the gratification of achieving long-term goals. Self-control is usually instilled from a young age via parent or guardian monitoring, nurture and punishment (*ibid*, 1990). It is for this reason that Gottfredson and Hirschi argue that ineffective parents, or more generally socialisation, can result in low self-control in children and adolescents. By failing to appropriately discipline a child or conversely show affection, children can grow up with low levels of empathy, responsibility and respect for authority (*ibid*, 1990).

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 90) characterise individuals with low self-control as often being 'impulsive, insensitive, physical, risk taking, short sighted and nonverbal'. They expand this further to say that such individuals are 'gregarious' but often have a 'low tolerance' for perceived 'outsiders' (*ibid*, 1990). These personality characteristics are said to account for why low self-control is a predominant factor for educational and employment underachievement. Low self-control is also a trait conducive to antisocial behaviour as such individuals handle conflicts less constructively and lash out in anger when frustrated (Baumeister and Vohs, 2004). During the three months spent with the subgroup I regularly heard, and also observed, many incidents of conflict and physical altercations involving the subgroup members, as well as 'outsiders'. Communication between group members was often direct and curt, and an 'outsider' would have regarded some of the language used as offensive, yet little

offence was ever taken. One of the most striking features of the subgroup was their complete lack of empathy with their victims or remorse for their actions, both characteristics identified by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) as indicating low self-control.

A central tenet of Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory is that individuals with low self-control, due to their 'impulsive' and 'short-sighted' traits, tend to seek out instant 'psychological' gratification (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990: 92) which substance misuse, risk taking behaviour and criminal conduct can provide. In the three months spent with the subgroup, all members of the group engaged in 'risky' behaviour, including taking both illegal drugs and legal highs, consuming alcohol, and engaging in highly sexualised behaviour and low level anti-social activities. Organised fighting between the subgroup members and young people from other local areas provided a regular event on Friday and Saturday nights. The subgroup appeared unable to turn down the opportunity to engage in this form of behaviour, as it aroused feelings of thrill, excitement and alleviated the boredom of everyday life. 'A General Theory of Crime' proposes that low self-control is 'the primary individual characteristic causing criminal behaviour' (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990:111).

Although 'A General Theory of Crime' is regarded as an integral factor for accounting for individual difference within this research, the theory has been criticised because of its perceived tautology. For example, Geis (2000) argues that 'A General Theory of Crime' uses a single element to explain the cause and product and therefore, can only surmise that low self-control causes low self-control. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1993:53) respond by stating that their theory is one of the first to 'explicitly show the logical connections between our conception of the actor and the act' (Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1993). For Gottfredson and Hirschi defining the parameters of the behaviour, exploring the causal link between the act and the individual, and then evaluating the differences between non-offenders and offenders, is a logical way of identifying an 'individual characteristic causing criminal behaviour'. When it comes to the explanatory ability of 'A General Theory of Crime' a further area of criticism is that the theory fails to explicitly demonstrate why having low self-control leads to a need

for instant gratification, excitement and risk-taking behaviour. Within this milieu psycho-physiological research on impulsivity and sensation-seeking could be incorporated in order to develop the causal link between individual personality traits and the need/desire for antisocial and criminal behaviour.

As discussed, self-control is regarded as being a stable personality trait which assesses the capacity of an individual to control their innate impulses (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Caspi, 2000; Tangney, et al., 2004; Derefinko, DeWall, Metze, Walsh and Lynam, 2011). Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 90) suggest that the main personality trait, which typifies individuals with low self-control, is 'impulsivity'. In fact, impulsivity is at the explanatory core of various etiological theories of crime (see Cleckley, 1976; Moffitt, 1993; Lynam, 1996). On a wider platform, this trait is one of the strongest correlates in meta-analyses of antisocial behaviour such as substance misuse and risk taking (see Baumeister, 1997; Miller and Lynam, 2001; Ruiz, *et al.*, 2008; Derefinko, *et al.*, 2011). By their very essence, criminal acts provide few long term benefits, in most cases require little to no planning and often produce an immediate gratifying reinforcement, all of which suggests an impulsive nature not subject to self-control (Derefinko, *et al.*, 2011). The reason for demonstrating the existing research and links between firstly, self-control and impulsivity and secondly, impulsivity and criminal behaviour is because impulsivity has been operationalised within psycho-physiological theories. Psycho-physiological theories are 'concerned with understanding the relationships between psychological states and processes on the one hand and physiological measures on the other' (Dawson, 1990:243). Using the 'Sensation Seeking' and 'Fearlessness' theories enables a synthesis between self-control and impulsivity and scientifically demonstrates how such traits can be causally linked to antisocial and criminal behaviour.

'Sensation Seeking' theories (Zuckerman, *et al.*, 1964; 1978; Horvath and Zuckerman, 1993; Zuckerman, 1994) propose that genetic and environmental factors can have varying effects on brain function and therefore, account for individual difference in responding to the same external stimuli, operationalising Agnew's perspective of 'Strain' (Slegal, 2008). 'Sensation seeking is a trait defined by the seeking of varied,

novel, complex and intense sensation and experiences, and the willingness to take physical, social, legal and financial risk for the sake of such experiences' (Zuckerman, 1994: 27). In contrast to Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of low self-control, sensation seeking and impulsivity have been identified through biological correlates (Roberti, 2004). One of the most researched psycho-physiological markers believed to predispose individuals to impulsive, sensation seeking behaviour is a low resting heart rate (Ortiz and Raine, 2004). Heart rate under arousal has been a robust correlate and predictive indicator of aggressive and violent behaviour, as opposed to a consequence as was originally suggested (see Farrington, 1997; Moffitt and Caspi, 2001; Raine, *et al.*, 1990; 1997; 2000). Under arousal is seen as a psychologically unpleasant state which then leads individuals to crave an optimal level of arousal by seeking potentially risky, illegitimate activities to provide stimulation and excitement (Zuckerman, 1994; Eysenck, 1997; Raine, *et al.*, 1997; Wilson and Scarpa, 2011). Whilst conducting the research I was always bewildered as to why I would find situations, such as the altercation with the youth worker, as frightening and unpleasant, yet the subgroup would thrive on such an experience. Explaining the differences in our reactions through solely biological correlates is far too simple, as it is clear that the subgroup's socialisation as well their current socio-cultural situation play an important role in which behaviours and experiences we find gratifying and exciting.

Raine's theory of 'Fearlessness' could complete the matrix of psycho-physiological theories explaining why certain young people seek out anti-social and illegitimate experiences (Raine, 2013). Raine (1993) proposes that the interplay between children who are born with an innate under arousal whom are then not adequately nurtured or disciplined, prevents the development of an understanding and appreciation of society's rules, norms and authority or the accompanying physiological feelings of fear (Raine, 1993; 2002; 2013 Raine, *et al.*, 1998). This theory could be used as a link Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of low self-control, which emphasises the importance of early socialisation, individual personality traits such as impulsivity and finally, the innate physiological need and desire for risk-taking, antisocial behaviour. In reviewing the literature, low self-control, impulsivity, sensation-seeking and fearlessness theories all illustrate that individuals with these specific traits and environmental conditions are

more likely to drink heavily (Barkley, 1997), to smoke (Zuckerman, *et al.*, 1990), use illegal drugs (Zuckerman, *et al.*, 1983; Digman, 1990; Popham, Kennison and Bradley, 2011), have a low level education and low-skilled, sporadic employment (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Levine and Jackson, 2004), engage in risk-taking behaviour such as gambling and multiple sexual partners (Zuckerman, 1976; Digman, 1990; Popham, Kennison and Bradley, 2011), and finally, be involved in criminality (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1969; Reio and Sanders-Reio, 2006; Derefinko, *et al.*, 2011; Popham, *et al.*, 2011). The subgroup members within this research not only meet the criteria of having a low level education and low-skilled, sporadic employment, but also engaged in all of the risk-taking anti-social behaviour identified by the range of studies.

Critical to this current research is that psycho-physiological research has given a considerable amount of empirical attention to age-related constructs of antisocial and criminal behaviour and the possible causal links with personality traits (Zuckerman, 2007). For example, the relationship between impulsivity, sensation-seeking and aggressive behaviour has been studied in children as young as six years old (see Zuckerman, 2007). Kafry (1982) found by using a child version of the Sensation Seeking Scale, participants between the ages of 6 and 10 years old personality traits positively correlated with numerous age-related antisocial activities they had reportedly been involved in. Not only has sensation seeking and aggression been linked through empirical findings, but they also correlate in developmental trends. Research on adolescents suggests that risk-taking and impulsive behaviour can increase due to both the period within the individual's life and social factors (Popham, *et al.*, 2011). Arnett (2000) identified a period of development which he termed 'emerging adulthood' during which young people tend to forfeit childhood norms, values and expectations, but delay accepting the role and responsibilities associated with adulthood. This could account for why risky behaviours, sensation seeking (Steinberg, *et al.*, 2008) and criminal activity peak during this developmental stage (Arnett, 1992), and also diminish in adulthood (Salter, 2003; Jackson, 2011). It is the perceived relevance and applicability of psycho-physiological theories to young people which cries out for further exploration in the context of engaging in targeted hostility.

Although this triad of psycho-physiological theories need to be explored and tested in the context of hate crime, behaviours and characteristics identified within the subgroup do appear to initially support the connection. Levin and McDevitt (1993; 2002) suggest that hate crime offenders are likely to be impulsive people already prone to physical risk taking. The subgroup within this study engaged in many forms of anti-social and criminal behaviour and regularly engaged in both spontaneous and arranged physical altercations with other groups of young people. This is synonymous with Gottfredson and Hirschi's description of criminals as 'adventuresome, active, and physical' (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990: 89). In 'A General Theory of Crime' individuals with low self-control are described as being driven by 'psychologically' gratifying experiences, acting upon their impulses and unable to comprehend the consequence of their actions (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Furthermore, Zuckerman's 'Sensation Seeking' theory explains that innate personality traits and environmental conditions can lead to individuals developing differing psychological and physiological responses to the same external stimuli. For individuals with low self-control and the accompanying trait of impulsivity, seeking and/or being unable to turn down an opportunity in which they could experience 'varied...complex and intense sensation' (Zuckerman, 1994: 27). This could account for individual difference and the motivating factor for the involvement in targeted hostility. Finally, Raine's theory of 'Fearlessness' replicates the findings within hate crime research in that individuals with specific personality traits and environmental factors, do not develop the societal norms and values which respect authority and laws, or the innate psychological feelings of fear and empathy at the consequences of their behaviour. This could explain why hate crime research has found that offenders are drawn to, and seek out 'thrilling' experiences, irrespective of societal norms and values, whilst playing down and underestimating the impact and consequence of such behaviour.

These theories could potentially provide a more complete understanding of micro-level offender traits which when combined with strain and doing difference, achieve a more comprehensive understanding of what motivates young people to commit acts of targeted hostility. It is suggested that all of these factors, to differing extent, play a role in the commission of targeted hostility. There is a key intersection between the

socio-structural framework which helps produce a target of difference and a young person's desire for instant gratification. In seeking to alleviate boredom, young people may choose a target influenced by their underlying prejudices and feelings of frustration, or conversely, be presented with a situation as part of everyday life where their actions spill over into acts of targeted hostility due to their impulsive nature and disregard for the victim's feelings or repercussions. The incident involving Connor and Claire at school demonstrated the nexus between the socio-structural influences which facilitates the teacher being viewed as different, inferior and a source of blame, and their lack of self-control, the gratification they experienced at the teacher's expense and their fearlessness towards the consequences of their actions. However, this incident also showed the importance of the immediate context in the causation of targeted hostility. As demonstrated in this chapter, the majority of the acts of targeted hostility took place within the context of everyday life, within micro-territories of interaction with ethnic and religious 'Others'. It is through incorporating the concept of everyday multiculturalism that the abstract theory developed so far becomes more effective in explaining the routine, everyday nature of targeted hostility.

6.6 Incorporating Everyday Multiculturalism: The Importance of Context

As Gadd (2009: 760) suggests, theoretical explanations of hate crime lack 'an adequately theorized account of the relationship between the outward hostility articulated in racist attacks and the inner world of insecurity, powerlessness and disregard many perpetrators feel'. As it stands the theoretical framework developed within this section is disconnected from the everyday contexts, interactions and challenges which spill over into acts of targeted hostility. Increasingly hate crime literature is recognising the 'ordinariness' of such acts, not only in the form it takes but also, in relation to how the offender perceives the incident (Iganski, 2008; McDevitt, *et al.*, 2010; Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). In addition, research suggests that hate crime offenders are not so different from non-offenders (Iganski, 2008) and that often, the victim is acquainted with the offender (Mason, 2005). Therefore, the interdisciplinary explanation developed so far is incomplete without incorporating the concept of everyday multiculturalism to explain the 'highly individualized "trigger"

situations' (McGhee, 2007: 221) which result in acts of targeted hostility. The act itself may deviate from the offender's standard norms of behaviour or may be influenced by alcohol, stress or situational anger (Dixon and Gadd, 2006; Gadd, 2009). Gadd (2009: 768) suggests that although offenders might seem 'much more hateful to their victims in the heat of a confrontation' a closer analysis to the immediate context before the incident could offer a different explanation.

This chapter has detailed how important context and micro-territories are for the subgroup's involvement in targeted hostility whether this is at school, on the park, outside a block of flats or the local supermarket. As outlined in Chapter Two, the concept of everyday multiculturalism has developed as an effective analytical framework to address the gap between ideological conceptions of multiculturalism and the everyday, lived reality of diversity and difference (Colombo and Semi, 2007; Wise, 2007; Harris, 2009). Multiculturalism is a dynamic, lived field of action within which social actors both construct and deconstruct ideas of cultural difference, national belonging and place-making. Living within a multicultural micro-geography produces spaces in which diversity comes together and relies on ordinary people managing and negotiating with ethnic, cultural and religious difference in the context of everyday life. Both the subgroup and the survey sample could be characterised as being 'ordinary' young people, with the prejudices, fears and intolerances they hold being an extension of the concerns in wider society. A more detailed investigation of the sample's lived reality achieves a greater understanding of the how young people engage and manage diversity, and how these interactions can spill over into acts of targeted hostility.

Both the survey data and fieldwork data collected from the subgroup reveal that whilst the vast majority of participants accepted multiculturalism as an ideology, there were 'very real fears, differences and antagonisms inevitably generated in conditions of massive social, cultural and economic change' (Harris, 2009: 201). The survey data illustrated that only a third ($n=141$) of the young White British people who took part in this study thought that people from different ethnic backgrounds got on well together. A range of factors including geographical segregation, perceptions of 'immigrants' and

the Muslim population, and an unfamiliarity with 'difference' were identified as influencing this perception. Importantly, it is this group of young people who are most likely to occupy the spaces whereby people of different ethnicities and religions come together such as at school, town centres, cinemas and other places of leisure. This backdrop could significantly affect the ways in which everyday multiculturalism is interpreted, managed and negotiated in day-to-day contexts. A quarter of young White British people in Leicester admitted to targeting someone because of their ethnicity or religion, with the top three explanations being: '*It was funny*' (39.3%, *n*=33), '*They deserved it*' (38.1%, *n*=32) and '*My friends were doing it*' (22.6%, *n*=19). All of these motivations emphasise the importance of the context prior to, during and after the incident.

A greater insight into the importance of context can be achieved from the subgroup data. The incident detailed earlier on in this chapter in which Connor and Claire racially abused and harassed an Asian school teacher provides an example of the importance of context. School provides a micro-geography where ethnic and religious difference come together, but it also symbolises a place of perceived failure and boredom to the subgroup members. This incident of targeted hostility is seen as the end product of an interplay between the subgroup's socio-economic context which legitimises and exacerbates their underlying prejudices, the immediate context of being bored within an environment where the group feel frustrated and their lack of self-control, illustrating the nexus between strain, doing difference and psycho-physiology. However, the incident could not have happened without the context whereby a visible target of 'difference' was available for Connor and Claire to act upon their underlying boredom, frustration and prejudices. This argument is also illustrated with the more extreme incident involving the security guard whereby racially abusing him was a measure embodying the subgroup's intense frustration and anger at being asked to move from a territory they felt entitled to occupy. Although the end product of racially abusing and even attacking the security guard was the interplay between the importance of identity, place and underlying prejudices, the incident came to fruition because of the context. More often than not acts of targeted hostility were the end product of a minor conflict which occurred whilst doing ordinary, banal activities.

These everyday activities included the subgroup trying to buy cigarettes and alcohol and the Asian shop owner refusing to sell it to them or when they were told off for their involvement in antisocial behaviour by a minority ethnic police officer, youth worker or teacher. Importantly, multicultural micro-geographies provide ample visible targets of difference of which the subgroup were relatively unfamiliar and felt hostile towards. It is within these everyday contexts that abstract theories of strain, doing difference and psycho-physiology come into play with the lived reality, and are either placated or exacerbated.

It is by using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as a lens through which to analyse local misunderstandings, tensions and incidents within the microcosm of everyday experiences, that targeted hostility can be seen as one interaction in a process (Wise, 2005). It is through analysing these ordinary interactions and local relationships, and accounting for the socio-economic context in which young people come from and their individual personality traits, that the complexity of engaging with 'difference' and ultimately acts of targeted hostility, becomes apparent.

6.7 Conclusion

This chapter combined the survey findings and fieldwork data to explore the sample's exposure to prejudice and involvement in racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility. In particular, the chapter analysed incidents of targeted hostility which took place in the context of the subgroup's everyday life. It illustrated the different, and yet, intrinsically linked motivations for committing such acts. The subgroup seemed motivated to commit incidents of targeted hostility because they were in search of a thrilling and 'funny' experience and/or out of frustration over employment or territory. These findings were mirrored somewhat within the data collected from the survey of young White British people from the county and city of Leicester, with 25.1% ($n=104$) admitted to targeting someone because it was funny, the victim deserved it and their friends were doing it.

The second section of this chapter sought to provide a theoretical explanation for why young people commit acts of racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility. In line with current trends, a multi-disciplinary approach was put forward which aimed to account for the macro contexts which give rise to feelings of frustration, entitlement and prejudice towards certain groups of 'Others'. In particular both strain and doing difference were combined to explain the importance of identity, belonging and territory to the subgroup and consequently, the feelings of frustration and fear when ethnic and religious 'Others' are perceived to be encroaching on this. Building on this platform, this chapter advocated for the use of a triad of psycho-physiological theories to explain acts of targeted hostility in young people. It is suggested that existing literature on the 'thrill' that hate crime offenders experience could be developed theoretically in order to explain why such individuals crave this visceral experience. These theories should be regarded as interlinked to varying degrees in the commission of targeted hostility. However, on their own, these theories are abstract and fail to account for the real-life situational cues and interactions which give rise to acts of targeted hostility. Correspondingly, everyday multiculturalism can provide the analytical lens to explain how ordinary interactions in the context of everyday life can spill over into incidents of targeted hostility. It is only through closer engagement with the lived realities of young people that more empirically rooted understandings of targeted hostility can be achieved, and more effective policy and practice recommendations can be developed.

CHAPTER SEVEN

7. Moving Forward: Implications for Research, Theory and Policy

7.1 Introduction

It is worth stating from the outset that the final chapter of this thesis does not fit the traditional 'conclusion' format. Rather, this chapter is designed to address the third research aim by reflecting upon the experience of conducting this study to consider what the future directions are for research, theory and policy. In truth, the thought of providing a 'conclusion' for this study seemed superficial since it illustrates how complex and challenging prejudice and targeted hostility are; and by extension, indicates how much more researchers and practitioners need to do to understand this phenomenon.

By combining both the survey and fieldwork data the previous two chapters have illustrated how multiculturalism as an ideology can differ from the everyday, lived reality of engaging and negotiating with ethnic and religious diversity. The previous chapter, in particular, demonstrated how 'ordinary' interactions and real-life situational cues can cause underlying prejudices and hostility to spill over into acts of targeted hostility. This chapter aims to use both the research experience and findings to consider how this study contributes to research and existing theory, and how it could inform policy and practice developments. The overall theme of this chapter is to urge researchers, educators and practitioners to empower young people on the issues of multiculturalism, diversity and prejudice. It is only through working *with* young people on these themes that we can begin to better understand underlying fears and local tensions and therefore, move forward in developing initiatives and interventions which effectively connect with young people's lives.

7.2 Doing Research with Young People

The first section of this chapter focuses on the experience of conducting this study and identifies specific methodological approaches which could feature more prominently when conducting research with young people. Throughout this thesis it has been noted that research involving young people, particularly those who are regarded as 'difficult' or hard to reach, is limited. Specifically, Chapter Three illustrated that hate crime literature could be perceived as being adultcentric in nature, and even that which does focus on young people often uses official, quantitative sources of data. The limited research actively conducted with young people cannot solely be explained as researcher reluctance; it could be better understood by accounting for the increasing constraints and restrictions applied by ethics committees. The process of getting ethical approval can be convoluted and time consuming; and to some extent can prevent research on topics which is highly needed and on people who are often considered 'hard to reach', misunderstood and even, ignored.

Until more recently children and young people have been regarded as being incompetent, vulnerable and unreliable within the research setting (Moss and Petrie, 2002; Lansdown, 2005). Young people were viewed as objects to be 'discussed, diagnosed, scientised, differentiated, and familiarised' (Lesko, 2001: 47) by expert adult knowledge. The present study illustrates that young people should instead be regarded as capable, opinionated and enthusiastic to communicate their own experiences. This argument is not intended to make light of the challenges and difficulties which can arise when conducting research with young people, but rather to urge for greater recognition of the ways in which researchers can be sensitive to these issues and develop strategies to overcome them. The experience of conducting this research has been intense and challenging, and has illustrated how worthwhile developing the appropriate methodological approach was and also, how important and relevant the research topic is.

Key to overcoming the concerns of ethics committees and still be able to collect empirically rooted data necessary for understanding complex human behaviour, researchers need to develop a more tailored 'softer' methodological approach to engaging with young people. Central to capturing and understanding the lived

experience of the subgroup within this research was the use of an ethnographic strategy which facilitated sustained observations and informal conversations. Beare and Hogg (2013) suggest that researchers have been reluctant to use ethnography despite a range of studies conveying its effectiveness in engaging with hard to reach groups and facilitating an in-depth understanding of complex behaviour. Venkatesh (2008: 21) notes that one of the primary motivations for using ethnography within his study was the response a gang member gave him when he was asked to fill in a survey:

You shouldn't go around asking them silly-ass questions ... With people like us, you should hang out, get to know what they do, how they do it. No one is going to answer questions like that. You need to understand how young people live on the streets.

For a range of practical and ethical reasons, as mentioned in Chapter Four, I did not feel comfortable using ethnography in its fullest sense with a group of young people who were characterised by marginalisation and fragility. Instead, an ethnographic strategy was chosen which involved spending two to three nights a week with the subgroup in 'their' area so as to capture the necessary contextual data whilst maintaining a professional distance from the group. This approach enabled the research to be conducted collaboratively, empowering young people to actively work with the researcher during the study.

The subgroup within this research was made up of 15 young White British people between the ages of 14 and 19 years old, who lived within an area characterised by socio-economic disadvantage. Few of the subgroup members had 'conventional' family relationships with the majority living with one parent or extended family members, several residing with friends and one staying in a children's home. Of the nine who were in full-time education, one attended a school specialising in behaviour difficulties and three had been expelled, collectively explaining that they 'rarely' attended school. The remaining six subgroup members would be categorised as NEET as they were not in education, employment or training. I had come to engage with the subgroup through my role at the Youth Offending Service as a detached youth worker in areas with high levels of youth anti-social behaviour. Within the subgroup 13 members had

been in trouble with the police for low-level anti-social behaviour, with 12 being in trouble on more than one occasion. Four of the participants, who were also the oldest in the subgroup, had been involved in more serious incidents such as possession of a knife, racially aggravated assault and theft. The reason for repeating the demographics and characteristics of the subgroup is to emphasise that these young people would be defined as 'difficult' to engage with and 'hard to reach'. This group fell between the gap of not being 'bad' enough to warrant a range of services working with them, and not being 'good' enough or socially and economically empowered to be able to make use of the opportunities available or take part in cultural activities.

In order to get this group of young people, who were insular and isolated, to engage with me, trust me enough to open up and share their opinions and experiences, was to allow the group to get to know me first. I would advocate that researchers devote more time to appropriately locating the desired population and factor in a longer period of initial engagement in which the participants can become familiar with the researcher. This 'softer' approach is essential for allowing participants who are wary of 'outsiders' to see the person behind the research, to develop mutual respect between both parties and for the researcher to gain a better understanding of the effective forms of communication, dynamics and norms within the group. This approach is by no means easy and from my experience within the early stages of fieldwork, in which the subgroup could be unpredictable and aloof, can take considerable effort and understanding on the part of the researcher. The ability for researchers to use a 'softer' approach is further hampered by the increasing pressure for studies to be conducted with less resources, less time and consequently, less flexibility. This is a great pity and an increasing concern, as without researchers being able to use a softer, sustained method of engagement they will be limited in being able to capture the lived experience of those who are the most marginalised, disadvantaged and vulnerable within society.

Using a softer approach over a longer time frame whilst conducting qualitative data collection, requires the researcher to be much more interactive within the research setting. As documented throughout this study, I opted to use auto-ethnography as an

additional data collection method. As illustrated in the last two chapters, the subgroup members, their opinions and their actions could make me laugh, shock me, frustrate me and also, upset me. I identified in Chapter Four that the concept of multiculturalism and in particular racism, was something I felt especially passionate about and found that my experience with the subgroup involved a 'discovery of the self through the detour of the other' (Hunt, 1989: 42). The use of auto-ethnography and in particular documenting experiences, opinions and feelings during the research process, is seen as being important and beneficial for two key reasons: Firstly, in a practical sense using auto-ethnography could actively promote good practice and therefore could increase the quality of the research produced. This is because researchers become more consciously aware of the impact they have on their research and through memo-ing their feelings and experiences can become more attuned to the subtleties and nuances which may have gone unnoticed or even forgotten, during the writing-up phase.

Secondly, when a researcher becomes more of an active participant within their research and documents their feelings and experiences, it enables them to achieve a greater understanding of the participants' characters and lives. This perspective acknowledges that qualitative research can become 'contaminated' with stories, emotions and relationships and that this should be embraced as it infuses a human side to complex and challenging research (Jewkes, 2012; Farrant, 2014). As Farrant (2014: 6) observed within her own research on prisons and prisoners, 'I have allowed the research to be contaminated, and it has contaminated me'. I began this research from a position where I personally could not understand what motivated young White British people who had grown up in Leicester to commit acts of targeted hostility. Without consciously being aware of my own prejudices and by not employing a methodology which facilitated a more active involvement in the participant's lives, I would have come away with a superficial understanding of their opinions on multiculturalism and participation in targeted hostility. Auto-ethnography permits a detailed inspection of a participant's lived reality, and therefore a more comprehensive understanding. Conveying the importance of understanding the subgroup's opinions and behaviour is not to suggest that I condone their actions any

more than when I began this study. However, if we are to achieve more comprehensive theoretical explanations of complex behaviour and to develop policy and practice which connects with real life, researchers must be able to see past the action, to understand the individual and to account for the socio-cultural context.

7.3 Theory

Using a more tailored, 'softer' and flexible methodological approach was central to developing a comprehensive and empirically rooted theoretical explanation of targeted hostility. This section reflects on the findings from this study to consider what implications they have for existing theoretical explanations of what motivates and causes young White British people to commit acts of racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility.

The motivation for this study began with observing a group of young White British people from a socially and economically disadvantaged background, openly expressing racially and religiously motivated prejudice and admitting their involvement in acts of targeted hostility. To gain insight into what caused the subgroup's prejudiced views and their involvement in targeted hostility, it was essential to develop an in-depth understanding of their upbringing, their current social-cultural and economic situation, and their individual personality traits. Leicester provided a fertile research environment to explore everyday multiculturalism and targeted hostility as it is regarded internationally as a successful model of social and cultural cohesion, and by extension the city's inhabitants are perceived to embrace its diverse population. Both the survey and fieldwork data collected from the subgroup reveal that whilst the vast majority (71.8% ($n=299$)) embraced multiculturalism as an ideology, there were 'very real fears, differences and antagonisms inevitably generated in conditions of massive social, cultural and economic change' (Harris, 2009: 201). The survey data illustrated that of the 425 young White British people taking part within this research, only 34.1% ($n=141$) felt that people from different ethnic backgrounds got on well together in Leicester. A range of factors including geographical segregation, cultural and language

barriers and pervading myths about the 'Other', were identified as facilitating a sense of unfamiliarity with 'difference' and consequently, undermining everyday encounters with diversity.

The concept of everyday multiculturalism has been a central tenet of this research as it provided an analytical lens through which to explore how young people interpret, engage and manage diversity. Today, most of the world's societies are ethnically and religiously diverse, and it is within these micro-spaces that multiculturalism continues to shape everyday life for ordinary people. The concept of everyday multiculturalism has emerged as an effective framework to understand how people encounter and manage diversity and 'difference' within the mundane micro-geographies of ordinary life (Colombo and Semi, 2007; Wise, 2007; Harris, 2009). It is through a closer analysis of local misunderstandings and tensions that incidents of targeted hostility can be seen as another aspect of a process which involves ordinary people negotiating difference and conflict in the context of everyday life (Wise, 2005). Integrating the concept of everyday multiculturalism within existing theories explaining why 'ordinary' people commit acts of targeted hostility, is essential to grounding these theories in real life experiences and contexts. This theoretical approach chimes with Perry's (2003: 5) assertion that hate crime scholars:

...must define hate crime in such a way as to give the term "life" and meaning, in other words, as a socially situated, dynamic process involving context and actors, structure and agency ... This allows us to acknowledge that bias motivated violence is not "abnormal" or "anomalous" in many Western cultures, but is rather a natural extension of the racism, sexism and homophobia that normally allocates privilege along racial and gender lines.

The previous chapter proposed a multi-disciplinary theory of why certain young White British commit acts of targeted hostility. Multiple, inter-connected factors were identified within the previous chapter, as motivating the subgroup to engage in racist and religiously motivated targeted hostility. The majority of low-level incidents, such as jokes in bad taste, verbal abuse and bullying, occurred due to a minor frustration or contestation in the context of everyday life. This included conflicts over not being served cigarettes or alcohol, being 'told off' or asked to move, or perceiving a minority

ethnic person as being rude or disrespectful to a member of the subgroup. These 'everyday' experiences convey the central role that prejudice plays within the context of daily life, whereby ordinary interactions with ethnic and religious 'Others' can exacerbate underlying feelings of insecurity and hostility towards Leicester's diverse population.

In times of boredom certain subgroup members would see acts of targeted hostility as an opportunity for a "*funny*", thrilling experience. Often these incidents involved subgroup members purposely targeting a specific household, corner shop or other business outlet which was known to be inhabited by minority ethnic people. In terms of the nature of these incidents, subgroup members would predominantly shout verbal abuse, knock on a window or door and then run away, or throw objects such as eggs, stones and footballs at the victim or at a building. The final category of offending identified with the subgroup involved the older members of the group in particular, using acts of targeted hostility as an outlet for their underlying anger, frustration and resentment towards diversity and 'difference'. These instances tended to be more extreme in nature with the subgroup members using verbal abuse, intimidatory behaviour, threats of violence and even physical assaults to send a message to the victim and the community they are perceived to represent. To the older subgroup members specifically, physical acts of targeted hostility were used as a means of reinforcing their perceived ownership over a particular place and served to strengthen their underlying belief of being superior to minority ethnic communities. Using the concept of everyday multiculturalism to analyse the subgroup's expressions of prejudice and involvement in targeted hostility facilitated an in-depth insight into the process and context in which such incidents took place.

Within the previous chapter strain and status frustration, alongside the amendments of Agnew's theory, were identified as offering a theoretical explanation as to how the subgroup's socio-economic instability could give rise to expressions and enactments of targeted hostility. Combining both strain and status frustration with Perry's theory of doing difference is regarded as explaining the macro context which generates feelings of socio-economic failure and which produces potential targets for offenders to exercise underlying prejudices and frustrations. Finally, linking Gottfredson and

Hirschi's (1990) theory of low self-control with the research on sensation seeking and fearlessness aimed to account for the differences in individual level offending. Although in need of further empirical testing, combining these psycho-physiological theories provides a preliminary explanation for the subgroup's involvement in targeted hostility, and why emotional gratification both motivated this group of young people to engage in this behaviour and also, reinforced it. This thesis contends that all of these factors, to differing extents, play a significant role in the motivation and causation of acts of racially and religiously motivated targeted hostility.

7.3.1 Recognising the Importance of Context

As outlined in the previous chapter, the theoretical explanation put forward is somewhat disconnected from the everyday contexts and lived reality which produces situational cues and incidents which can manifest into acts of targeted hostility. Within the field of hate crime, scholars have been increasingly vocal in urging more research to be conducted on the 'ordinary' and unspectacular nature of targeted hostility (Iganski, 2008; Walters and Hoyle, 2012; Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). The present study conveys that in contrast to the assumption that acts of targeted hostility are extreme in nature and committed by 'hardened race haters' (Gadd, *et al.*, 2005: 9), the majority of the incidents captured within this research were committed by 'ordinary' young people in the context of their everyday lives. The explanation developed so far is therefore incomplete without incorporating the concept of everyday multiculturalism to account for the 'ordinary' conflicts and contestations that occur in daily life and which can gravitate towards targeted hostility.

The previous chapter detailed how important place and micro-territories, such as school, the park, the corner shop, the local supermarket and the city centre, were to the subgroup's involvement in targeted hostility. To reiterate, for the subgroup school provided one of the few environments in which they were expected to engage with ethnic and religious diversity, and therefore school presented many opportunities for conflict. To the subgroup, school was an unhappy and boring environment in which they perpetually underachieved and got into trouble. There many instances of

targeted hostility which took place at school and these were often directed at minority ethnic teachers or support staff. In the eyes of the subgroup and even to their families, bullying the Asian school girl who had “*the hairiest arms ever*” and “*stinks*”, as well as harassing the Asian teacher were ‘ordinary’, unspectacular events. The importance of context was also illustrated through the more extreme incidents, including the physical attack on the security guard. The act of racially abusing and physically attacking the security guard symbolised again how an everyday ‘banal’ incident of being asked to move from congregating outside a block of flats, manifested into targeted hostility. Using the inter-disciplinary theory developed so far could explain why the underlying socio-economic strain and frustration felt by the subgroup legitimised and exacerbated their existing prejudiced views and how influential their lack of self-control and innate psycho-physiology was in the commission of targeted hostility. However, incidents which occurred within the school environment as well as those which took place in their local area, would not have come to fruition without certain situational cues and opportunities which permit these underlying feelings, prejudices and innate personality traits to surface. For the subgroup, living everyday multiculturalism provided ample opportunities to come into contact with people who looked ‘different’, people they did not like, people they felt threatened by, people they blamed and people they perceived as inferior. In truth, living everyday multiculturalism both exacerbated the subgroup’s social and economic status frustration and prejudiced views and also, generated the situational circumstances and opportunities for the subgroup to act upon these underlying feelings.

More recently within the field of hate studies there has been a shift towards the concepts of ‘difference’ and vulnerability featuring more heavily within theoretical frameworks explaining hate crime motivation and the heightened risk of victimisation (Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). This more nuanced framework recognises that victims of targeted hostility are not selected on the basis of a single identity characteristic such as ethnicity or religion, but rather that a range of identity, visual and situational factors increase the likelihood of victimisation. As Chakraborti and Garland (2012: 501) suggest, ‘vulnerability is exacerbated through social conditions, prevailing norms and people’s reactions to ‘difference’’. Using the concept of everyday

multiculturalism provides greater recognition of why 'difference' and importantly, unfamiliarity with 'difference' generates contexts which are conducive to targeted hostility. Many of the excerpts of discussions with the subgroup included within this thesis convey the lack of meaningful interaction this sample of young people have with diversity through routine, everyday activities. The intolerance towards 'difference' was not dependent on a singular aspect of identity such as ethnicity or religion; instead participants picked up on culture, appearance, dress, language, food, attitudes and behaviour as symbolising the differences between 'them' and 'us'. Both the subgroup and student sample spoke of minority ethnic communities and 'immigrants' who *"speak funny"*, *"smell"*, are *"hairy"* and *"curry munchers"*, dress in *"bin bags"*, have *"dark skin"* and engage in *"terrorism"*, *"stabblings"*, *"paedophilia"* and *"sponge of us"*. In addition, the incidents involving the African foreign exchange student, the Asian student and teacher, the Black African security guard and the Asian shop owners, all emphasise the importance of vulnerability and context. In all of these incidents the target for the hostility was visibly 'different', and therefore stood out within that mundane environment. All of the victims in these incidents were in a numerical minority position within that context, which reinforced the perception that the victim was an easy target and therefore, increased the perceived vulnerability of that individual.

Embedding the concept of everyday multiculturalism within existing theories hate crime motivation also helps to recognise that underlying tensions and prejudices are somewhat context and location specific. Spending time with the subgroup within 'their' turf provided a more comprehensive understanding of why they were so hostile towards specific groups of 'Others'. The subgroup spoke about *"immigrants"* in Leicester and often referred to the Asian, Polish and Somalian people. The subgroup's hostility towards these specific minority ethnic groups could be because geographically the subgroup were next to a significant concentration of Indian and Bangladeshi communities and lived within an area that had international shops which were frequented by Eastern European and African communities. This meant that within the context of their everyday life they were presented with visible objects of 'difference' which reinforced and exacerbated their underlying prejudices and hostility. The local

Indian, Somali and Muslim communities in Leicester have strong visual cultural characteristics and identity markers, and this was resented by the subgroup and seen as an affront to the 'British way of life'. Moran, Skeggs, Tyrer and Corteen (2003: 7) use the concept 'regimes of placement', to illustrate the importance of visibility in a public space and to explain how visual 'differences' embody the perceived threat posed by minority ethnic communities. Within the present study, the subgroup members appeared to justify their intolerance towards 'difference' by emphasising the potential cultural threat of "*Asians*", "*Muslims*" and "*immigrants*" as being "*terrorists*", who wanted to "*take over the country*". To some extent this was mirrored in the survey responses with a small percentage of participants associating the problem of 'immigrants' with the Muslim community, suggesting that they were '*everywhere*' and wanted to '*bring Sharia Law to the UK*'.

7.3.2 The Geography of Targeted Hostility

The time spent getting to know how the subgroup felt about the different ethnic and religious groups in Leicester demonstrated how fluid and dynamic prejudiced views can be. The subgroup's hostility was predominantly directed towards the out-groups they observed as part of their everyday lives, including local the Muslim, Indian and Somali communities. Although they are likely to still hold prejudiced views towards 'Muslims' due to the significant societal intolerance towards this population, if they were located within a different area of Leicester or even a different city, their prejudices would not necessarily be the same. This is supported by research conducted by the Institute of Race Relations which found that the patterns of racist victimisation within the UK were changing (Burnett, 2012a; 2012b; 2012c). By focusing on specific locations within Plymouth, Stoke on Trent and Peterborough the reports illustrate how patterns of migration and settlement has impacted upon levels of prejudice and targeted hostility on a local level. Micro-multicultural geographies provide many visual targets of 'difference' who might be perceived as challenging British norms, values and traditions, as well as threatening ownership over a specific territory, opportunities for employment and access to societal resources. All of these underlying perceptions and

tensions are brought to the fore in micro-multicultural spaces and can strain everyday encounters between people from different backgrounds.

Relating to the geography of multiculturalism, this thesis illustrates how the complex social relationship between the subgroup and minority ethnic 'Others' can be further strained by socio-economic conditions. A key contention of this study is that expressing prejudiced views and involvement in targeted hostility is not a 'working-class' phenomenon. The prejudices expressed by the sample of young people within this research are seen as an extension of the prejudices held by wider society. However, it is important to recognise the role that socio-economic conditions play in producing micro-spaces and contexts in which people from different backgrounds come together. As Walters and Hoyle (2012: 17) explain:

... those who can afford large detached houses may be better placed to avoid perceived provocation. The distance from their neighbours and their ability to negotiate day-to-day tasks at a distance from others protects them – at least to some extent – from unwanted contact with those they consider to be outside of their 'circle', whether the lines are drawn according to race, sexual preference, age or other differences.

The role of social, economic and cultural capital should figure more prominently in theoretical explanations of targeted hostility. Bourdieu (1986) suggests that economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital are dependent on a person's position in the social-class hierarchy in a given society. Within the subgroup all but one of the group members were born in the area in which they still lived, and had multiple extended family members living in close proximity. The subgroup's community was characterised by 'local nomadism', whereby extended family members would move into different houses but would still remain within the same locale (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004). 11 of the subgroup members had close family living within the area, with four having at least one family relation in the immediate group. This group of young people were not in a position to move areas, and to therefore, purchase their freedom from living everyday multiculturalism. Furthermore, because the subgroup felt a sense of exclusion and failure in education, employment and more generally in wider society, their area generated a geography of inclusion around which residents constructed a

sense of pride, cultural identity and belonging (Parker, 1974). For those within society who do not experience social and economic instability so acutely, their immediate area and community may not hold the same emotional resonance and significance. Therefore, the perceived threat to the ownership of this 'territory' and the daily reminder of 'difference' is amplified within socially and economically disadvantaged communities who are living everyday multiculturalism.

7.3.4 Blurring the Victim and Offender Boundary

As the field of hate crime has developed more inclusive frameworks of targeted hostility which recognise the prevalence of low-level crimes, as well as non-criminal incidents, a more comprehensive understanding of the victim-offender relationship has developed with it (Chakraborti and Garland, 2009; Walters and Hoyle, 2012). Walters and Hoyle (2012: 7) suggest that 'the messier and sometimes intractable disputes between neighbours, colleagues or other acquaintances – conflicts that are often only partly motivated by prejudice' had been left out of debates on hate crime. The present study has illustrated that the majority of the incidents of targeted hostility committed by the subgroup involved victims who lived locally to the group or victims they were acquainted with through other means such as school and local businesses. This included local shopkeepers, residents, Police Community Support Officers and youth workers, to name but some. This supports Mason's (2005) research conducted with the Metropolitan Police Service in which she challenged the notion of 'stranger danger' by finding that the majority of hate crimes were committed by people who were acquainted with the victim. Much of the targeted hostility committed by the subgroup occurred whilst doing routine activities such as buying cigarettes and alcohol from the local corner shop, activities which they were likely to do again. For this reason an act of targeted hostility committed by the subgroup can be seen as just one incident in an ongoing process of encountering and interacting with the victim. For minority ethnic communities who lived in the area repeat victimisation was a sad reality.

Often the relationship between the victim and the offender is regarded as a dichotomous one, mainly due to the prevailing perception that people who commit incidents of targeted hostility are qualitatively 'different' from ordinary people. The present study illustrates that framing the subgroup as solely 'offenders' misinterprets, and even ignores, the plurality of their life experiences. During the three months spent with the subgroup I was able to get to know the young people behind the expressions of prejudice and acts of targeted hostility. What became apparent was that the subgroup members themselves were subject to different forms of victimisation and this impacted on how they felt about themselves and the world around them. Many of the females within the subgroup were involved in exploitative relationships, and had experienced domestic abuse and sexual assault. Dan, Ryan and James had all experienced emotional and physical abuse from within their own family. The majority of the subgroup had grown up within an environment which was characterised by a lack of care and support, unequal power relationships, substance misuse and the use of violence to resolve conflict. The group faced a unique form of prejudice and victimisation because of being stereotyped as 'Chavs'. Highlighting the upbringing of the subgroup is again not intended to excuse or condone their involvement in acts of targeted hostility, but rather to suggest that the dichotomous view of 'victims' and 'offenders' is far too simple.

This is also true for the relationship the subgroup had with their victims. For example, the Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) in particular was especially disrespectful and punitive to the subgroup members which generated immense frustration within the group. The PCSO spoke to the subgroup in a manner which was patronising and rude. In addition the PCSO interpreted Will, Ryan and Dan's involvement in certain behaviour, including Will allowing James to sit on the handlebars of his bike, Ryan dropping litter and Dan spitting, as breaking the conditions of their Acceptable Behaviour Contract and consequently led to them being given Anti-Social Behaviour Orders. To this group of young people, the PCSO's attitude towards the group and his actions were perceived to be provocation and therefore, justification for the racial abuse they directed at him. This is not to suggest that the PCSO in any way deserved being victimised, but rather to emphasise that the framework used to explain the

victim and offender relationships needs to be more sophisticated in order to understand the underlying tension and motivation. As Walters and Hoyle (2012: 9) suggest, the 'labels [of victim and offender] do not always adequately represent the harm caused and the suffering experienced by both sides throughout ongoing conflicts'. This study illustrates that accounting for the complicated nature of social relationships and the plurality of life experience, develops a more comprehensive theoretical explanation of targeted hostility.

7.4 Policy

The findings from this research demonstrate that more needs to be done to develop policy and practice which connects with real life and which tackles the underlying themes of prejudice, unfamiliarity and hostility. This study has illustrated the existence of a conventional level of prejudice amongst 'ordinary' young White British people in Leicester. For this reason this section begins by using the research findings and experience to consider ways in which these underlying feelings of fear, unfamiliarity and hostility can be tackled with 'ordinary' young people within the educational environment. It then moves on to consider how prejudice and targeted hostility could be addressed with young people who are engaging, or are at risk of engaging, in targeted hostility. Within this section the findings are re-introduced to consider the implications and future directions for the educational environment, youth work and initiatives for young offenders. It is worth noting from the outset that from both the research experience, as well as my own work experience, I consider the most effective initiatives with young offenders involved in targeted hostility may be achieved away from the Criminal Justice System within schools and youth offending teams. Rather than focusing on punitive forms of punishment for young people who engage in acts of targeted hostility, it is suggested that 'identifying strategies for reducing prejudice and using these to inform rehabilitative efforts offer better prospects for responding to hate and hate crime' (Hall, 2013: 147). It is for this reason that this section focuses on how schools could better engage and empower young people in debates on the themes raised within this thesis, and how youth offending teams could develop and

deliver more effective programmes of activities to address the underlying causes of targeted hostility.

7.4.1 Tackling Prejudice in Schools

Before conducting this study and submitting the proposal for ethical clearance from the relevant committee at the University of Leicester, my main concern was that the research focus would be considered 'contentious' and therefore would prevent me from gaining access to the relevant young people. However, it became apparent that the themes within this study were considered to be so 'controversial' because they were topics which are shied away from, particularly when it comes to young people. Oddly, this study provided a rare opportunity for young people to voice their opinions and discuss their experiences of prejudice and targeted hostility. The subgroup members often commented that this was the first time that they had been asked about living in a multicultural city and about their experiences with people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds, and they felt more valued for it. Although the subgroup members often remarked on everyone being "*well racist*" and that they heard this everyday racism from their friends and family, this is very different from a having a social space to engage in a more open, informative and educational debate. This has been found in studies conducted into similar areas where young people are found to lack a platform in which they can openly express and debate the meaning of 'difference' and cultural cohesion (McLeod and Yates, 2003; Harris, 2008).

As Clayton (2009) found when asking young White British people in Leicester about their experiences and interactions with ethnic and religious diversity, the focus groups provided the participants with a 'rare space' where they could openly discuss their beliefs without the fear of repercussion or ridicule. Pettigrew (2012) also illustrated that the students within her study had little to no understanding of history which Cole (2004) suggests is fundamental to tackling contemporary expressions of racism. Pettigrew's (2012) research revealed that few of the students could recall a lesson in which they had been actively involved in a discussion about racism. It was for this

reason that the participants within her study wished that they could have specifically tailored lessons where they could explore the issue of racism and identity and ‘where you could just talk about language and stuff’ (Pettigrew, 2012: n.p.). The findings from the present study demonstrate that young people in Leicester, both those who commit acts of targeted hostility and those who do not, are sometimes fearful, ignorant and prejudiced towards ethnic and religious diversity; this section therefore reflects on the findings from the present study to consider the need for schools to be doing more in tackling these issues and the barriers they face in doing so.

The study found, that within the survey sample, there were many respondents who expressed views which could be categorised as being ‘conventionally’ prejudiced (as mentioned in the previous chapter). This concept was first coined by Aboud (1988) who developed a typology of prejudice with three distinct categories. One of the categories in Aboud’s typology is ‘Conventionally Prejudiced’ which describes individuals whose views are seen as conforming to the norms, values and opinions of their peers and families and are often underpinned by ignorance and fear. This category was identified throughout the analysis of the survey findings within this study, firstly through the perceived issue of immigration which emerged when participants were asked to consider what they thought was the biggest issue facing Britain. 50% ($n=208$) of respondents focused on the negative and detrimental impact immigration has on Britain. When young people in Leicester were asked to explain why immigration was the biggest problem facing Britain, a range of reasons were offered:

As long as they don’t come for the sole purpose of getting benefits.

Not enough room/supplies/jobs.

Government doesn’t focus on the most important people.

Decreasing job opportunities and immigrants taking houses and benefits that should be given to the British.

They use and abuse the country.

There was a clear association between immigrants being in the country and the perceived loss of opportunity and resources for the ‘native’ British population. This view may be exacerbated within the current economic climate and the increasing

focus on 'immigrants' within the popular press.

Within the survey young people were asked if they thought people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds got on well together in Leicester, to which 34.1% ($n=141$) answered 'Yes', 41.0% ($n=170$) said 'No' and 24.7% ($n=102$) stated 'Sometimes'. Within the 41.0% ($n=170$) who felt that different ethnic groups did not get on well together, a range of explanations were offered which conveyed the underlying 'tension' and 'hostility' observed by this group of young people:

There is racism everywhere and some ethnic groups do not get along.

People are either violent due to religion [sic] differences or try to dominate others.

There is a great divide between White and Asian people and a lot of racial tension.

White people don't like Asian people.

Most Whites don't get on with others, however most Asian and Black people get on.

Indian culture all live in one community together and don't tend to mix with white people.

They hate each other.

The White people don't like Black people.

Do they fuck cuz [sic] White people don't like Black people and Black people don't like White people.

They are not from here and they're different. They don't dress or speak English and it annoys people.

Further conventionally prejudiced views towards 'difference' could be observed from the 53% ($n=226$) of participants who provided an opinion of why they thought people commit acts of targeted hostility. Within the sample the theme of 'perceived justification' emerged, with respondents suggesting offenders are:

Annoyed at them for coming over to our country and for many other reasons.

They are angry at the way immigration works and get angry when they let us hold Diwali but we aren't allowed Christmas because it celebrates Christ.

Because they take over the country and steal our jobs.

Because they are proud to be British and want England to stay English.

To be truthful and/or fed up that they are everywhere.

All three of these questions provided the sample of 14 to 19 year old White British people living in Leicester with the opportunity to share their opinions on these 'contentious issues'. It not only illustrated that this sample were capable of voicing their opinions but also that these young people were sometimes fearful, ignorant and

intolerant of 'difference' and diversity.

As all of the participants within the survey sample were located within schools, it raises questions as to how these underlying tensions are impacting upon young people at school and how this is being tackled within the educational environment. Schools now reflect the ethnic and religious diversity that exists in the western world and this can create challenges within the classroom (Van Geel and Vedder, 2011). Recently ChildLine found that more than 1,400 children reported experiencing racist bullying in school, which is a 69% rise from the previous year, and had sought out counselling to support them through the experience (ChildLine, 2014). Worryingly the ChildLine (2014) report documents that many young people who have experienced racist bullying felt that the teachers were either ineffective or simply ignored what they had been told. Within the process of conducting this study I heard similar remarks from teachers themselves who expressed considerable fear and confusion when it came to knowing how to cover the themes of diversity and prejudice within the classroom, and how to deal with incidents of targeted hostility when they arose.

Pagani and Robustelli (2010: 252) argue that prejudice which is underpinned by ignorance is the 'most obvious, matter-of-fact, easiest to identify and to combat of all the basic motivations', and that the most effective way of counteracting the stereotypes and fears is through providing knowledge within an educational environment. Thomas and Sanderson (2013) found that schools offer a unique micro-context where boundaries between 'difference' are much more fluid and negotiable and that the young White British people within their study reported a positive contact with Muslim young people in this environment. However, Thomas and Sanderson's (2013) study demonstrates that having a multicultural school population is not enough to counteract underlying tensions and prejudices which exist between different ethnic and religious groups. Instead we must look at how the themes of multiculturalism, diversity and 'difference' are being taught within the classroom. A range of commentators suggest that the issues of diversity and equality took a greater prominence in political and education contexts under the Blair government, with key

policy drivers requiring schools to address discrimination and community cohesion (High, Arshad, Mitchell, Watt, and Roberts, 2011). In 2000, the delivery of citizenship education was made compulsory within the school curriculum in England due to the growing fear that society's social mortar was being undermined by a lack of cohesion, shared values and civic ties (Pettigrew, 2012). The addition of citizenship was just one aspect of a wider shift to develop educational policy and guidance which embraced the discourse of equality and diversity in schools.

The effectiveness of these developments is debateable. High *et al.* (2011) reported that newly qualified teachers (NQTs) felt 'out of their depth' teaching and tackling race issues. In particular, they found that the majority of NQTs were white, monolingual, female and middle class who felt that their own background made them ill-equipped in understanding cultural difference and dealing with challenging issues. High *et al.* (2011) found that only 44% of NQTs felt that the training they received on equality and diversity was 'good to very good'. Elsewhere, a range of studies illustrate that the subject of race and racism in particular is addressed in a limited way (Wilkins and Lall, 2010; for a full review see High, *et al.*, 2011), and that many teacher training courses 'deal' with the matter in a single lesson. By not embedding these themes within the curriculum, there is no obligation or time for teachers to cover the increasingly important issues of diversity, immigration and tolerance within the classroom.

Moreover research demonstrates that young people are often given no language with which they can discuss and debate the topics of race and religion within the educational environment which does not reduce them to being perceived as intolerant, offensive or simply, racist (McLeod and Yates, 2003). As this study illustrates, it must be recognised that young people are most likely to occupy the types of everyday geographical spaces to encounter and engage with ethnic and religious diversity. They are equally likely to use everyday language to negotiate and interpret these events (Harris, 2009). We are often too keen to interpret young people's experiences and opinions through an adultcentric lens, using the formal labels and concepts of multiculturalism and social cohesion with which young people rarely identify. Various studies demonstrate that young people struggle to express their experience of multiculturalism in these terms (Schech and Haggis, 2000; Harris, 2009).

It is equally important that researchers and educators realise that when trying to engage young people in debates on these issues, their opinions and beliefs are subjective and relative. Taking the subgroup as an example, this group of young people were surrounded by adults who expressed 'prejudiced' views, lived within an area where the success of minority ethnic groups was visually evident and felt socially and economically disadvantaged. If the subgroup members were to express their beliefs, which they perceive as being rational and 'true', and were simply admonished or even ignored, then it is likely to further reinforce their feelings of disconnect and frustration.

The extant literature on the teaching of equality and diversity within schools, as well as the findings from this study, overwhelmingly suggests that the government must do more to embed these areas within the curriculum (DfES, 2007; Tomlinson, 2011; Hick, *et al.* 2011). As Banks' (2004: 291) explains:

Although it is essential that all students acquire basic skills in literacy, basic skills are necessary but not sufficient in our diverse and troubled world . . . the world's greatest problems do not result from people being unable to read and write. They result from people in the world – from different cultures, races, religions, and nations – being unable to get along and to work together to solve the world's intractable problems.

Tomlinson (2011) observes however that since the Coalition government took power there has been a significant reversal of the policy developed under Labour. Tomlinson (2011) remarks on the 'persistent absence' of the issue of race in government discourse on education. It is within this void that schools and colleges must make greater use of voluntary and community organisations within the education environment.

In the report 'Challenge It, Report It, Stop It', the government outlined 23 action points designed to prevent hate crime perpetration (HM Government, 2012). The report identified supporting education and anti-bullying initiatives, as well as developing resources for use by local practitioners as top priorities (HM Government, 2012; Hall, 2013; HM Government, 2014). Within the UK there are a range of voluntary and charitable organisations such as the Sophie Lancaster Foundation, the Anne Frank Trust UK and Show Racism the Red Card, who develop educational resources for

schools and colleges and deliver a wide range of workshops within these environments. In order to tackle the 'conventional' everyday prejudice expressed by the sample of young White British people in the present study, schools need to place greater emphasis on using these voluntary and charitable organisations. For example, the Sophie Lancaster Foundation delivers numerous presentations and workshops focusing on the nature of prejudice and 'intolerance of difference' in society (Chakraborti and Garland, 2014: 49; The Sophie Lancaster Foundation, 2014). Sylvia Lancaster founded the charity in the wake of her daughter's murder on August 24th 2007. The murder of Sophie Lancaster was motivated by her alternative dress and appearance and subsequently, her mother Sylvia Lancaster set up the Foundation to raise awareness of this form of victimisation and campaign for subcultures to be protected by law (The Sophie Lancaster Foundation, 2014). The Foundation has developed a range of innovative educational resources which are available to schools, colleges, youth clubs, young offenders institutions and any professionals working with young people (The Sophie Lancaster Foundation, 2014).

Similarly, the Anne Frank Trust UK is another invaluable organisation which in 2013 worked with over 29,000 young people in schools and colleges (The Anne Frank Trust UK, 2014). The Trust delivers a programme of tailored activities which focus on Anne Frank's life to illustrate the damage caused by prejudice and hatred, and enables young people to reflect upon their own lives and the prejudices they may hold. Collaborative work between schools, the local authority and third-sector organisations needs to be given greater priority within the educational environment (HM Government, 2014). It is only through the development and delivery of creative educational activities, which are context and location specific, that everyday prejudices, stereotypes and tensions can be brought to the surface and challenged.

It is worth stating that there have been many commentators who have highlighted the lack of practical knowledge to emerge from prejudice literature, specifically when it comes to addressing and reducing such views through educational initiatives (Paluck and Green, 2009). This has direct implications for the school environment in terms of developing approaches which tackle underlying prejudices and hostility with young

people. There is a general feeling amongst such scholars that whilst the literature on prejudice reduction is exhaustive, there is a paucity of research that supports 'internally valid inferences and externally valid generalisation, meaning that in order to formulate prejudice reduction policies must extrapolate beyond the available data and use theoretical suppositions to fill the gap' (Hall, 2013: 160). This is further supported by the work of Abrams (2010), who reviewed a range of prejudice reduction strategies from a British perspective. Abrams (2010) observed that whilst both the public and private sector have developed a range of initiatives to promote equality and diversity, reduce prejudiced views and enhance cross-cultural cohesion, there has been a naive assumption that these strategies will work simply because they have been implemented. This is a sentiment to which I do not disagree with; there needs to be much more of an emphasis on developing evidence-based policy and practice on 'what works' with young people in both a school or community environment.

Furthermore, not all research within this area is negative; indeed as Paluck and Green (2009) note, the best approaches to prejudice reduction include cooperative learning, where classroom lessons are designed to enable students to teach and learn from each other. On the basis of the available evidence, Paluck and Green (2009) identify initiatives which involve media, reading and other forms of narrative and normative communication as potential approaches to reducing prejudiced views. It is strategies such as these that should be developed in a relativistic manner, administered innovatively and then appropriately evaluated to generate a body of knowledge on prejudice reduction. The educational environment requires significant reform in order for real and continuing progress to be made towards fostering more understanding and tolerance in young people. If the teaching of equality and diversity is to be successful then educators and young people need the time, space and flexibility to discuss these increasingly important themes together in an open and informative way.

7.4.2 Engaging Young People in Youth Work

The motivation for conducting the present study was born out of my experiences with

the Youth Offending Service and specifically, my role as a detached youth worker. Detached youth work plays a crucial part in engaging young people who feel marginalised and frustrated. As Thomas and Sanderson (2013) found, although schools help to bring together young people from different backgrounds, outside of this environment young White British people reported limited interaction with diversity. This is a finding mirrored within the present study where participants in both the subgroup and survey sample suggested that *'in schools they get on but where everyone lives it is quite divided'*. As discussed in the previous section, the school environment is seen as the first arena in which underlying prejudices and tensions should be dealt with. However, there are two issues: firstly, there needs to be a significant change to existing policy on teacher training and the current curriculum to embed understanding diversity and 'difference' appropriately, which therefore is unlikely to come into fruition quickly; and secondly, the last chapter identified how the subgroup found school to be an environment in which they felt disconnected and which also exacerbated their feelings of failure and frustration. It is for this group of young people that detached youth work provides a much more effective and practical option to developing initiative and interventions.

Youth work is multifaceted, particularly so when trying to work with young people who can be 'difficult' and 'hard to reach'. The strengths of youth work are that it often takes place within a young person's own 'turf'; it requires voluntary participation; and it involves friendship groups rather than individuals. My experience of youth work and of engaging with this subgroup illustrates that effective youth work is dependent on being able to relate to each other and develop mutual respect. This point is not too dissimilar to that mentioned in the first section on researchers. Trying to engage with marginalised young people requires youth workers to put in substantial groundwork in getting to know the group. This is a point that Riah, a youth worker working in the area with the subgroup, supported:

Riah: ... We've been in the area working with the group for like ... six months or something.

Researcher: So I guess you know the young people in the area pretty well?

Riah: Yeah we've got a good relationship with them, especially since Mo has started working here. The group really like him.

Researcher: *That's cool. Do you think that makes a big difference? ... like if the young people can relate to the person working with them.*

Riah: *Yeah totally ... I think it helps being around their age... and like knowing the stuff that they like. Age isn't everything but if you are good with them like have a laugh then it makes a massive difference*

This point may seem self-evident, and yet even during my time with the subgroup I observed youth workers immediately begin trying to educate or challenge the group about their anti-social behaviour, with little to no success. One of the major barriers between people in authority and young people is the perception that 'adults' do not understand. Byers *et al.* (1999) found that one of the neutralisation techniques used by hate crime offenders was 'condemnation of the condemners' where such offenders question the right of the 'condemners' to judge their beliefs and behaviours. If I had begun engaging with the subgroup by telling them that their views were wrong and had spoken to them in a patronising manner then I would never have achieved a meaningful understanding of their lives. In order for youth workers to begin identifying underlying motivations and causations for targeted hostility and anti-social behaviour more generally, they need to 'get to know' the group they are working with. This can only be achieved through listening to young people and through developing rapport and mutual respect.

Youth work can be pivotal to challenging existing stereotypes and prejudices towards minority ethnic and religious communities. Meaningful engagement over a sustained timeframe can have a significant impact on a young person who feels isolated and uncared for. As identified through contact theory (Brewer and Brown, 1998; Schalk-Soekar, *et al.*, 2004), meaningful interaction with a youth or support worker from an out-group can lead to a more positive attitude towards 'difference', and therefore a reduction in the levels of prejudice and hostility. As outlined in Chapter Five, this was demonstrated through the positive impact that an Asian youth worker had on Dan's understanding of 'difference' and the prejudices he held towards the Asian community. However, this is by no means easy; the subgroup had shown hostility towards a new youth worker in the area simply because he was Asian. However, when revisiting the subgroup after the three months engagement, I observed a much better relationship between the subgroup and the youth workers. One of the main reasons

for the improved relationship was that the youth workers had listened to the group when they explained that their offending took place in times of boredom because they had nothing to keep them occupied. The youth workers had attended a community forum with a select few from the subgroup to ask about using local facilities to play 5-a-side football pitch for free and develop a boxing club. Although a simple point, what also helped the group in accepting the Asian youth worker was that he was good at playing football which challenged the stereotype of minority ethnic people only playing cricket, and helped them relate to each other through a common interest.

A key role for youth workers is listening to the underlying tensions and local hostilities expressed by the group of young people they are working with. As the Government report 'Challenge It, Report It, Stop It' (HM Government, 2012: 11) identifies, there needs to be more of a focus towards actively promoting 'early intervention, as a key part of a preventative approach that looks to resolve issues and tensions early before they can manifest themselves in the form of hate crime.' The subgroup within this research perceived the local minority ethnic community as receiving preferential treatment and services:

Steph: *They (local Asian community) get everything though like down there they've got this new like Centre where you can do DJ-ing and play loads of sports and it's like open all the time but only for Pakis.*

Researcher: *So you think this area hasn't got anything because you're all White?*

Ryan: *Fuck yeah they get everything.*

Researcher: *But it's not that far from here like why don't you guys go try it?*

Ryan: *No way ... Why would we want to be around a load of curry munchers ... there'd be so many fights.*

Steph: *God imagine the smell (laughing).*

A primary role for a detached youth working team should be to try and resolve these underlying tensions through developing and delivering fun and creative activities tailored to meet the needs of the group. Within this study the majority of the incidents of anti-social behaviour and targeted hostility perpetrated by the subgroup took place within the context of everyday life, where the group were bored and where the opportunity for an exciting experience presented itself. Running clubs and activities

that the subgroup were interested led to an increased engagement and therefore, less opportunity to engage in anti-social behaviour, and a more positive attitude towards the facilities and resources available within their area.

Building upon this platform, youth workers should seek to develop activities which involve young people from different areas and from different backgrounds as it contributes to bridging social capital (Putman, 1994). The most effective contact is mediated through cultural forms such as art, music, sport and outdoor activities (Gilroy, 2002). Thomas' (2003) research conveys how effective engaging young people within this form of youth work can be to promoting cultural cohesion and addressing offending behaviour. Thomas (2003) explored the experiences of young Asian and White people in Oldham who took part in a range of activities such as cricket matches and drama workshops, and reported successful, meaningful engagement. The strength of this approach has also been supported within hate crime literature; Levin and McDevitt (2002) found that community sentences which involve the offender working with a local minority community group, had moderate success in reducing the risk of re-offending. This form of youth work is seen as being key in challenging underlying prejudices and tensions between young people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. However, this is not always straightforward for youth workers to arrange and execute. As outlined in the Chapter Five, the subgroup expressed great reluctance towards the prospect of engaging in any form of activity if it involved minority ethnic people.

Youth work has a potentially unique role in challenging existing stereotypes and prejudices and developing interventions to prevent incidents of targeted hostility. It is unfortunate and to some extent, worrying that services for young people have been significantly curtailed as part of the ongoing austerity measures. The process of conducting this study illustrated the effectiveness of a sustained interaction with young people on their 'turf' and empowering this group by listening to their opinions and experiences. For youth work to be effective in engaging young people, activities need to be tailored to meet the needs of a specific group, and should ideally combine both enjoyable and cultural pursuits as well as delivering educational messages on

anti-social behaviour, education and employment. Finally, it is worth reiterating that well-planned and managed cross-community projects could be central to promoting understanding and tolerance between people from different backgrounds but the effectiveness of these activities will be dependant on funding and support being available to local authority youth services.

7.4.3 Addressing Targeted Victimisation with Young Offenders

The last two sections have focused on working with young people who express prejudiced views and who may be at risk of engaging, if not already engaging, in acts of targeted hostility. On reading the literature relating to how best to deal with racially and religiously motivated offenders it becomes clear that there are more questions than answers when it comes to the most effective practice. Although there appears to be little consensus on which strategy is the most effective, a range of initiatives have been put forward such as legislative responses, the development of behavioural programmes and the use of restorative justice. It is worth stating that the literature focusing explicitly on young racially or religiously motivated offenders and the most effective offending programmes, is negligible. A review by Gadd (2009) into existing provisions designed to work with racially or religiously motivated adult offenders illustrates that within the Probation Service there is a limited amount of services aimed at addressing prejudice with offenders (Isal, 2004; Hankinson, 2008). In a report from the Probation Inspectorate, it was made explicitly clear that evidence suggesting that hate crime offender programmes and initiatives can effectively produce 'positive change in attitudes, beliefs and behaviour in relation to racially motivated offending' was inadequate (HMIP 2005: 32).

One of the issues identified in evaluating the most effective offender programmes is the low numbers of racially motivated offenders who are convicted, and therefore the low-levels of such offenders using probation services (Gadd, 2009; Hall, 2013). It is noted that for this reason there has been a shift from practitioners relying on generic programmes to address offending behaviour and attitudes in favour of the use of one-to-one tailored work (Hall, 2013). Although this approach is regarded as being more

effective (Smith, 2006a; McGhee, 2007), there is still little consensus on exactly what should be covered within these individual sessions.

Of the range of programmes and initiatives aimed at addressing racist or religiously motivated offending, numerous commentators identify that aiming to enhance cognitive, social and employability skills is not enough to prevent future offending (Gadd, 2009; Iganski and Smith, 2011). Lemos (2005: 34) suggests that interventions combining work to address prejudice, developing victim empathy and management of aggression are the most effective. Within the reviews by Gadd (2009) and Iganski and Smith (2011), the use of role play which aims to highlight the affect of peer group pressure and improve victim awareness, and the involvement of offenders in voluntary and community groups through restorative justice, is reported as being most effective. In particular the 'Greenwich Race Hate Project' reported reduced offending rates through the use of multi-agency partnership work. The London Probation area developed materials to address underlying feelings of shame and frustration with the offender whilst other agencies with specialised skills facilitated a greater understanding to the impact hate crime has on the victim (Dixon and Court, 2003). Iganski and Smith (2011) identify a range of recommendations within their report, including 'the need for a national policy, an increased evidence base upon which to base interventions ... commitments to funding, the sharing of a conceptually sound evidence-based practice, the need for systematic evaluation of existing programmes ... and appropriately tailored programmes', which if implemented would help to inform and improve the rehabilitation programmes delivered to hate crime perpetrators (cited in Hall, 2013: 153).

As already stated, the extant literature focusing on how best to deal with racially motivated offenders is lacking clarity and is overwhelmingly adultcentric in nature. In relation to young people, every effort should be made to divert them away from the punitive responses of the Criminal Justice System and to intervene at the earliest stage possible. The impact of being convicted and labelled as 'racist' is powerful and may only serve to marginalise already isolated young people further and exacerbate underlying prejudices and tensions. Research appears to support this contention with

racially motivated offenders reportedly feeling angry and resentful at being charged with racially aggravated offences in the first place (Dixon and Court, 2003; Smith, 2006b; Iganski and Smith, 2011). This can then impact on the effectiveness of addressing this behaviour (Dixon and Court, 2003; Smith, 2006b; Iganski and Smith, 2011). Of those in the subgroup who had been involved in targeted hostility, only one had ever been convicted of a racially aggravated assault. Dan had received no further involvement from the Criminal Justice System and unfortunately his conviction was heralded as a badge of honour within the subgroup. There appears to have been a missed opportunity of conducting meaningful work with Dan to address the underlying motivation for such behaviour. As mentioned previously within this chapter, it is evident that the one-to-one work between Dan and the support worker within the children's home had a significant positive impact on him and led to a slight reduction in his prejudiced views towards minority ethnic groups.

Within the subgroup the older members such as Ryan and Alex expressed the most extreme prejudiced views and had also engaged in the most serious acts of targeted hostility. It is apparent that they would have benefited from tailored work to address the frustration that they feel towards their own socio-economic situation. Ryan and Alex expressed great desire to achieve employment, and the shame that they felt because they still 'hung around' with 13 and 14 year olds was observable. Although both Ryan and Aaron spoke of taking part in "*all those things ... yeah the courses*" they are often delivered in a generic format and still require Ryan and Aaron to be competent in writing a Curriculum Vitae (CV), and to be successful in an interview. I had found it incredibly frustrating when I asked my manager within the Youth Offending Service if I could work with some of the young people in the area to develop a CV and fill in job application forms, and he replied that it was not within my role. Having young people from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds who are NEET breeds resentment and frustration and without having employment or education to occupy their time, there is ample opportunity within the context of everyday life to act upon this hostility. One of the benefits of conducting this research over three months was being able to help two participants develop CVs, fill in application forms and practise interview techniques. I was incredibly moved when Claire emerged from

the other side of the park one day, ran up to me to tell me she had “*got a job*”. As Gadd (2009) rightly argued, tackling a young person’s socio-economic situation will not be enough to alter their underlying prejudiced views but it should figure prominently within tailored interventions with young disadvantaged and marginalised offenders.

One of the key findings to emerge from this thesis is that the subgroup displayed a complete lack of empathy with minority ethnic groups. Although they took satisfaction from targeting an ethnic or religious ‘Other’, they had little comprehension of the impact their actions had on the victim. Empathy can and should be developed through educating young people about diversity and ‘difference’ within the educational environment or through cross-cultural contact in youth services or cultural activities. However, the success of both of these approaches relies on young people being taught about these themes in a meaningful way, having services and facilities available to them, or being socially and economically empowered enough to be able to take part in such activities. The subgroup had little knowledge of ethnic, religious and cultural ‘difference’ and actively chose to disengage with the multicultural population around them. Therefore, youth workers and youth offending services face a daunting task to try and educate ‘difficult’ and ‘hard to reach’ young people on diversity outside of the classroom environment and raise victim awareness.

Restorative justice has begun to emerge as a potentially effective method of rehabilitation with young people who engage in targeted hostility (Walters, 2014). As Gavrielides (2012: 3625) explains, restorative justice ‘focuses on restoring the harmful effects of these actions, it is not dependent on the law, and it actively involves all parties in the restoration process.’ Restorative approaches offer direct, or indirect opportunities for the offender, the victim and any other relevant individuals or organisations, to come together to discuss the incident on an equal platform and develop ways to repair the harm caused (Eglish, 1977; Gavrielides, 2007; Walters, 2014). Although restorative justice offers a fresh approach to resolving conflicts, it has often been regarded as a ‘gray area’ in relation to hate crime (Gavrielides, 2012). The reluctance to use restorative justice to deal with hate crime incidents revolves around concerns over the power imbalance between the victim and the offender which could

lead to re-victimisation (Penell and Francis, 2005; Walters and Hoyle, 2010). There is also the perception that because acts of targeted hostility are perceived to be motivated by prejudice, and are therefore deeply-rooted within the offender, restorative approaches are less likely to be effective with hate crime offenders compared to perpetrators who engage in other forms of criminal activities (McDevitt, Levin, and Bennett, 2002; Gavrielides, 2012).

Those who express concerns about the use of restorative justice in its traditional format, suggest that community mediation may offer a more effective and sensitive approach to resolving local conflicts (Walters and Hoyle, 2012). As Walters and Hoyle (2012: 10) explain:

Community mediation is a restorative process aimed at bringing together those in conflict in order to find a resolution. At its heart are the notions of revelation, empowerment and resolution.

This approach could be particularly effective for acts of targeted hostility which take place over the course of doing 'ordinary', routine activities and involve a victim and offender who are already acquainted. Through the process of community mediation relevant parties engage in an open and honest dialogue to try to resolve the dispute by outlining both perspectives. For young people, such as the subgroup, who may not be fully aware of the harm they have caused through their actions and who may themselves feel that the other party had in some way provoked the incident, community mediation provides an opportunity to understand the consequence of their behaviour in an informal and proactive manner. Community mediation also offers the chance for young people, who dehumanise and denigrate specific out-groups to see the victim and their community in real terms, and to understand the similarities between themselves rather than focusing on the differences.

Often community mediation is delivered without using the terms 'victim' and 'offender' and this recognises the often messy and complicated relationship involved in low-level, everyday conflicts (Walters and Hoyle, 2011; Walters, 2014). Finally, community mediation also provides the opportunity for other members of the community to become involved. Both Bowling (1998) and Hewitt (1996) found that

offenders felt that they were acting out community prejudices that had gone unchallenged within local settings. Offenders within these studies reported feeling an obligation to express racist attitudes and engage in acts of targeted hostility on behalf of both the community and the peer-group they belonged to (Hewitt, 1996; Bowling, 1998). Sibbitt (1997: p vii) uses the term 'reciprocal relationship' to describe how 'perpetrators see this as legitimising their actions. In turn, the wider community not only spawns such perpetrators, but fails to condemn them and actively reinforces their behaviour'. As suggested by Iganski (2012: 21), local community members need to be involved in community mediation and rehabilitative interventions with young people specifically, to try and challenge the influence of locally shared prejudices and hostility.

Although occurring after my three months with the subgroup, I was fortunate enough to witness first hand a community mediation arranged and delivered by youth workers from the local Youth Offending Team (YOT) involving the subgroup. The victim, a physically disabled woman in her 60s, had been the target of 'low level' anti-social behaviour. Members of the subgroup, as well as other local youths in the area had been responsible for verbally abusing her and targeting her house with stones and footballs. She had contacted the council who had in turn facilitated her meeting with the YOT working within the area. She wanted to meet with the group and tell them about the emotional and physical impact this form of victimisation had on her. I sat there before the session held in the local leisure centre, feeling quite nervous, unsure about whether young people would turn up and if they did how they were going to respond. It was incredibly pleasing to see that not only did the majority of the subgroup show up but that they sat quietly, listened respectfully and appeared to take on board what the victim was saying. The success of this approach could be explained by the communication between the County Council and the Youth Offending Team, the willingness of the victim to take part, the relationship the youth workers had developed with the young people that made them want to turn up, and how the session was facilitated by staff who felt confident and comfortable in addressing this issue. The use of restorative justice approaches, if facilitated and delivered by staff who are competent, could be one of the most effective approaches for developing empathy and understanding in young people. Restorative justice has been widely cited

as being under researched (Gavrielides, 2010; Walters and Hoyle, 2011), and therefore both advocates and opponents of restorative justice have called for further investigation (Penell and Francis, 2005; Gavrielides, 2007). However, this could be one approach used in conjunction with a broad range of tailored initiatives that is developed to address community tensions and intolerance, and reduce acts of targeted hostility in young people (Hall, 2013).

7.4.4 The Importance of Practitioner Confidence and Competence

In the majority of the literature addressing offending interventions and initiatives, success seems dependent on practitioners having the skills and confidence required to facilitate open and honest conversations with racist offenders. Dixon (2002: 12) suggests that practitioners working with racially and religiously motivated offenders should aim to ‘... help offenders develop a positive non-racist identity’ by encouraging offenders to freely express their prejudiced views and being competent in challenging them once they are exposed. One of the main issues in achieving a constructive relationship with young offenders is that educators, youth workers and practitioners may not feel competent in doing so. Research has found that practitioners within the Criminal Justice System report feeling uncomfortable on hearing expressions of racism and lack confidence in knowing how best to challenge these racist views (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2005; 2004). I had heard similar concerns voiced by youth workers I had either worked with or engaged with during my time with the subgroup.

During the three months with the subgroup many of the practitioners I engaged with expressed apprehension towards tackling race and racism with young offenders, particularly when they themselves came from a minority ethnic background. In a discussion with Connor about hypothetically what would happen if Sharia Law were enacted within Britain, he used the term “*Paki*” frequently and was particularly derogatory about the Muslim population. This conversation took place towards the end of my time with the subgroup and I felt much more comfortable in being able to challenge such views or offer an alternative viewpoint. After the conversation finished I turned to an Asian female support worker who had stood by whilst the discussion

took place and I asked if she ever challenged the language used or took part in the conversations. She explained that as an Asian woman it had taken a considerable time for her to build up a good relationship with this group of young White British people and she had finally managed to get the group to see past her ethnicity. She felt that by challenging the prejudiced views or the use of racist language she would no longer have the same relationship with them. On weighing up the options she decided it would be more productive to tolerate the expressions of racism. In another discussion I spoke with Riah, a youth worker who was engaging with the subgroup at the time of the research, who again was often the bystander to racist prejudice, even by members of authority, and felt unable to challenge such views:

Riah: *Actually (animated) ... you won't believe this!*

Researcher: *What?*

Riah: *I can't believe I didn't tell you, the other day I was chatting to ... yeah I'm pretty sure he's a PCSO.*

Researcher: *Yeah ...*

Riah: *And he was saying ... yeah we were chatting about the corner shop and the young people and he was asking if I thought any of them were actually racist.*

Researcher: *Yeah.*

Riah: *And like he then said and I'm not joking ... he said like 'while I wear this uniform I don't agree with them'.*

Researcher: *No!*

Riah: *Seriously! Like maybe 'cuz it was dark and he didn't realise ... (laughs) like that I'm Asian ... but I was well shocked ... I turned around and said to Lee did he just say that?*

Researcher: *You don't expect that!*

Riah: *Innit ... he's probably more racist then the young people.*

Researcher: *Wow.*

Riah: *I know.*

Researcher: *So what did you do?*

Riah: *What ... about what he said? (researcher nods) nothing ... I didn't know what to do so just left it.*

Reflecting on the process of conducting this research, it appears that many educators and practitioners have a significant lack of confidence in knowing how to appropriately and effectively challenge prejudiced views. Like myself, many working within a related field will have felt the inner conflict of not wanting to appear to condone such views but also, not wanting to risk impacting the trust and respect that can take a lot of time

and effort to develop. In yet, for interventions and initiatives to be effective with young people who commit racially and religiously motivated acts of targeted hostility, practitioners need to feel competent and able to achieve the kind of constructive relationship required to address these complex and challenging attitudes and behaviours.

7.5 Conclusion

This thesis began by detailing my first experience of being confronted by a group of young White British people who were overtly prejudiced and hostile towards all forms of diversity and 'difference'. Initially the thought of spending time with this group, even within a work capacity, was not an attractive prospect. However, taking the time to get to know the group and to some extent, question my own ignorance and prejudices opened my eyes to how complex and confusing being a young person can be. This experience has been a significant and challenging personal journey for myself and undoubtedly has shaped my interest in this field and my views on living within one of the most multicultural cities in the world. The most disheartening part of getting to know this group of young people is that in reality the attitudes they hold and the way that they act will define them to the outside world. It is partly for both of these reasons that this final chapter is not a traditional 'conclusion'; this research illustrates that much more work needs to be done by researchers and practitioners to engage *with* young people and generate more sophisticated understandings of the motivation for holding prejudiced views and committing acts of targeted hostility. One of the most difficult aspects of this study was coming to the end of my time with the subgroup. As Farrant (2014) observes, relationships with participants can become 'contaminated', and I feel this is particularly true when engaging with young people who feel marginalised and isolated. In truth, I hope that the experience of engaging with me was as enjoyable, impactful and challenging for the group, as I found my three months with them.

This chapter has drawn from both the research findings and the experience of conducting this study to suggest the implications and possible future directions for

research, theory and policy. The chapter began by reflecting on the process of conducting this study. From this experience, a 'softer' more nuanced methodological approach is seen as being most effective in engaging 'hard to reach' and 'difficult' participants. The use of auto-ethnography in particular is regarded as providing a range of benefits, including actively promoting good research practice as researchers become more consciously aware of the impact they have on their research, and facilitating a greater understanding of the participants' character and lived reality.

This chapter used both the subgroup and survey findings to consider the theoretical implications this thesis has for the field of hate studies. This study employed a grounded theory framework, which holds centrally that theory and theory development are rooted in empirical data and acts of everyday social life (Covan, 2007; Stern, 2009). This research sought to explore how young people interpret and encounter 'difference', what micro and macro contexts exacerbate underlying prejudices and tensions and why certain young White British people engage in acts of targeted hostility. This study conveys that using the concept of everyday multiculturalism as a lens through which to analyse micro-contexts and location specific tensions, could help develop more nuanced theoretical explanations of targeted victimisation. In particular, integrating the concept of everyday multiculturalism within existing theories of why 'ordinary' people engage in targeted hostility, is essential to giving life and meaning to otherwise abstract explanations.

A consistent theme throughout this final chapter is that the educational environment, youth work and youth offending services need to do more to engage and empower young people in difficult and challenging debates. It is only through listening to young people and understanding the ways in which they interpret, negotiate and engage with diversity that we can more effectively develop initiatives and interventions which are rooted in the reality of young people's lives. Schools, youth work and youth offending services should be seen as being inter-dependant when it comes to teaching equality and diversity and tackling prejudice and targeted hostility. There should be a clear set of practices in place when a young person or a group of young people at school or in the community, come to the attention of teachers, youth workers and community

leaders for expressing prejudiced views and/or committing acts of targeted hostility. The earlier that local tensions and conflicts are dealt with in the context of a young person's everyday life by an educator or practitioner they can relate to, then the more effective that intervention is going to be. This is by no means easy and the road to challenging prejudice and acts of targeted hostility appears long and complex. This thesis has illustrated that despite ever-increasing constraints on time and resources, there are a range of innovative and dynamic approaches that educators, practitioners and researchers can use which will help to challenge underlying prejudices and the harm caused by targeted hostility.

References

References

Aboud, F. (1988) *Children and Prejudice*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E. (2005) 'The Development of Prejudice in Children and Adolescents' in J. F. Dovidio, P. S. Glick and L. A. Rudman (eds) *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*, Oxford: Blackwell, 310-326.

Abrams, D. (2010) *Processes of Prejudice: Theory, Evidence and Intervention*, Manchester: EHRC.

Abrams, D. and Rutland, A. (2008) 'The Development of Subjective Group Dynamics' in S. Levy and Killen, M (eds) *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 47-65.

Abrams, D., Rutland, A. and Cameron, L. (2003) 'The Development of Subjective Group Dynamics: Children's Judgments of Normative and Deviant In-Group and Out-Group Individuals' *Child Development* **74**: 1840-1856.

Agnew, R. (1992) 'Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency' *Criminology* 30 (1): 47-87.

Agnew, R. (2001) 'Building on the Foundation of General Strain Theory: Specifying the Types of Strain Most Likely to Lead to Crime and Delinquency' *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* **38** (4): 319-361.

Agnew, R., Brezina, T., Wright, J.P. and Cullen, F. T. (2002) 'Strain, Personality Traits and Delinquency: Extending General Strain Theory' *Criminology* **40** (1): 43-72.

Alibali, M. W. and Nathan, M. J. (2010) 'Conducting Research in Schools: A Practical Guide' *Journal of Cognition and Development* **11** (4): 397-407.

Allen, C. (2007) 'Islamaphobia in Europe' in S. Amghar, A. Boubekeur, and M. Emerson (eds) *European Islam: The Challenges for Public Policy and Society*, Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.

Allen, C. (2010) *Islamophobia*, London: Ashgate.

Allen, C. (2011) 'Opposing Islamification or Promoting Islamophobia?: Understanding the English Defence League' *Patterns of Prejudice* 45 (4): 279-294.

Allport, G. W. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*, Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Amin, A. (2002) 'Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity' *Environment and Planning* 34 (6): 959-980.

Amin, A. (2005) 'Local Community on Trial' *Economy and Society* 34 (4): 612-633.

Anderson, E. (1994) 'The Code of the Street' *Atlantic Monthly* 273: 80-94.

Ang, I., Brand, J. E. Noble, G. and Wilding, D. (2002) *Living Diversity: Australia's Multicultural Future*, Sydney: Special Broadcasting Service Corporation.

Arnett, J. (1992) 'Review: Reckless Behavior in Adolescence: A Developmental Perspective' *Developmental Review* 12 (3): 339-373.

Arnett, J. (2000) 'Emerging Adulthood: A Theory of Development from the Late Teens through the Twenties' *American Psychologist* 55 (5): 469-480.

Ashcroft, M. (2013) *45 years on, do ethnic minorities remember "rivers of blood"?*, <http://lordashcrofthpolls.com/2013/04/45-years-on-do-ethnic-minorities-remember-rivers-of-blood/>, (accessed 23rd April 2013).

Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (2004) 'Opportunities and Despair, It's All in There: Practitioner Experiences and Explanations of Area Effects and Life Chances' *Sociology* 38 (3): 437-455.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (2001) *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.

Augustinos, M. and Reynolds, K. (2001) *Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict*, London: Sage.

Babbie, E. R. (2008) *The Basics of Social Research*, Belmont: Wadsworth.

Baca Zinn, M. and Thornton Dill, B. (1996) 'Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism' *Feminist Studies* **22** (2): 321-331.

Back, L., Keith, M., Khan, A., Shukra, K. and Solomos, J. (2002) 'New Labour's White Heart: Politics, Multiculturalism and the Return of Assimilation' *Political Quarterly* **73** (4): 445-454.

Banks, J. A. (2004) 'Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World' *The Educational Forum* **68** (4): 289-298.

Barker, M. (1981) *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*, London: Junction Books.

Barkley, R. A. (1997) 'Behavioral Inhibition, Sustained Attention, and Executive Functions: Constructing a Unifying Theory or ADHD' *Psychological Bulletin* **121** (1): 65-94.

Bartlett, J., Birdwell, J. and Littler, M. (2011) *The New Face of Digital Populism*, London: Demos.

Baumeister, R. F. (1997) *Evil: Inside Human Violence and Cruelty*, New York: W.H. Freeman.

Baumeister, R. F. and Vohs, K. D. (2004) 'Sexual Economics: Sex as Female Resource for Social Exchange in Heterosexual Interactions' *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **8** (4): 339-363.

BBC News (2005) *UK Majority Back Multiculturalism*,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4137990.stm>, (accessed 30th January 2014).

BBC News (2012) *Census 2011: Leicester 'Most Ethnically Diverse' in Region*,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-leicestershire-20678326>, (accessed 28th October 2013).

- Beare, M. E. and Hogg, C. (2013) 'Listening in ... to Gang Culture' *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* **55** (3): 421-452.
- Bechhofer, F. and Paterson, L. (2000) *Principles of Research Design in the Social Sciences*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society*, Sage: London.
- Beck, U. (2000) *The Brave New World of Work*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Berry, J. W. (1984) 'Multicultural Policy in Canada: A Social Psychological Analysis' *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* **16**: 353-370.
- Berry, J. W. (2006) 'Mutual Attitudes Among Immigrants and Ethnocultural Groups in Canada' *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* **30** (6): 719-734.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R. and Taylor, D. M. (1977) *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*, Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Betts, K. (2005) 'Cosmopolitans and Patriots: Australia's Cultural Divide and Attitudes to Immigration' *People and Place* **13** (2): 29-40.
- Bigler, R. S. and Liben, L. S. (2006) 'A Developmental Intergroup Theory of Social Stereotypes and Prejudice' *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* **34**: 39-89.
- Birks, M. and Mills, J. (2011) *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide*, London: Sage.
- Blackman, S. (2007) 'Hidden Ethnography': Crossing Emotional Borders in Qualitative Accounts of Young People's Lives' *Sociology* **41** (4): 699-716.
- Bloch, B. and Dreher, T. (2009) 'Resentment and Reluctance: Working with Everyday Diversity and Everyday Racism in Southern Sydney' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* **30** (2): 193-209.
- Boeck, T., Cardoza, C., McCullum, J., Bell, M. and Skinner, M. (2008a) *Assessing Community Cohesion in Leicester*, Leicester: Leicester City Council.

Boeck, T., Cardoza, C., McCullum, J., Bell, M. and Skinner, M. (2008b) *Assessing Young People's Sense of Community Cohesion in Leicester*, Leicester: Leicester City Council.

Bonney, R. and Le Goff, W. (2007) 'Leicester's Cultural Diversity in the Context of the British Debate on Multiculturalism' *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations* **6** (6): 45-58.

Bottrell, D. (2009) 'Dealing with Disadvantage: Resilience and the Social Capital of Young People's Networks' *Youth Society* **40** (4): 476-501.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital', in J. G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. C. (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (2nd Edition), London: Sage.

Bow, A. (2002) 'Ethnographic Techniques' in K. Williamson (ed.) *Research Methods for Students and Professionals: Information Management and Systems* (2nd Edition), New South Wales: Centre for Information Studies.

Bowling, B. (1993) 'Racial Harassment and the Process of Victimisation' *British Journal of Criminology* **33** (2): 231-250.

Bowling, B. (1998) *Violent Racism: Victimization, Policing and Social Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowling, B. and Phillips, C. (2002) *Racism, Crime and Justice*, Harlow: Pearson.

Brady, B. and Chorley, M. (2010) Coalition: 100 Days. 100 Cuts, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/coalition-100-days-100-cuts-2052886.html>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Branscombe, N. R. and Wann, D. L. (1994) 'Collective Self-Esteem Consequences of Out-Group Derogation when a Valued Social Identity is on Trial' *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **24** (6): 641–657.

Breugelmans, S. M. and Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2004) 'Antecedents and Components of Majority Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism in the Netherlands' *Applied Psychology: An International Review* **53** (3): 400-422.

Breugelmans, S. M., Van de Vijver, F. J. R. and Schalk-Soekar, S. (2009) 'Stability of Majority Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism in the Netherlands Between 1999 and 2007' *Applied Psychology: An International Review* **58** (4): 653-671.

Brewer, J. (2000) *Ethnography*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brewer, M. B. and Brown, R. J. (1998) 'Intergroup Relations' in D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. (4th Edition), Boston: McGraw-Hill, 554-594.

Brown, B. (2010) *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology* (2nd Edition), Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006) 'Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Crime: Future Directions for Feminist Criminology' *Feminist Criminology* **1** (1): 27-47.

Burchill, J. (2005) 'Yeah but, No but, Why I'm Proud to Be a Chav', *The Times*, 18 February: 2.

Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006) 'Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Crime: Future Directions for Feminist Criminology' *Feminist Criminology* **1** (1): 27-47.

Burnett, J. (2004) 'Community, Cohesion and the State' *Race and Class* **45** (3): 1-18.

Burnett, J. (2012a) *The New Geographies of Racism: Peterborough*, London: Institute of Race Relations.

Burnett, J. (2012b) *The New Geographies of Racism: Stoke on Trent*, London: Institute of Race Relations.

Burnett, J. (2012c) *The New Geographies of Racism: Plymouth*, London: Institute of Race Relations.

Burnett, J. (2013) *Racial Violence: Facing Reality*, London: Institute of Race Relations.

Butcher, M. and Harris, A. (2010) 'Pedestrian Crossings: Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* **31** (5): 449-453.

Byer, B., Crider, B. W. and Biggers, G. K. (1999) 'Bias Crime Motivation: A Study of Hate Crime and Offender Neutralization Techniques Used Against the Amish' *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* **15** (1): 78-96.

Bynner, J. and Parsons, S. (2002) 'Social Exclusion and the Transition from School to Work: The Case of Young People Not in Education, Employment, or Training (NEET)' *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **60** (2): 289-309.

Cantle, T. (2001) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*, London: Home Office.

Cantle, T. (2005) *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Caspi, A. (2000) 'The Child is Father of the Man: Personality Continuities from Childhood to Adulthood' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **78** (1): 158-172.

Castells, M. (2004) *The Power of Identity, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (2nd Edition), Oxford: Blackwell.

Castles, S., Cope, B., Kalantzis, M. and Morrissey, M. (1988) 'The Bicentenary and the Failure of Australian Nationalism' *Race and Class* **29** (3): 53-68.

Chahal, K. and Julianne, L. (1999) *'We Can't All Be White!' Racist Victimisation in the UK*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2009) *Hate Crime: Impact, Causes and Responses*, London: Sage.

Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2012) 'Reconceptualising Hate Crime Victimization through the Lens of Vulnerability and 'Difference' *Theoretical Criminology* **16** (4): 499-514.

Charmaz, K. (2000) 'Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods' in N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Edition), London: Sage, 509-535.

Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, London: Sage.

Childline (2014) *Can I Tell You Something?*,
http://www.nspcc.org.uk/news-and-views/media-centre/press-releases/2014/childline-report/childline-report_can-i-tell-you-something_wdf100354.pdf, (accessed 24th February 2014).

Christensen, P. M. and James, A. (2000) *Research with Children: Perspectives and Practices*, Oxon: Routledge.

Citrin, J., Wong, C., Sears, D. and Muste, C. (2001) 'Multiculturalism in American Public Opinion' *British Journal of Political Science* **31** (2): 247-275.

Clarke, A. E. (2005) *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn*, London: Sage.

Clayton, J. (2009) 'Thinking Spatially: Towards an Everyday Understanding of Inter-Ethnic Relations' *Social and Cultural Geography* **10** (4): 481-499.

Cleckley, H. (1976) *The Mask of Sanity*, St. Louis: Mosby.

Cohen, A. (1955) *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*, New York: Free Press.

Cole, M. A. (2004) "'Brutal and Stinking" and "Difficult to Handle": The Historical and Contemporary Manifestations of Racialisation, Institutional Racism, and Schooling in Britain' *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 7 (1): 35-56.

Coleman, J. S. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Collins, M. (2004) *The Likes of Us: A Biography of the White Working Class*, London: Granta Books.

Colombo, E. and Semi, G. (2007) *Multiculturalismo Quotidiano. Le Pratiche Della Differenza*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Commission for Racial Equality (2006) *Equality and Diversity in a Contemporary Society: The 6th annual Temple Address*, <http://www.cre.gov.uk/default.aspx.locid-0hgnew0nb.RefLocID-0hg00900c002.Lang-EN.htm>, (accessed 16th August 2007).

Community Cohesion Project Team (2006) *The Diversity of Leicester: A Demographic Profile*, <http://www.lsr-online.org/static/lsr/legacy/documents/research/Diversity%20of%20Leicester%20-%20DRAFT.pdf>, (accessed 24th June 2010).

Cotterell, J. (1996) *Social Networks and Social Influence in Adolescence*, London: Routledge.

Covan, E. (2007) 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory in Practice: The Legacy of Multiple Mentors' in A. Bryant, and K. Charmaz (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, London: Sage.

Craig, K. M. (2002) 'Examining Hate Motivated Aggression: A Review of the Social Psychological Literature on Hate Crimes as a Distinct Form of Aggression' *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 7 (1): 85-101.

Commission for Racial Equality (2005) *After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation*, <http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/socialchange/research/social-change/summer-workshops/documents/sleepwalking.pdf>, (accessed 12th June 2012).

Crenshaw, K. (1991) 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color' *Stanford Law Review* **43** (6): 1241-1299.

Creswell, J. W. (1994) *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, London: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2003) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd Edition), London: Sage.

Cuhadar, E. and Dayton, B. (2011) 'The Social Psychology of Identity and Inter-group Conflict: From Theory to Practice' *International Studies Perspectives* **12** (3): 273-293.

Cutcliffe, R. (2003) 'Methodological Issues in Grounded Theory' *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **31** (6): 176-194.

Dandy, J. and Pe-Pua, R. (2010) 'Attitudes to Multiculturalism, Immigration and Cultural Diversity: Comparison of Dominant and Non-Dominant Groups in Three Australian States' *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* **34** (1): 34-46.

Dawson, M. E. (1990) 'Psychophysiology at the Interface of Clinical Science, Cognitive Science, and Neuroscience' *Psychophysiology* **27** (3): 243-255.

de Witt, H. (2010) *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe and its Assessment, Trends and Issues*, NVAO: Accreditation Organization of the Netherlands and Flanders, 12-16.

Denham, J. (2001) *Building Cohesive Communities - A Report of the Inter-Departmental Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion*, London: Home Office.

Denney, D. (2005) *Risk and Society*, London: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2005) 'Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research' in N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (eds) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd Edition), London: Sage, 1-32.

Derefinko, K., DeWall, C. N., Metze, A. V., Walsh, E. C. and Lynam, D. R. (2011) 'Do Different Facets of impulsivity Predict Different Types of Aggression?' *Aggressive Behaviour* **37** (3): 223-233.

Dey, I. (2004) 'Grounded Theory' in C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, and D. Silverman (eds) *Qualitative Research Practice*, London: Sage, 80-93.

DfES (2007) *Curriculum Report: Citizenship and Diversity*. London: DfES.

Digman, J. M. (1990) 'Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model' *Annual Review of Psychology* **41**: 417-440.

Dill, B. T. and Baca Zinn, M. (1997). 'Race and Gender: Re-Visioning the Social Sciences' in J. Ladenson, M. Anderson, L. Fine, and K. Geissler (eds) *Doing Feminism: Teaching and Research*, Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Dixon, L. (2002) 'Tackling Racist Offending: A Generalised Or Targeted Approach?' *Probation Journal* **49** (3): 205-216.

Dixon, L. and Court, D. (2003) 'Developing Good Practice with Racially Motivated Offenders' *Probation Journal* **50** (2): 149-153.

Dixon, B. and Gadd, D. (2006) 'Getting the Message? 'New' Labour and the Criminalisation of 'Hate'' *Criminology and Criminal Justice* **6** (3): 309-328.

Draucker, C. B., Martsof, D. S., Ross, R. and Rusk, T. B. (2007) 'Theoretical Sampling and Category Development in Grounded Theory' *Qualitative Health Research* **17** (8): 1137-1148.

Duffy, B. and Frere-Smith, T. (2014) *Perceptions and Reality: Public Attitudes to Immigration*, http://www.ipsos-MORI.com/DownloadPublication/1634_sri-perceptions-and-reality-immigration-report-2013.pdf, (accessed February 13th 2014).

Dunbar, E. (2002) 'Signs and Cultural Messages of Bias Motivated Crimes: Analysis of the Hate Component of Intergroup Violence' in Howard. G (ed) *Law Enforcement, Communication and Community*, Philadelphia: John Benjamin North America, 201-228.

Dunbar, E. and Crevencoeur, D. (2005) 'Assessment of Hate Crime Offenders: The Role of Bias Intent in Examining Violence Risk' *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice* **5** (1): 1-19.

Duncan, G. and Gilmore, G. (2009) *It's Official – Britain is in a Recession*, <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/economics/article5571973.ece>, (accessed 6th August 2010).

Dunne, C. (2011) 'The Place of the Literature Review in Grounded Theory Research' *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* **14** (2): 111–124.

Edwards, R. and Gillies, V. (2005) *Resources in Parenting: Access to Capitals, Families & Social Capital Research Group Working Paper No. 14*, London: London South Bank University.

Edwards, R., Franklin, J. and Holland, J. (2003) *Families and Social Capital: Exploring the Issues Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group Working Paper No. 1*, London: South Bank University.

Eglash, A. (1977) 'Beyond Restitution: Creative Restitution' in J. Hudson, and B. Galaway (eds) *Restitution in Criminal Justice*, Lexington: DC Heath and Company.

Elias, N. (1978) *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners* Vol I, Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias, N. (1982) *The Civilizing Process: State Formation and Civilization* Vol II, Oxford: Blackwell.

Erickson, B. H. (1996) 'Culture, Class and Connections' *American Journal of Sociology* **102** (1): 217-251.

Evans, K., Rudd, P., Behrens, M., Kaluza, J. and Wooley, C. (2001) 'Reconstructing Fate as Choice? Initial Findings from the Comparative Study "Taking Control? Personal Agency and Social Structures in Young Adult Transitions in England and the New Germany"' *Young* **6** (3): 2-29.

Eysenck, H. J. and Eysenck, S. B. G. (1969) *Personality Structure and Measurement*, London: Routledge.

Eysenck, H. J. (1997) 'Addiction, Personality and Motivation' *Human Psychopharmacology* **12** (2): 79-87.

Farrant, F. (2014) 'Unconcealment: What Happens When We Tell Stories' *Qualitative Inquiry* **20** (4): 461-470.

Farrington, D. (1997) 'Human Development and Criminal Careers' in M. Maguire, R. Morgan, and R. Reiner (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (2nd Edition), Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fenigstein, A. (2009) 'Private and Public Self-Consciousness' in M. R. Leary and R. H. Hoyle (eds) *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behaviour*, New York: The Guilford Press, 495-511.

Ferguson, K. M. (2006) 'Social Capital Predictors of Children's School Status in Mexico' *International Journal of Social Welfare* **15** (4): 321-331.

Field, J. (2003) *Social Capital*, London: Routledge.

Fleetwood, J. (2009) *Emotional Work: Ethnographic Fieldwork in Prisons in Ecuador*, http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_134470_en.pdf, (accessed February 13th 2014).

Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (4th Edition), London: Sage.

Franklin, K. (2000) 'Antigay Behaviors by Young Adults: Prevalence, Patterns, and Motivators in a Noncriminal Population' *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* **15** (4): 339-362.

Franklin, J. (2004) *Politics, Trust and Networks: Social Capital in Critical Perspective: Working Paper No. 7 Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group*, London: London South Bank University.

Freedland, J. (2010) *100 Days of the Coalition Government*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/aug/18/100-days-coalition-government>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Furedi, F. (2002) *Culture of Fear*, London: Continuum.

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (1997) *Young People and Social Change: Individualisation and Risk in the Age of High Modernity*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (2004) *Vulnerable Young Men in Fragile Labour Markets: Employment, Unemployment and the Search for Long-Term Security*, York: York Publishing.

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (2008) 'Young people in the UK: Pessimism and disconnection' in A. Stelling, and R. Wintrebert (eds) *Young People Facing the Future: An International Survey*, Paris: Foundation pour l'innovation Politique.

Gadd, D. (2009), 'Aggravating Racism and Elusive Motivation' *British Journal of Criminology* **49** (6): 755-771.

Gadd, D., Dixon, B. and Jefferson, T. (2005) *Why Do They Do It? Racial Harassment in North Staffordshire: Key Findings*, Keele: Centre for Criminological Research, University of Keele.

Gadd, D. and Dixon, B. (2009) 'Posing the "Why" Question: Understanding the Perpetration of Racially Motivated Violence and Harassment' in B. Levin (ed.) *Volume 1: Understanding and Defining Hate Crime*, Perry, B. (Gen. ed.), *Hate Crime: Issues and Perspectives, A Five Volume Set*, Westport: Praeger, 77-94.

Garland, J. (2012) 'Difficulties in defining hate crime victimization' *International Review of Victimology* **18** (1): 25-37.

Garner, S. (2007) *Whiteness: An Introduction*, Oxon: Routledge.

Gavrielides, T. (2007) *Restorative Justice Theory and Practice: Addressing the Discrepancy*, New York: Criminal Justice Press.

Gavrielides, T. (2012) 'Contextualizing Restorative Justice for Hate Crime' *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* **27** (18): 3624-3643.

Geis, G. (2001) 'On the Absence of Self Control as the Basis for a General Theory of Crime: A Critique' *Theoretical Criminology* **4** (1): 35-54.

Gentleman, A. and Mullholand, H. (2010) *Unequal Britain: Richest 10% are now 100 Times Better off than the Poorest*, <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2010/jan/27/unequal-britain-report>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1994) *Beyond Left and Right*, London: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way*, London: Polity Press.

Giles, H. and Hewstone, M. (1986) 'Social Groups and Social Stereotypes in Intergroup Communication: Review and Model of Intergroup Communication Breakdown' in W. B. Gudykunst (ed.) *Intergroup Communication*, London: Arnold, 10-26.

Gilmore, G. (2009) *Case Study: Up to One Million Young People Unemployed*, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article6792754.ece>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Gilroy, P. (1982) 'The Myth of Black Criminality' in M. Eve and D. Musson (eds) *The Socialist Register*, London: Merlin.

Gilroy, P. (2000) *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond The Color Line*, Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Ginwright, S., Cammarota, J. and Noguera, P. (2005) 'Youth, Social Justice and Communities: Toward a Theory of Urban Youth Policy' *Social Justice* **32** (3): 24-40.

Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, New York: Aldine Transaction.

Glaser, B. G. (1978) *Theoretical Sensitivity*, Mill Valley CA: The Sociology Press.

- Gleason, K. A., Jensen-Campbell, L. A. and Richardson, D. (2004) 'Agreeableness and Aggression in Adolescence' *Aggressive Behavior* **30**: 43-61.
- Goffman, E. (1968) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- González, R., Sirlopú, D. and Kessler, T. (2010) 'Prejudice Among Peruvians and Chileans as a Function of Identity, Intergroup Contact, Acculturation Preferences and Intergroup Emotions' *Journal of Social Issues* **66** (4): 802–823.
- Gottfredson, M. R. and Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gove, M. (2006) *Celsius 7/7*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Green, D. P., McFalls, L. H. and Smith, J. K. (2003) 'Hate Crime: An Emergent Research Agenda' in B. Perry (ed) *Hate and Bias Crime: A Reader*, New York: Routledge.
- Green, D. P., Strolovitch, D. Z. and Wong, J.S. (1998) 'Defended Neighbourhoods, Integration, and Racially Motivated Crime' *American Journal of Sociology* **104** (2): 372-403.
- Hall, N. (2005) *Hate Crime*, Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Hall, N. (2013) *Hate Crime* (2nd Edition), Oxon: Routledge.
- Hankinson, I. (2008) 'Working with Racially Motivated Offenders: Practice Issues' *Probation Journal* **55**: 119-20.
- Hall, N. and Hayden, C. (2007) *Is 'Hate Crime' a Relevant and Useful Way of Conceptualising Some Forms of School Bullying?*, <http://www.ijvs.org/files/Revue-03/pp-3-24-Hall-and-Hayden-IJVS-n3.pdf>, (accessed 4th August 2013).
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Oxon: Routledge.

- Hankinson, I. (2008) 'Working with Racially Motivated Offenders - Practice Issues' *Probation Journal* **55** (1): 119-120.
- Harris, A. (2009) 'Shifting the boundaries of cultural spaces: young people and everyday multiculturalism' *Social Identities* **15** (2): 187-205.
- Hate Incident Monitoring Project (2009) *Hate Incidents: Partnership Strategic Assessment 2009*, Leicester: Research and Information Team Leicestershire County Council.
- Hayward, K. and Yar, M. (2006) 'The 'Chav' Phenomenon: Consumption, Media and the Construction of a New Underclass' *Crime, Media, Culture* **2** (1): 9-28.
- Heath, H. (2006) 'Exploring the Influences and Use of the Literature During a Grounded Theory Study' *Journal of Research in Nursing* **11** (6): 519-528.
- Heath, A. F. and Tilley, J. R. (2005) 'British National Identity and Attitudes Towards Immigration' *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* **7** (2): 119-132.
- Heaven, P. C. (1994) *Contemporary Adolescence: A Social Psychological Approach*, Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Helve, H. (2007) 'Social Capital and Minority Identity' in H. Helve, and J. Bynner (eds) *Youth and Social Capital*, London: Tufnell Press, 103-106.
- Hemmerman, L., Law, I., Simms, J. and Sirriyeh, A. (2007) *Situating Racist Hostility and Understanding the Impact of Racist Victimisation in Leeds*, Leeds: Centre for Ethnicity and Racism Studies, University of Leeds.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) (2005) *I'm Not a Racist But ... An Effective Supervision Inspection Thematic Report*, London: Home Office.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2002) 'The Dialogical Self as a Society of Mind' *Theory and Psychology* **12** (2): 147-160.

Hesse, B. (2000) *Unsettled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*, London: Zed Books.

Hewitt, R. (1996) *Routes of Racism: The Social Basis of Racist Action*, Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Hewitt, R. (2005) *White Backlash and the Politics of Multiculturalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M. and Willis, H. (2002) 'Intergroup Bias' *Annual Review of Psychology* **53**: 575–604.

Hick, P., Arshad, R., Mitchell, L., Watt, D. And Roberts, L. (2011) *Promoting Cohesion, Challenging Expectations: Educating the Teachers of Tomorrow for Race Equality and Diversity in 21st Century Schools*, Manchester: The HEA Subject Centre for Education, University of Manchester.

Hirschi, T. and Gottfredson, M. (1993) 'Commentary: Testing the General Theory of Crime' *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* **30** (1):47-54.

Hjerm, M. (2005) 'What the Future May Bring Xenophobia among Swedish Adolescents' *Sociology* **48** (4): 292-307.

HM Government (2012) *Challenge it, Report it, Stop it –The Government's Plan to Tackle Hate Crime*, London: HM Government.

HM Government (2014) *Challenge it, Report it, Stop it - Delivering the Government's Hate Crime Action Plan*, London: HM Government.

Hogg, M. A. (2005) 'All Animals are Equal but Some Animals are More Equal than Others: Social Identity and Marginal Membership' in W. Kipling, D. Forgas, P. Joseph, and W. von Hippel (eds) *The Social Outcast: Ostracism, Social Exclusion, Rejection, and Bullying*, New York: Psychology Press, 243-261.

Hoggett, P. (1992) 'A Place for Experience: A Psychoanalytical Perspective on Boundary, Identity and Culture' *Environment and Planning: Society and Space* **10**: 345-356.

Holland, J., Reynolds, T. and Weller, S. (2007) 'Transitions, Networks and Communities: The Significance of Social Capital in the Lives of Children and Young People' *Journal of Youth Studies* **10** (1): 97-116.

Home Office (2012) Hate crimes, England and Wales 2011 to 2012, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hate-crimes-england-and-wales-2011-to-2012--2/hate-crimes-england-and-wales-2011-to-2012>, (accessed 1st May 2014).

Home Office (2013) *An Overview of Hate Crime in England and Wales*, London: Home Office.

Hopkins, P. (2011) *Young People, Place and Identity*, London, Routledge

Horvath, P. and Zuckerman, M. (1993) 'Sensation Seeking, Risk Appraisal, and Risky Behavior' *Personality and Individual Differences* **14**: 41-52.

Howarth, C. (2002) "'So, You're From Brixton?' The Struggle for Recognition and Esteem in a Stigmatized Community' *Ethnicities* **2** (2): 237-260.

Howarth, C. and Andreouli, E. (2010) *Has Multiculturalism Failed? The Importance of Lay Knowledge and Everyday Practice*, http://www.lse.ac.uk/socialPsychology/faculty/caroline_howarth/Howarth-and-Andreouli-paper-FINAL.pdf, (accessed 6th June 2013).

Hunt, J. (1989) *Psychoanalytic Aspects of Fieldwork*, London: Sage.

Hunter, A., Murphy, K., Grealish, A., Casey, D. and Keady, J. (2011) 'Navigating the Grounded Theory Terrain' *Nurse Researcher* **18** (4): 6-10.

IdEA (2003) *Taking Forward Community Cohesion in Leicester*, http://www.leicester.gov.uk/sys_upl/documents/departments/dpt_1105.pdf, (accessed 4th July 2013).

Iganski, P. (2008) *'Hate Crime' and the City*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Iganski (2012) *Hate Crime: Taking Stock – Programmes for Offenders of Hate*, http://www.niacro.co.uk/filestore/documents/hate_crime_project_papers/07_Programmes_for_Offenders_of_Hate.pdf, (accessed 27th January 2014).

Institute of Public Care (2009) *Estimating the Prevalence of Severe Learning Disability in Adults, IPC Working Paper 1*, Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.

Ipsos MORI (2005) *Young People and British Identity*, London: Ipsos MORI.

Isal, S. (2004) *Preventing Racist Violence: Interim Findings*, Runnymede Trust working paper, London: Runnymede Trust.

Jackson C. J. (2011) 'How Sensation Seeking Provides a Common Basis for Functional and Dysfunctional Outcomes' *Journal of Research in Personality* **45**: 29-36.

Jacobs, J. and Potter, K. (1998) *Hate Crimes: Criminal Law and Identity Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jamal, A. (2009) 'The Racialization of Muslim Americans' in A. H. Sinno (ed.) *Muslims in Western Politics*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Jeffrey, C. and Dyson, J. (2008) *Telling Young Lives: Portraits of Global Youth*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jensen, G. (2003) 'Criminology: Historical Development' in R. A. Wright (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Criminology*, New York: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.

Jewkes, Y. (2012) 'Autoethnography and Emotion as Intellectual Resources : Doing Prison Research Differently' *Qualitative Inquiry* **18** (1): 63-75.

Jones, O. (2011) *Chavs: The Demonization of the White Working-Class*, London: Verso.

Jones, M. and Alony, I. (2011) 'Guiding the Use of Grounded Theory in Doctoral Studies: An Example from the Australian Film Industry' *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* **6**: 95-114.

- Joppke, C. (2004) 'The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy', *British Journal of Sociology* **55** (2): 237-257.
- Jupp, V. (2001) *Methods of Criminological Research*, London: Routledge.
- Kafry, D. (1982) 'Sensation seeking of young children' *Personality and Individual Differences* **3**: 161-166.
- Kelly, P. (2003) 'Growing Up as Risky Business? Risks, Surveillance and the Institutionalized Mistrust of Youth' *Journal of Youth Studies* **6** (2): 165-80.
- Kepel, G. (2005) *The Roots of Radical Islam*, London: Saki.
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M. L. (1986) *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Kite, M. (2010) *100 Days of Coalition Government - How They Fared*, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/politics/conservative/7945955/100-Days-of-Coalition-Government-how-they-fared.html>, (accessed 18th August 2010).
- Klein, R. (2008) White and Working Class ... the one Ethnic Group the BBC has Ignored, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-523351/White-working-class---ethnic-group-BBC-ignored.html>, (accessed 23rd June 2013).
- Kollewe, J. (2009) *Recession Britain: It's Official*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/jan/23/recession-uk-unemployment>, (accessed 14th April 2009).
- Koss, M., Bachar, K. J., Hopkins, Q. C. and Carlson, C. (2004) 'Expanding a Community's Justice Response to Sex Crimes Through Advocacy, Prosecutorial, and Public Health Collaboration: Introducing the RESTORE Program' *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* **19** (12): 1435-1463.
- Kotecha, S. (2013) *Quarter of Young British People 'Do Not Trust Muslims'*, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/newsbeat/24204742>, (accessed 9th February 2014).
- Kruger, B. (1990) *Love for Sale*, New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc.

Kumar, R., Seay, N. and Karabenick, S. (2011) 'Shades of White: Identity Status, Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Xenophobia' *Educational Studies: A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association* **47** (4): 347-378.

Kundnami, A. (2002) 'The Death of Multiculturalism' *Race & Class* **43** (2):67-72.

Kymlicka, W. (2005) 'Models of Multicultural Citizenship: Comparing Asia and the West' in S. H. Tan (ed.) *Challenging Citizenship*, Burlington: Ashgate, 110-136.

Kymlicka, W. (2011) 'Multicultural Citizenship within Multination States' *Ethnicities* **11** (3): 281-302.

Lamont, M. and White, P. (2005) *Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research*, http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/soc/ISSQR_workshop_rpt.pdf, (accessed 23rd March 2013).

Lansdown, G. (2005) *Can You Hear Me? The Right of Young Children to Participate in Decisions Affecting the Them*, The Hague, Netherlands: Bernard van Leer Foundation.

Lawrence, F. (1999) *Punishing Hate: Bias Crimes under American Law*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Leedy, P.D. and Ormrod, J.E. (2001) *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (7th Edition), New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Legrain, P. (2006) *Immigration: Your Country Needs Them*, London: Little, Brown.

Leicester City Council and Leicester Partnership (2007) *Evidence to the Commission on Integration and Cohesion*, Leicester: Leicester City Council.

Leicester City Council, (2008) *The Diversity of Leicester: A Demographic Profile*, www.lrsport.org/core/core_picker/download.asp?id=1955, (accessed 24th July 2010).

Leicester City Council (2011) *Community Cohesion in Leicester*, Leicester: Leicester City Council.

Leicester Mercury (2012) *Census 2011: Leicester and Leicestershire by Numbers*, <http://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/Census-2011-Leicester-Leicestershire-numbers/story-17558848-detail/story.html>, (accessed 13th March 2013).

Lemos, G. (2005) *The Search for Tolerance*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Lesko, N. (2001) *Act Your Age!: A Cultural Construction of Adolescence*, London: Routledge.

Levin, J. and McDevitt, J. (1993) *Hate Crimes: The Rising Tide of Bigotry and Bloodshed*, New York: Plenum.

Levine, S. Z. and Jackson, C. J. (2004) 'Eysenck's Theory of Crime Revisited: Factors or Primary Scales?' *Legal and Criminological Psychology* **9** (1): 135-152.

Liebling, A. (1999) 'Doing Research in Prison: Breaking the Silence?' *Theoretical Criminology* **3** (2): 147-173.

Locke, L. F., Silverman, S. J. and Spirduso, W. W. (2004) *Reading and Understanding Research*, London: Sage.

Lucey, H. and D. Reay (2000) 'Social Class and the Psyche' *Soundings* **15**: 139-154.

Lun, J., Sinclair S., Glenn, C. and Whitchurch, E. R. (2007) '(Why) Do I Think What You Think? Epistemic Social Tuning and Implicit Prejudice' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **93** (6): 957-972.

Lupton, D. and Tulloch, J. (2002) 'Life Would be Pretty Dull Without Risk': Voluntary Risk-Taking and its Pleasures' *Health, Risk & Society* **4**: 113-124.

Lynam, D. R. (1996) 'The Early Identification of Chronic Offenders: Who is the Fledgling Psychopath?' *Psychological Bulletin* **120**: 209-234.

MacDonald, R., Shildrick, T. A., Webster, C. and Simpson, D. (2005) 'Growing Up in Poor Neighbourhoods: The Significance of Class and Place in the Extended Transitions of 'Socially Excluded' Young Adults' *Sociology* **39** (5): 873-891.

- Malik, S. (2007) 'My brother the bomber' *Prospect Magazine*, 28 June: 135.
- Martin, P. Y. and Turner, B. A. (1986) 'Grounded Theory and Organizational Research' *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* **22** (2): 141-157.
- Mason, G. (2005) 'Hate Crime and the Image of a Stranger' *British Journal of Criminology* **45** (6): 837-859.
- Matza, D. (1964) *Delinquency and Drift*, New York: John Wiley.
- Mayall, B. (1994) *Children's Childhoods: Observed and Experienced*, London: Falmer Press.
- Maynard, T. (2002) *Boys and Literacy: Exploring the Issues*, London: Routledge.
- McAlister, S., Scraton, P. and Haydon, H. (2009) *Childhood in Transition: Experiencing Marginalisation and Conflict in Northern Ireland*, Belfast: Queen's University Belfast.
- McCann, T. V. and Clark, E. (2003) 'A Grounded Theory Study of the Role that Nurses Play in Increasing Clients' Willingness to Access Community Mental Health Services' *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* **12** (4):279-287.
- McCracken, G. (1988) *The Long Interview*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McDevitt, J., Levin, J. and Bennet, S. (2002) 'Hate Crime Offenders: An Expanded Typology' *Journal of Social Issues* **58** (2): 303-317.
- McDevitt, J., Levin, J., Nolan, J. and Bennett, S. (2010) 'Hate Crime Offenders' in N. Chakraborti (ed.) *Hate Crime: Concepts, Policy, Future Directions*, Cullompton: Willan, 124-145.
- McGhee, D. (2007) 'The Challenge of Working with Racially Motivated Offenders: An Exercise in Ambivalence'? *Probation Journal* **54** (3): 213-226.
- McGhee, D. (2008) *The End of Multiculturalism? Terrorism, Integration and Human Rights*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

McGhee, G., Marland, G. R. and Atkinson J. M. (2007) Grounded Theory Research: Literature Reviewing and Reflexivity' *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **60** (3): 334-342.

McLeod, J. and Yates, L. (2003) 'Who is Us? Students Negotiating Discourses of Racisms and National Identification in Australia' *Race, Ethnicity and Education* **6** (1): 29-49.

Medin, D. L. (1989) 'Concepts and Conceptual Structure' *American Psychologist* **44**: 1469-1481.

Medrano, J. D. (2005) 'Nation, Citizenship and Immigration in Contemporary Spain' *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, **7**: 133-156.

Meer, N. and Modood, T. (2009) 'The Multicultural State We're In: Muslims, 'Multiculture' and the 'Civic Re-balancing' of British Multiculturalism' *Political Studies* **57**: 473-497.

Meer, N. and Modood, T. (2011) 'How Does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism?' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* **33** (2): 1-22.

Merton, R. K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York: The Free Press.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1997) *Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making*, London: Sage.

Miles, R. and Brown, M. (2003) *Racism*, Routledge, London.

Miller, J. D. and Lynam, D. (2001) 'Structural Models Of Personality And Their Relation To Antisocial Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review' *Criminology* **39** (4): 765-798.

Mills, J., Bonner, A. and Francis, K. (2006) 'The Development of Constructivist Grounded Theory' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* **5**: 25-35.

Milner, D. (1975) *Children and Race*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Modood, T. (2007) *Multiculturalism: Themes for the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Modood, T. (2011) *Post-Immigration 'Difference' and Integration: The Case of Muslims in Western Europe*, London: The British Academy.
- Modood, T. (2012) 'Capitals, Ethnicity and Higher Education' in B. Tehmina and S. Tomlinson (eds) *Social Inclusion and Higher Education*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Modood, T. and Meer, N. (2011) 'Framing Contemporary Citizenship and Diversity in Europe' in A. Triandafyllidou, T. Modood, and N. Meer (eds) *European Multiculturalisms: Cultural, Religious and Ethnic Challenges*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 33- 60.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993) 'Adolescence Limited and Life-Course Persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy' *Psychological Review* **100** (4): 674-701.
- Moffitt, T. E. and Caspi, A. (2001) 'Childhood Predictors Differentiate Life-Course Persistent and Adolescent-Limited Antisocial Pathways Among Males and Females' *Development and Psychopathology* **13**: 355-375.
- Moran, L., Skeggs, B., Tyrer, P. and Corteen, K. (2003) *Sexuality and the Politics of Safety*, London: Routledge: 1-207.
- MORI (2005) Muslims 'Take Pride' In British Way Of Life, <http://www.ipsos-MORI.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/417/Muslims-Take-Pride-In-British-Way-Of-Life.aspx>, (accessed 18th November 2013).
- Morris, E. (2007) 'Ladies' or 'Loudies'? Perceptions and experiences of Black girls in Class-Rooms' *Youth and Society* **38** (4): 490-515.
- Morrow, V. (2001) 'Conceptualising Social Capital in Relation to the Well-Being of Children and Young People: A Critical Review' *Sociological Review* **47** (4): 744-765.
- Moss, P. and Petrie, P. (2002) *From Children's Services to Children's Spaces: Public Policy, Children and Childhood*, London: Routledge Falmer.

- Mythen, G., Walklate, S. and Khan, F. (2009) 'I'm a Muslim, But I'm Not a Terrorist': Risk, Victimization and the Negotiation of Risky Identities' *British Journal of Criminology* **49** (6): 736-54.
- Nage, C. and Hopkins, P. (2010) *Introduction: Spaces of Multiculturalism Spaces and Polity* **14** (1): 1-11.
- Nathaniel, A. K. (2007) *A Tribute to the Fortieth Anniversary of Classic Grounded Theory' The Grounded Theory Review*, Special Issue, Mill Valey CA: Sociology Press, 49-54.
- Nayak, A. (2003) *Race, Place and Globalization: Youth Cultures in a Changing World*, Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Neal, S. (2003) The Scarman Report, The Macpherson Report and the Media: How Newspapers Respond to Race Centred Social Policy Interventions' *Journal of Social Policy* **32** (1): 55-74.
- Newburn, T. (2002) 'Young Crime and Youth Culture' in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 575-601.
- Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. L. (2004) *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*, London: Sage.
- OECD (2010) *Educating Teachers for Diversity: Meeting the Challenge*, Paris: OECD.
- Office of National Statistics (2012a) *Ethnicity and National Identity in England and Wales 2011*, http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_290558.pdf, (accessed 23rd August 2013).
- Office of National Statistics (2012b) *Religion in England and Wales 2011*, http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_290510.pdf, (accessed 23rd August 2013).
- Ortiz, J. and Raine, A. (2004) 'Heart Rate Level and Antisocial Behavior in Children and Adolescents: A Meta-Analysis' *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* **43**: 154-162.
- Ouseley, H. (2001) *Community Pride Not Prejudice: Making Diversity Work in Bradford*,

Bradford: Vision.

Pagani, C. and Robustelli, F. (2010) 'Young People, Multiculturalism, and Educational Interventions for the Development of Empathy' *International Social Science Journal* **61**(200-201): 247-261.

Paluck, E. L. (2010) 'Peer Pressure Against Prejudice: A High School Field Experiment Examining Social Network Change' *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* **47**: 350-358.

Parekh, B. (2000) *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, London: Profile.

Paluck, E. L. and Green, D. (2009) 'Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice' *Annual Review of Psychology* **60**: 339-367.

Parker, H. (1974) 'View from the Boys: A Sociology of Downtown Adolescents' *British Journal of Law and Society* **1** (2): 207-210

Pennell, J. and Francis, S. (2005) 'Safety Conferencing: Toward a Coordinated and Inclusive Response to Safeguard Women and Children' *Violence Against Women* **11**(5): 666-692.

People United (2013) Leicester Tops Poll for Diversity and Tolerance According to New Poll, <http://www.unitetheunion.org/news/leicestertopspollfordiversityandtoleranceaccordingtonewpoll/>, (accessed 12th January 2014).

Perry, B. (2001) *In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*, London: Routledge.

Perry, B. (2003) *Where Do We Go From Here? Researching Hate Crime*, Internet Journal of Criminology, <http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Where%20Do%20We%20Go%20From%20Here.%20Researching%20Hate%20Crime.pdf>, (accessed 24th March 2014).

Pettigrew, A. (2012) 'Confronting the Limits of Antiracist and Multicultural Education: White Students' Reflections on Identity and Difference in a Multiethnic Secondary School' *Sociological Research Online* **17** (3).

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998) 'Intergroup Contact Theory' *Annual Review of Psychology* **49**: 6585.

Phillips, C. and Earle, R. (2010) 'Reading Difference Differently? Identity, Epistemology and Prison Ethnography' *British Journal of Criminology* **50** (2): 360-378.

Pickering, J., Kintrea, K. and Bannister, J. (2012) 'Invisible Walls and Visible Youth: Territoriality among Young People in British Cities' *Urban Studies* **49** (5): 945-960.

Policy Exchange (2007) *Living Apart Together: British Muslims and the Paradox of Multiculturalism*, London: Policy Exchange.

Popham, L., Kennison, S. M. and Bradley, K. I. (2011) 'Ageism, Sensation-Seeking, and Risk-Taking in Young Adults' *Current Psychology* **30**: 184-193.

Popham, P. (2013) 'We're All in this Together: How Leicester Became a Model of Multiculturalism (Even if that was Never the Plan...)',
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/this-britain/were-all-in-this-together-how-leicester-became-a-model-of-multiculturalism-even-if-that-was-never-the-plan-8732691.html>,
(accessed 12th January 2014).

Porter, A. (2008) 'David Cameron Launches 'Moral Neutrality' Attack on Obese, Idle and Poor',
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/conservative/2263521/David-Cameron-launches-moral-neutrality-attack-on-obese-idle-and-poor.html>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Poynting, S., Noble, G., Tabar, P. and Collins, J. (2004) *Bin Laden in the Suburbs: Criminalising the Arab Other*, Sydney: Federation Press/Institute of Criminology.

Putman, R. D. (1994) *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (2007) 'E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century' *Scandinavian Political Studies* **30** (2): 137-174.

Quinn, J., Thomas, L., Slack, K., Casey, L., Thexton, W. and Noble, J. (2006) 'Lifting the Hood: Lifelong Learning and Young, White, Provincial Working-Class Masculinities' *British Educational Research Journal* **32** (5): 735-750.

Raine, A. (1993) *The Psychopathology of Crime: Criminal Behavior as a Clinical Disorder*, San Diego: Academic Press.

Raine, A. (2002) 'Biosocial Studies of Antisocial and Violent Behavior in Children and Adults: A Review' *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* **30** (4):311-326.

Raine, A. (2002) 'The Biological Basis of Crime' in J. Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia (eds) *Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control*, California: ICS Press, 43-74.

Raine, A. (2013) *The Anatomy of Violence: The Biological Roots of Crime*, London: Allen Lane.

Raine, A., Lencz, T., Bihle, S., LaCasse, L. and Colletti, P. (2000) 'Reduced Prefrontal Gray Matter Volume and Reduced Autonomic Activity in Antisocial Personality Disorder' *Archives of General Psychiatry* **57**: 119-127.

Raine, A., Reynolds, C., Venables, P. H., Mednick, S. A. and Farrington, D. P. (1998) 'Fearlessness, Stimulation-Seeking and Large Body Size at Age 3 as Early Predispositions to Childhood Aggression at Age 11 years' *Archives of General Psychiatry* **55** (8): 745-751.

Raine, A., Venables, P. H. and Mednick, S. A. (1997) 'Low Resting Heart Rate at Age 3 Years Predisposes to Aggression at Age 11 Years: Evidence from the Mauritius Child Health Project' *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* **36**: 1457-1464.

Raine, A., Venables, P. H. and Williams, M. (1990) 'Relationships Between Central and Autonomic Measures of Arousal at Age 15 years and Criminality at Age 24 Years' *Archives of General Psychiatry* **47**: 1003-1007.

Ray, L. and Smith, D. (2001) 'Racist Offenders and the Politics of 'Hate Crime'' *Law and Critique* **12** (3): 203-221.

- Ray, L. and Smith, D. (2002) 'Hate Crime, Violence and Cultures of Racism' in P. Iganski (ed.) *The Hate Debate: Should Hate be Punished as a Crime?*, London: Profile Books, 88-102.
- Ray, L., Smith, D. and Wastell, L. (2004) 'Shame, Rage and Racist Violence' *British Journal of Criminology* **44** (3): 350-368.
- Reio, T. G. and Sanders-Reio, J. (2006) 'Sensation Seeking as an Inhibitor of Job Performance' *Personality and Individual Differences* **40** (4): 631-642.
- Reynolds, T. (2009) 'Friendship Networks, Social Capital and Ethnic Identity: Researching the Perspectives of Caribbean Young People in Britain' *Journal of Youth Studies* **10** (4): 383-398.
- Ritchie, D. (2001) *Panel report: Oldham Independent Review*, Oldham: Oldham Independent Review.
- Ritchey, N. P. and Fishbein, H. D. (2001) 'The Lack of an Association Between Adolescent Friends: Prejudices and Stereotypes' *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*: **47** (2): 188-206.
- Roberti, J. W. (2004) 'A Review of Behavioral and Biological Correlates of Sensation Seeking' *Journal of Research in Personality* **38**: 256-279.
- Roberts-Thomson, T., Clarke, R., Coulter, K. and Robertson, I. (2008) *The Diversity of Leicester: A Demographic Profile*, <http://www.leicesterpartnership.org.uk/EasySite/lib/serveDocument.asp?doc=111607&pgid=113861>, (accessed 8th August 2010).
- Robins, D. and Cohen, P. (1978) *Knuckle Sandwich: Growing Up in the Working-Class City*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research* (2nd Edition), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rosenfield, D. and Stephan, W. (1981) 'Intergroup Relations Among Children' in S. Brehm, S. Kassin, and F. Gibbons (eds) *Developmental Social Psychology*, New York: Oxford, 271-297.

Ruiz, M. A., Pincus, A. L. and Schlinka, J. A. (2008) 'Externalizing Pathology and the Five Factor Model: A Meta-Analysis of Personality Traits Associated with Antisocial Personality Disorder, Substance Use Disorders, and their Co-Occurrence' *Journal of Personality Disorder* **22**: 365-388.

Rushdie, S. (2005) *What This Cultural Debate Needs is More Dirt, Less Pure Stupidity*, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article756265.ece, (accessed 6th August 2010).

Russel-Bernard, H. (2002) *Social Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, London: Sage.

Sachdev, I. and Bourhis, R. Y. (1991) 'Power and Status Differentials in Minority and Majority Group Relations' *European Journal of Social Psychology* **21** (1): 1-24.

Salter, A. (2003) *Predators, Pedophiles, Rapists, and Other Sex Offenders: Who They Are, How They Operate, and How We Can Protect Ourselves and Our Children*, New York: Basic Books.

Santangelo-White, J. (2012) 'Conducting School-based Research: Lessons Learned From an After-school Intervention Study' *Journal of Pediatric Health Care* **26** (1): 75-79.

Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G and Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2008) 'The Concept of Multiculturalism: A Study Among Dutch Majority Members' *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* **38** (8): 2152-2178.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. L. (1973) *Field Research*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schech, S. and Haggis, J. (2000) *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Schuller, T., Baron, S. and Field, J. (2000) 'Social Capital: A Review and Critique' in S. Baron, J. Field, and T. Schuller (eds) *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-38.

- Semi, G., Colombo, E., Camozzi, I. and Frisina, A. (2009) 'Practices of Difference: Analysing Multiculturalism in Everyday Life' in A. Wise, and S. Velayutham (eds) *Everyday Multiculturalism*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sibbitt, R. (1997) *The Perpetrators of Racial Harassment and Racial Violence*, Home Office Research Study 176, London: Home Office.
- Siegel, L. J. (2008) *Criminology* (10th Edition) Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Simpson, L. (2007) 'Fixing the Population: from Census to Population Estimat' *Environment and Planning* **39** (5): 1045-1057.
- Simpson, L. and Finney, N. (2007) 'Minority White Cities?', Annual Conference of the British Society for Population Studies, Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Simpson, L. and Gavalas, V. S. (2006) *Population Dynamics within Rochdale and Oldham: Population, Household and Social Change*, Stoke on Trent: Centre for Census and Survey Research.
- Skeggs, B. (2009) 'The Moral Economy of Person Production: The Class Relations of Self-Performance on 'Reality' Television' *The Sociological Review* **57** (4): 626-644.
- Smith, D. (2006a) 'What Might Work with Racially Motivated ' in S. Lewis, P. Raynor, D. Smith, and A. Wardak (eds) *Race and Probation*, Collumpton: Willan, 200-216.
- Smith, D. (2006b) ' Racially Motivated Offenders and the Probation Service ' in S. Lewis, P. Raynor, D. Smith, and A. Wardak (eds) *Race and Probation*, Collumpton: Willan, 25-40.
- Sniderman, P. and Hagendoorn, L. (2007) *When Ways of Life Collide. Multiculturalism and its discontents in the Netherlands*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Standing, G. (2011a) 'Labour Market Policies, Poverty and Insecurity' *International Journal of Social Welfare* **20** (3): 260-269.
- Standing, G. (2011b) *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*, London: Bloomsbury Academic

Steinberg, L. (2008) 'A Social Neuroscience Perspective on Adolescent Risk-Taking' *Developmental Review* 28: 78-106.

Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W. and Martin, T. (2005) 'The Effects of Feeling Threatened on Attitudes to Immigrants' *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29: 1-19

Stern, P. N. (2009) 'In the Beginning Glaser and Strauss Created Grounded Theory' in J. M. Morse, P. N. Stern, J. Corbin, B. Bowers, K. Charmaz and A. E. Clarke (eds) *Developing Grounded Theory: The Second Generation*, Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, Inc.

Strauss, A. (1987) *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, London: Sage.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, London: Sage.

Sutherland, E. H. (1939) *Principles of Criminology* (3rd edition), Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott.

Sveinsson, K. J. (2009) *Who Cares about the White Working Class?*, London: Runnymede Trust.

Swartz, D. (1997) *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Sykes, G. and Matza, D. (1957) 'Techniques of Neutralisation' *American Sociological Review* 22: 664-670.

Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1979) 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict' in W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (eds) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 33-47.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986) 'The Social Identity Theory of Inter-group Behavior' in S. Worchel, and L. W. Austin (eds), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F. and Boone, A. L. (2004) 'High Self-Control Predicts Good Adjustment, Less Pathology, Better Grades, and Interpersonal Success' *Journal of Personality* **72** (2): 271-324.

Taylor-Gooby, P. and Cebulla, A. (2010) 'The Risk Society Hypothesis: An Empirical Test using Longitudinal Data' *Journal of Risk Research* 13 (6): 731-752.

Taylor, M. and Muir, H. (2014) *Racism on the Rise in Britain*, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/may/27/-sp-racism-on-rise-in-britain>, (accessed 20th June 2014).

The Anne Frank Trust UK (2014) *Home*, <http://www.annefrank.org.uk>, (accessed 18th May 2014).

The Prince's Trust (2009) *Deprived Youth Hit Hardest By Recession*, https://www.cass.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/76566/Princes-Trust-Charitable-Giving.pdf, (accessed 6th August 2010).

The Prince's Trust (2014) 'Mental Health Warning For Jobless Young', *The Prince's Trust Macquarie Youth Index*, http://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about_the_trust/what_we_do/research/youth_index_2014.aspx, (accessed 2nd March 2014).

The Sophie Lancaster Foundation (2014) *Education*, http://www.sophielancasterfoundation.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=16, (accessed 18th May 2014).

Thomas, P. (2003) 'Young People, Community Cohesion and the Role of Youth Work in Building Social Capital' *Youth and Policy* 81: 21-43.

Thomas, P. (2011) *Youth, Multiculturalism and Community Cohesion*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

Thomas, P. and Sanderson, P. (2013)'Crossing the Line? White Young People and Community Cohesion' *Critical Social Policy* **33** (1): 160-180.

Thomson, R., Flynn, R., Roche, J. and Tucker, S. (2004) *Youth in Society* (2nd Edition), London: Sage.

Thrasher, F. M. (1927) *The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Threadgold, S. and Nilan, P. (2009) 'Reflexivity of Contemporary Youth, Risk and Cultural Capital' *Current Sociology* **57** (1): 47-68.

Tomlinson, S. (2011) 'More Radical Reform (But Don't Mention Race): Gaps and Silences in the Government's Discourse' *Race Equality Teaching* **29** (2): 25-29.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. and Schulz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-Eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*, Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Trahan, A. (2011) 'Qualitative Research and Intersectionality' *Critical Criminology* **19** (1): 1-14.

Treadwell, J. and Garland, J. (2011) 'Masculinity, Marginalisation and Violence: A Case Study of the English Defence League' *British Journal of Criminology* **51** (4): 621-634.

Triandafyllidou, A., Modood, T. and Meer, N (2011) *European Multiculturalisms: Cultural, Religious and Ethnic Challenges*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tyler, K. (2004), 'Reflexivity, Tradition and Racism in a Former Mining Town', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, **27** (2): 290-309.

- Uitermark, J., Rossi, U. and van Houtum, H. (2005) 'Reinventing Multiculturalism: Urban Citizenship and the Negotiation of Ethnic Diversity in Amsterdam' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **29** (3): 622-640.
- Valentine, G. (2000) 'Exploring Children and Young People's Narratives of Identity' *Geoforum* **31**: 257-267.
- Valentine, G. (2003) 'Boundary Crossings: Transitions from Childhood to Adulthood' *Children's Geographies* **1**: 37-52.
- Valentine, G. (2008) 'Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter' *Progress in Human Geography* **32** (3): 323-337.
- Valentine, G. (2010) 'Prejudice: Rethinking Geographies of Oppression' *Social and Cultural Geography* **11**: 521-537.
- Valentine, G., Butler, R. and Skelton, T. (2001) 'The Ethical and Methodological Complexities of Doing Research with 'Vulnerable' Young People' *Ethics, Place and Environment* **42**: 119-125.
- Valentine, G., Skelton, T. and Chambers, D. (1998) 'Cool Places: An Introduction to Youth and Youth Cultures' in T. Skelton, and G. Valentine (eds) *Cool Places: Geographies of Youth Culture*, London: Routledge, 1-32.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G., Arends-To' th, J. V. and Breugelmans, S. M. (2006) 'Cracks in the Wall of Multiculturalism? A Review of Attitudinal Studies in the Netherlands' *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* **8**: 104-120.
- Van Geel, M. and Vedder, P. (2011) 'Multicultural Attitudes Among Adolescents: The Role of Ethnic Diversity in the Classroom' *Group Processes Intergroup Relations* **14** (4): 549-558.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S. and Buunk, B. P. (1998) 'Attitudes of Minority and Majority Members Toward Adaptation of Immigrants' *European Journal of Social Psychology* **28**: 995-1013.

- Verkuyten, M. (2002) 'Ethnic Attitudes Among Minority and Majority Children: The Role of Ethnic Identification, Peer Group Victimization and Parents' *Social Development* **11**: 558-570.
- Venkatesh, S. (2008) *Gang Leader for a Day: A Rogue Sociologist Takes to the Streets*: London: Penguin Press.
- Venkatesh, S. A. and Kassimir, R. (2007) *Youth, Globalisation and the Law*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007) 'Super-Diversity and Its Implications' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **30** (6): 1024-1054.
- Vertovec, S. and Wessendorf, S. (2009) *The Multiculturalism Backlash European Discourses, Policies and Practices*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Vohs, K. D., & Ciarocco, N.J. (2004) 'Interpersonal Functioning Requires Self-Regulation' in R. F. Baumeister, and K. D. Vohs (eds) *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications*, New York: Guilford, 392-410.
- Walford, G. (2008) 'Selecting Sites, and Gaining Ethical and Practical Access' in G. Walford (ed.) *How to do Educational Ethnography*, London: Tufnell Press, 16-38.
- Walker, D. and Myrick, F. (2006) 'Grounded Theory: An Explanation of Process and Procedure' *Qualitative Health Research* **16** (4): 547- 559.
- Walker, P. and Taylor, M. (2011) *Far right on rise in Europe, says Report*, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/nov/06/far-right-rise-europe-report>, (accessed 7th November 2011).
- Walklate, S. (2000) 'Researching Victims' in R. King and E. Wincup (eds) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press,
- Walters, M. A. (2011) 'A General Theories of Hate Crime? Strain, Doing Difference and Self Control' *Critical Criminology* **19** (4): 313-330.

Walters, M. A and Hoyle, C. (2010) 'Healing Harms and Engendering Tolerance: The Promise of Restorative Justice for Hate Crime' in N. Chakraborti (ed.) *Hate Crime: Concepts, Policy and Future Directions*, Collumpton: Willan Publishing.

Walters, M. A. and Hoyle, C. (2012) 'Exploring the Everyday World of Hate Victimisation through Community Mediation' *International Review of Victimology* **18** (1): 7-24.

Walters, M. A. (2014) 'Restorative Approaches to Working with Hate Crime Offenders' in N. Chakraborti and J. Garland (eds) *Responding to Hate Crime: The Case for Connecting Policy and Research*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Watson, I. (2010) *Coalition Cuts Projects: The Political Significance*,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10344634>, (accessed 18th August 2010).

Weis, L., Proweller, A. and Centrie, C. (1997) 'Re-Examining "A Moment in History": Loss of Privilege Inside White Working-class Masculinity in the 1990s' in M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, and L.M. Wong (eds) *Off White: Readings on Race, Power, Society*, London: Routledge, 210-228.

Weller, P., Purdam, K., Ghanea, N. and Cheruvallil-Contractor, S. (2013) *Religion Or Belief, Discrimination and Equality: Britain in Global Contexts*, London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Wilkins, C. and Lall, R. (2010) 'Getting By or Getting On? Black Student Teachers' Experiences of Teacher Education' *Race Equality Teaching* **28** (2): 19-26.

Williamson, M. and Khiabany, G. (2010) 'UK: The Veil and the Politics of Racism' *Race & Class* **52** (2): 85-96.

Willmott, R. (2003) 'The Power of Community Action: Creating the Momentum to Sustain just and Peaceful Communities' *Local Environment* **8** (3): 337-343.

Wilson, L. C. and Scarpa, A. (2011) 'The Link Between Sensation-Seeking and Aggressive Behavior: A Meta- Analytic Review' *Aggressive Behavior* **37**: 81-90.

- Wise, A. (2004) *Contact Zones: Experiences of Cultural Diversity and Rapid Neighbourhood Change Among Anglo-Celtic and Long Term Elderly Residents in Ashfield*, Sydney: Centre for Research on Social Inclusion, Macquarie University
- Wise, A. (2005) 'Hope and Belonging in a Multicultural Suburb' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* **26** (1-2): 171-186.
- Wise, A. (2007) 'Multiculturalism from Below: Transversal Crossings and Working Class Cosmopolitans' in A. Wise, and S. Velayutham (eds) *Everyday Multiculturalism Conference Proceedings*, Sydney: Macquarie University, 2-23.
- Wood, E., Stolz, J. A., Li, K., Montaner, J. S. G. and Kerr, T. (2006) 'Changes in Canadian Heroin Supply Coinciding with the Australian Heroin Shortage' *Addiction* **101**: 689-695.
- Worchel, S., Cooper, J. and Goethals, G. (1998) *Understanding Social Psychology*, Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Wren, K. (2001) 'Cultural Racism: Something Rotten in the State of Denmark?' *Social and Cultural Geography* **2** (2): 141-162.
- Wright, O. and Taylor, J. (2011) Cameron: My War on Multiculturalism, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/cameron-my-war-on-multiculturalism-2205074.html>, (accessed 2nd March 2012).
- Zdun, S. (2007) *Dynamic Strategies To Legitimize Deviant Behaviour Of Street Culture Youth*, *Internet Journal of Criminology*, http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Zdun_Dynamic_Strategies.pdf, (accessed 15th April 2013).
- Zick, A., Wagner, U., van Dick, R. and Petzel, R. (2001) 'Acculturation and Prejudice in Germany: Majority and Minority Perspectives' *Journal of Social Issues* **57**: 541-557.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979) *Sensation Seeking: Beyond the Optimal Level of Arousal*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zuckerman, M. (1983) 'Sensation Seeking: A Biosocial Dimension of Personality' in A. Gale, and J. Edwards (eds) *Physiological Correlates of Human Behavior: Vol. 3, Individual differences*, New York: Academic Press, 99-115.

Zuckerman, M., Ball, S. and Black, J. (1990) 'Influences of Sensation, Gender, Risk Appraisal, and Situational Motivation on Smoking' *Addicted Behaviour* **15**: 209-220.

Zuckerman, M. (1994) *Behavioral Expressions and Biosocial Bases of Sensation Seeking*, New York, NY: Cambridge Press.

Zuckerman, M. (2007) *Sensation Seeking and Risky Behavior*, Washington: American Psychological Association.

Zuckerman, M., Kolin, E. A., Price, L. and Zoob, I. (1964) 'Development of a Sensation-Seeking Scale' *Journal of Consulting Psychology* **28** (6): 477-482.

Zuckerman, M., Eysenck, S. and Eysenck, H. J. (1978) 'Sensation Seeking in England and America: Cross-Cultural, Age, and Sex Comparisons' *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* **46**: 139-149.

Appendices

Questionnaire

Thank you very much for taking the time to fill in this survey.

As stated on the information sheet, your survey is anonymous and the information you provide is confidential. This means that your survey cannot be traced back to you.

Please try to answer all of the questions in this survey.

General Information

Age:

Gender:

Ethnicity:

Religion:

What are your parent's or guardian's jobs?:

.....

Are you still in education?:

Please Tick

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

How often do you/did you attend school?

Please Tick

Frequently		Miss one or two days a week		Rarely	
------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--------	--

Are you going to stay in education?

E.g. A-Levels/University

Please Tick

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

What would be your dream job?:

.....

Your Opinions

What do you think are the biggest problems facing Britain right now?

You can tick more than one.

Economy		Crime	
Immigration		Terrorism	
Unemployment		Climate	
Other			

Why?

If 'Other', please explain:

.....

.....

England is described as being multicultural. This means that there are people living in England who are from different countries, ethnic backgrounds and have different religions.

Do you think this is positive?

Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Why?

.....

.....

What would you change about England?

.....

.....

Do you like living in Leicester? Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Why?

.....

.....

Would you like to stay in the area that you live when you get older?

Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Do you think that different ethnic groups such as White, Asian and Black people, get on well together in Leicester? Please tick.

Why?

Yes		No		Sometimes	
-----	--	----	--	-----------	--

.....

.....

Who is most likely to influence your opinion on important topics like immigration and crime?

For example, who are you more likely to listen to?

You can tick more than one.

Friends		School	
Parents/Family		Religion	
TV, Internet, Books, Magazines etc		Other	

If 'Other', please state:

.....

Your Experience

PLEASE REMEMBER THAT YOUR SURVEY IS ANONYMOUS AND THE DATA FROM IT IS CONFIDENTIAL. THIS MEANS THAT THE ANSWERS YOU PROVIDE WILL NOT BE SEEN BY ANYONE ELSE BUT MYSELF AND CANNOT BE TRACED BACK TO YOU.

Have you ever verbally or physically attacked someone because of their skin colour, ethnicity or religion? Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Have you ever heard people around you say negative or abusive names about people because of their skin colour, ethnicity or religion? Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Who have you heard it from? Please tick.

Friends		Family		Other	
---------	--	--------	--	-------	--

If 'Other', please state:

.....

How often do you hear these negative or abusive names/comments? Please tick.

Under 5 times		More than 5 times	
Regularly		Daily	

Could you provide examples of what words or phrases you have heard?

.....

.....

.....

If you have ever seen someone verbally or physically abuse someone because of their skin colour, ethnicity or religion, why do you think they did it?

.....

.....

If you have ever verbally or physically attacked someone based on their skin colour, ethnicity or religion, why did you do it? You can tick more than one.

It was funny		It was exciting	
My friends were doing it		To impress my friends	
They deserved it		Other (please state)	

Can you provide any more information about the incident? E.g. why did you do it? what led to the incident?

.....

.....

Have you ever been in trouble with the police?

Please tick.

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

Thank you very much for filling in the survey.