

3

Public conceptions and misconceptions of crime

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will review popular ideas of criminality and how these are affected by the media. It will then illustrate the limitations of public conceptions with two brief case studies which outline specific areas of criminal activity which are not popularly perceived as criminal, namely, 'white-collar crime' and 'corporate crime'. Later chapters will discuss related issues such as the effect of the media on the amount of crime that is committed (whether it causes crime) and on perceptions of criminal types which are not usually in the public mind (such as female criminals).

The way people perceive crime and criminals is important to criminologists for a number of reasons. First, it is vital for new students to this area to be aware of any prejudices, preconceptions or opinions which they may hold. The mere awareness of these can often prevent those views interfering with an objective approach. It will allow students to evaluate the usefulness of such views in the light both of extra information and of other, possibly conflicting, views. Secondly, the public's attitude to crime and criminals is used by certain theorists to explain why people might commit crimes, see for example, labelling in Chapter Fourteen. Thirdly, the perception of crime as being 'wrong' or 'abhorrent' may be questioned when one looks at crime in its wider sense rather than looking just at the acts most commonly associated with the idea of crime (see also Chapter Two where the relationship between crime and morality was discussed). Lastly, perceptions of crime are all important when it comes to looking at punishment. If perceptions, although inaccurate, determine or even influence punishment the result may be unfairness and inefficiency.

This chapter is largely concerned with the effects of media on our understanding of crime and the criminal justice and punishment systems. We are all exposed to a lot of media coverage of crime: it makes up between a quarter and a third of all books of fiction; about a quarter of films and TV output is about crime and in about another half crime is a significant element of the content of the film or TV drama (Allen *et al.*, 1997); information on electronic media systems is similarly preoccupied with crime; and everything points to this output becoming increasingly violent (Reiner *et al.*, 2001; Hall *et al.*, 1978). There is suspicion over press coverage, its effects and intentions. First, there is some suggestion that media influences people's behaviour and so may cause or encourage crime (this is discussed in Chapter Ten). Secondly, the media may present a distorted image of crime which, if it is believed, may lead to fear of crime or to 'moral panics'. Thirdly, the media may

present a distorted image of criminals resulting in certain groups being 'labelled' as bad and so feared, excluded or over controlled. Fourthly, as Reiner (2007) suggests many are concerned that the media deliberately and maliciously distort, intending to mislead and to cause heightened fear or increase the likelihood of criminal activity, or that they use their position to focus on certain issues to lead thinking down a certain path, a form of social control. Fifthly, whether the media present a sensationalist account and, if so, how this impacts on the 'viewer' and whether the impact is dependent on the source (TV, electronic, novels etc) or on the type of output (fictional, non-fictional etc). Each of these will be considered here.

3.2 Popular and media perceptions of crime

The word 'crime' generally evokes images of murder, rape, drug abuse, drug trafficking, terrorism, aggravated assault, aggravated burglary, armed robbery, arson, theft or similar dramatic acts. The 'criminal' is often perceived as thoroughly 'bad' or an out and out villain: not the sort of person one knows and is friendly with—an unknown and feared creature. Often, if one does know a person who has been convicted, that person is perceived differently; not a true criminal but rather someone basically good who has perhaps been led astray by others. Or their crime is an activity which is not considered as truly criminal: driving offences or petty dishonesty offences for example. Actions, indeed, which one might even have committed oneself without being apprehended.

Images of criminals are particularly interesting as most of us will know someone who has offended, even if they have not been caught and officially labelled a criminal. Offending is common, especially for men: one-third of males have a conviction for a relatively serious offence (standard list offence) by the time they are 46 (Prime *et al.*, 2001); and, many more people, male and female, commit offences and are never caught. Moreover, many offenders commit more than one offence; a quarter of males and a tenth of females admit committing five or six offences. This might suggest a habit of offending, but for most this is a youthful phase which will pass. The ideal is to try to prevent offending in the first place or, where this is not possible, to limit the damage caused. All this should make us confront the possibility that many of those who commit offences are not others but rather ourselves and those we know, even if we, or they, have no overt contact with the criminal justice system.

With this in mind it is particularly difficult to assess how perceptions of crime and criminals are constructed, still less how they are maintained, but some understanding of these issues is useful. Our awareness of any social phenomenon is clearly affected by all our personal experiences. Contact with crime may come directly as criminal or victim, or in contact with the police, or indirectly through police information, family, friends, work, education, the community or the media. It is difficult to assess the effect each of these may have on public opinion.

It is, however, safe to assert that one of these sources, the media, plays some role in forming people's perceptions of crime. One eloquent confirmation of this is implicit in the much greater attention paid to the media in recent times by all the main interested bodies. Not just the Home Office and the police, but the

professional associations and trade unions as well as the many pressure groups all work hard to influence media coverage which they see as influencing public attitudes. How great its effect is more debatable. Media take various forms (newspapers, television, electronic etc) and are made up of a number of aspects—news, editorials and documentaries, each of which is assumed to be largely non-fiction. There are also stories, drama and films which are largely fictitious. Here most attention will be paid to the non-fiction areas, particularly news reporting. News provides us with an important point of contact with the rest of society. With 24-hour 'rolling news' and the advent of electronic communication news is brought to us almost instantaneously and from around the world. It makes the world feel smaller and society takes on a different meaning. One may even have more information about events hundreds or thousands of miles away than those on one's street or in one's immediate community. Modern media has altered our understanding and relationship with the world and in evaluating its effect on popular perceptions of crime it becomes important to consider where most of the information comes from and how representative it is of actual criminality.

To illustrate our points attention will be concentrated on newspapers although, allowing for differences of style and technique, many of the points would broadly apply to radio, television and electronic media. There are several broad styles or forms of presentation which journalists use in the reporting of crime. The most direct is the straight-forward giving of factual accounts, where the information is documented and presented as reliable. This is in sharp contrast to a sensationalist mode, presenting crime, usually a specific crime, in graphic terms which are expected both to attract readers and to rouse strong emotions of anger, revenge or fear. A third approach is to analyse information and the criminal justice responses. Analysis should not, however, be assumed to represent impartiality: each media outlet reflects its audience and a particular political stance which will tend to colour their reporting and explanations of and cures for crime. Most traditional media have a conservative take on crime, some more than others, and most are basically supportive of the criminal justice system and criminal justice agencies.

Journalists largely have the same access to criminal data as most other individuals, but they have a professional motive to make use of these sources. Most crime stories come to them from official sources such as the police, the courts and the Home Office. Some may originate from unofficial sources such as victims, witnesses or informants. Generally, information from these latter sources must be checked against official sources before printing or presenting. The more official the source, the more credible the account, and the more likely it is to be reported as fact rather than allegation. The seeming objective nature of facts lends further weight to the report. Rarely does the criminal's own view or interpretation appear in the media, and when it does the reference will tend to be more anecdotal than factual. There is an increasing tendency, however, for groups—even those critical of the establishment—to be given a voice (Lawrence, 2000).

News is a report; an event is not news until it is reported and there is nothing intrinsic about an event that guarantees news coverage. Newspapers sift through information and reports of events, choosing only those areas which are 'newsworthy'. The distortion of information arises from the commercial and highly competitive nature of newspapers and their fight to obtain a wider readership which is generally achieved by titillating their patrons and/or by stimulating their lives

with sensational information, see Chibnall (1977). Crime reports, particularly of violent and/or sexual crimes, sell newspapers, which gives the media a powerful incentive to give most prominence to the more graphic cases of criminal behaviour (Hall *et al.*, 1978: 67–8).

Why are certain items reported while others remain in the dark? Clearly it would be impossible to report every item, so some selection is necessary, but how do the press decide which crimes are newsworthy?

Reporters are not generally interested in the most common crimes involving those people who are most usually the victims of crime, but concentrate rather on more serious crimes or on ones whose victims are particularly vulnerable or 'news-worthy'. Moreover, they present these crimes in a deliberately shocking, blunt, or brutal manner, and emphasise the contrast with what is implied to be a quiet and law-abiding community. To achieve this the papers simplify events, sensationalise them with shock headlines, and present the story as good threatened by evil, or law and order threatened by crime and chaos. Reports will be presented in a dramatic and unusual way so as to capture the readers' imagination; for example, reporting of rape focuses on dramatic attacks by strangers in public places, whereas women are more likely to be raped in private by someone they know. In 1996 over 90 per cent of reported cases fell into this category (see Harris and Grace, 1999). Furthermore, once an individual is convicted, the papers often print as factual, sensational information concerning that individual or the crime, distorting accuracy; often the criminal has no legal reputation to be protected and so the papers have no fear of a libel action. In this way the 'story' is supposedly rendered more interesting to the public.

The work of a few academics (Chibnall, 1977; Hall *et al.*, 1978; Jewkes, 2004; Greer, 2003 and 2007) is central to our understanding of what is newsworthy and why. Each author sets out slightly different ideas but the following are accepted by a number:

Immediate—the occurrence must fit into the current interests and/or be able to be 'captured' immediately.

Visible and spectacular—it must be in the public sphere and different, maybe novel. For example, violence committed by women or by young children (Jewkes, 2004).

Visual—the visual image is increasingly central to the newsworthiness of the occurrence. Some offenders use this—terrorists target spectacular locations or those with high civilian casualties in order to guarantee maximum publicity. However, in most cases it is added by the media, a photograph of the 'innocent' victim next to one of the offender looking dangerous or other more graphic representations.

Known—celebrities or those we feel we know or can identify with are most likely to be reported.

Experts—have official information or experts who can explain or analyse the occurrence in an accessible way.

Simple—be capable of simple representation, especially that involving stark contrasts: vulnerable elderly person or a child victimised by a strong male; rioters juxtaposed with the police etc.

Individual pathology—there is something 'wrong' with or 'different' about the offender, society is not at fault. Even cases of political violence such as protests, especially when they dissolve into riots, are often depicted in terms of an individual pathology rather than the result of structural social problems (Lawrence, 2000: ch 3). Of course when they happen abroad structural problems are often recognised.

Proximity—can the occurrence be made culturally or geographically relevant (include a local victim; or happen to people ‘like us’).

Involve scandal or violent or sexual aspects. The reporting of violence has increased over the years and is misrepresentative of the amount of violence in society (Schlesinger and Tumber, 1994; Greer, 2007). Violence which can be linked to others’ fears such as gangs or drugs has become increasingly common and feeds fears. The reporting of sex crime has also increased, particularly if the offender can be portrayed as predatory or dangerous, a stranger, a ‘sex beast’, and the victim as innocent or the offences can be linked to unsolved cases (Soothill and Walby, 1991).

Have a political element or open the door to analysis of the need for deterrence or control. This clear politicisation of crime dates from the 1970s when the then Prime Minister, Edward Heath, used speeches and the media to draw attention to groups (folk devils) he thought needed to be controlled such as youth gangs, trade unions, scroungers (Cohen, 1972; Hall *et al.*, 1978). Since then the media have often called for harsher punishments or better control systems; policies their readers can relate to, especially after being exposed to a particularly graphic account of victimisation of the vulnerable.

Victim-centred analysis and risk—stories with clear and innocent victims (especially children) or where readers may think ‘it could have been me’, feel vulnerable and begin to consider how they can be protected. These stories feed on and are fed by fear and unease and are particularly powerful in the case of sex offenders especially paedophiles.

The media stories and dramas are often written or presented to highlight these aspects and present a simplified, distorted picture of offenders as violent, immoral, uncaring and a threat to security and harmony whereas victims are vulnerable and in need of protection, normality is portrayed as ordered and safe and criminality as totally alien to that stereotypical normality. There is little nuance to the narratives, few grey areas. Life is rarely this simple and criminologists need to seek out and take account of the complex and the grey.

In general the media is most drawn towards acts which are visible and spectacular, especially if they have sexual or political connotations and lend themselves to presentation in pictures (Greer, 2007). The clear implication is that the violence most likely to receive coverage in the press is that which involves sudden physical injury to seemingly innocent strangers, preferably committed in public. So, the escapades of football hooligans outside football grounds are particularly newsworthy, as are those of muggers, vandals, rioters, terrorists and rapists or paedophiles where the offender is a stranger. If there is also a controversial political content, its interest is enhanced. Such broad and permanent characteristics should not be taken to imply that the list of what is newsworthy is static—30 years ago newspaper coverage of child pornography and paedophiles was rare, now it is fairly common (Williams, 2003)—and baby-battering was rare; now it is reported fairly frequently. This may reflect an increase in such offences, or it may simply portray a change in what is judged to be newsworthy. There are still some areas of violence which are rarely reported, such as injuries or deaths at work resulting from unsafe working conditions, and illness caused by pollution. On the other hand, some sexual and/or violent crimes (eg paedophilia and terrorism) seem always to have a high value in news reporting.

What is described as ‘bias’ in newspapers is inherent in their own functions (informative, entertaining, making money etc) and is not necessarily a criticism. But it does raise the question: are the types of crime most commonly reported the

ones which are actually most commonly committed? Is crime reporting representative of the amount and type of crime committed?

The bias in the press on the type of crime considered worth reporting has a long history. For example, both Rochier (1973) and Cumberbatch and Beardsworth (1976) discovered an over-emphasis on crimes of violence. This over-emphasis has been consistently found in research over the last 30 years. Thus Schlesinger *et al.* (1995) shows that most coverage was given to violence against the person and to sexual offences. Beckett and Sasson (2000) noted the particular rise in the reporting of sexual offences and Williams (2003) noted a rise in the reporting of paedophiles.

Schlesinger *et al.* (1995) in a study of the whole range of the national press demonstrated both the proportion of coverage given to different types of crime and the variations between different sections of the press. They found that most coverage in all types of newspapers was given to violence, although there are interesting differences in the coverage by different newspapers. Non-sexual violence occurred in a quarter of the cases mentioned in the 'quality press' as against 45.9 per cent of those in the tabloid press. They noted that television coverage was also varied both in substance and style: ITV came closest to the tabloid coverage, but local bulletins were even more clearly of this type, being most likely to focus on violent crime.

A further reading of some studies reveals that in the 1990s crime reporting, particularly in the 'quality' papers and on television, tended to move more towards an analysis of what is being done about the problem of crime (a similar though less marked trend is seen in the tabloids though it started later). The media seems to believe that their readers are more interested in the wider issues of solving the crime problem because such information touches more clearly on their own lives and well-being; the public wants to know what is being done to tackle burglaries or violence on the streets. These papers may therefore utilise more column inches in considering the performance of the professional crime control agencies of the criminal justice system than in discussing individual criminal activity. The coverage will often entail a 'debate' in which there is a competition between the acceptability and rationality of the actions of the criminal justice system and the emotionally powerful anguish of a vulnerable victim (or victims) who may feel they have been failed by or even injured by the system (see Anderson, 1995). This preoccupation with crime and the criminal justice system is, on the one hand understandable, and on the other becoming obsessive for many people. Over the past 30 years or so crime has become a more common experience amongst many, especially in the middle classes, who previously had little direct contact. During this period their property has become more accessible to the criminal through increased availability of vehicular transport, and their increasing ownership of portable goods makes them more attractive targets. Furthermore the visible signs of disorder on the streets have increased, including graffiti and vandalism as well as the presence of large numbers of youths who, even if not rude or dangerous, swagger and sometimes look threatening etc. Their everyday experience of crime or rather their feeling that they might realistically experience crime has increased. All this makes them interested in what is being done to improve their safety and to remove or decrease the dangers. The media feed this personally experienced unease through reports of dangerous and violent crimes and then provide critical comment on the

alleged failures of the system of criminal justice. Much press coverage in fact calls for ever greater controls of what are viewed as problems and crimes.

Fictional accounts, particularly television, cinema and video presentations, are also relevant. Most of us are subjected to such representations from an early age and are probably more interested in them and watch them for longer periods than our exposure to news or other non-fiction criminal information. They are arguably the most effective medium of mass communication. If the news presentations have an effect on our perceptions, attitudes are equally likely to be formed by the impact of fiction. In Chapter Ten the effect of media on criminality will be considered; here we are concerned only with its effect on perceptions of crime.

Fiction is full of representations of crime, criminals, victims and enforcement agencies. Such images are so common that we take them for granted. What is more difficult is to understand the images and the effects they have on our understanding of the world. Like the news media they tend to over-represent sensational crimes which makes for good drama, but they do not represent what are most people's real experience of crime. However, they are even more complex than the news reports: they are imbued with other meanings, a moral representation. There is an even greater bias towards criminality than non-fiction: it is one of the commonest themes of dramas, films and serials, especially soap operas. And like non-fiction accounts, sex and sensationalism are heavily over-represented. Reiner *et al.* (2001) note a marked change in the media representation of crime over the past 50 years. They claim that in the immediate post-war (Second World War) period crime stories both fictional and non-fictional presented a consensus view of society, which accepted the differing status of individuals and groups as well as the need for, and actions of, authority. They claim that victims were seen as being good and in need of protection, that criminals were caught and made to pay for their wrongdoing (or helped to change their ways) and the criminal justice system was good, and effective. In the late 1960s until almost 1980 they see a massive shift. Authority and the criminal justice system and its employees are not now depicted as necessarily good. The acceptability and effectiveness of the system and of criminal laws are questioned. Society is portrayed as full of conflicts and the law enforcement officials and the victims are often no better than the criminals. In fact victimisation is depicted as a more complex issue and the offenders may well be portrayed as the real victims. Much is made of the possibility and need for reforming the system and such a project is portrayed as possible. Reiner *et al.* argue that this change encapsulates a move from an unquestioning acceptance of those in the criminal justice system as professional and therefore necessarily good, to seeing them as no different from anyone else and therefore as needing to prove their worth daily and with results. It also depicts crime as a problematically defined legal concept. Having said that they do conclude that despite these enormous changes it is still true that the vast majority of media representations continue to conclude in favour of the system even if along the way they question certain facets of it. In this way the media continue to support socially acceptable behaviour and to accept social control as a good and a necessary part of communal living. This, largely conservative, depiction is likely to continue as shareholders and advertisers take a more in-depth interest in the programmes they are associated with and use their influence. This happened, for example, when Becks Brewery withdrew funding from *Queer as Folk* (1998) after explicit portrayal of gay sexual intercourse in the first episode.

Despite this overall conservatism some representations retain a confrontational element.

Allegations of a bias in both crime reporting and fictional representations would therefore seem to be towards the more sensational crimes of violence and sex. Given that such bias exists, what is its effect, if any, on the public's perceptions of crime?

3.3 Effects of media on public perceptions of crime

It should not be assumed that the media necessarily influences people's perception of crime, particularly that it might do so in specific ways. We watch or read fictional crime for entertainment not enlightenment so any influence must not be exaggerated, nor should its effects be totally dismissed. At the least many fictional and non-fictional accounts encourage fears and insecurity. And it is interesting that it is often difficult to tell the difference between fiction and the crime reconstruction that takes place in a programme such as *Crimewatch UK*. Here the non-fiction programme employs the techniques of fiction programmes so as to grab the imagination and appear more entertaining, thereby using our preoccupation with fictional depiction of fear as a weapon in crime detection.

As a generalisation it could be suggested that the media affect public opinion in one of three ways:

- (a) by mass manipulation—assumes the public is a gullible mass into which the media can pour chosen information in order to mould opinions. The theorists who support this thesis generally see the press as dangerous because of the possibility of political manipulation;
- (b) by a commercial *'laissez-faire'*—the media offer a variety of differing views allowing the public a choice of opinions. Here a person is not just a void; an individual's attitudes already exist and so he or she will choose the paper or programme which best reinforces that view. Of course it is possible to alter views, but the ease with which this may be done is inversely proportional to the importance of a particular view to the person. Against this those who support the 'consensual paradigm' argue that there are not many views portrayed in newspapers, largely because they are all owned and run by a few people;
- (c) by the 'consensual paradigm'—assumes society is made up of like-minded individuals who agree both on the individual and collective goals and the means to achieve them, the function of law and the State is to aid in the achievement of this ideal. Here the media should also aid in that ideal, playing its part to make society work better, to work towards trust and consensus on moral values for ideal behaviour and how to achieve that so delivering a stable society. Any crime must then be portrayed as dysfunctional, either an individual or part of society is dysfunctional and needs to be reformed.

Garland (2000) suggests another approach to the explanation of the role of the media in relation to recent trends towards more punitive developments in crime control. He argues that these do not originate with the media. They arise from

changes in social structures and everyday experience which the media reflect, disseminate and then use to justify punitive remedies. He argues that cultural changes led the way. Since the 1960s the political clout of welfare professionals has declined partly because they had not delivered a safer society. Politicians took over, deciding how to punish and solve crime in answer to popular fears, they concentrated on serious offending. In addition, as already mentioned, the combination of more portable electronic valuables and thieves with cars and vans meant that crime became a growing problem for the middle classes, although this did not alter the basic fact that most crime was committed by the poor against the poor. At the same time the spread of vandalism, graffiti and incivility gave a general feeling that crime was not far away. Finally the emergence of a widespread drugs culture and its associated violence evoked a fear that was fed by much lurid media coverage. It is in this already fertile arena that Garland sees the media have had an effect. They have responded to the increased interest in crime by producing more and more fictional and non-fictional portrayals of crime. As noted above, these often question the integrity and/or competence of the system to deal with the crime problem. The media coverage does not cause the change in mindset but rather reinforces widespread experience and feelings, making it easier to accept media calls for legal and political action to address the 'problem' with punitive action.

Reiner *et al.* (2001) suggest a more complex and fragmented effect of media, particularly fictional media. They found that each generation tended to be positively affected by the media of their youth and this most shaped their perceptions and their views on the criminal justice system and the society today. Older people spoke with approval of idealised clear moral and justice positions displayed in their youth; younger generations welcomed the more complex moral issues and questioning of authority through rights and alternative viewpoints. Gender differences were also discovered. Women perceived themselves as potential victims, young women used media stories to help them assess and learn to deal with risk. Men rarely perceived risks to themselves as potential victims, older men tended to identify with the authority figures, younger men were more ambivalent not seeing clear moral differences. Clearly, though, the message is of a marked media effect on perceptions of crime and criminal justice system.

Against this one of the most recent large-scale pieces of research throws some doubt on the extent to which the media influences views and opinions. Gillespie and McLaughlin (2002) suggest that media representations (fictional and non-fictional) do not have a strong impact either on people's knowledge of the criminal justice system or on their views and attitudes, especially towards sentencing. Most informants had a punitive attitude towards crime and this arose whether they were subjected to a lot or only a little media coverage. The individuals who were most affected were those who regularly watched soap operas where the crime details were affected by the depth of character and personal circumstances of both the victim and the offender. But even here the often less punitive attitudes to particular cases did not necessarily affect the overall punitive values of the individual. Many individuals felt strongly that the media could be used to alter views towards a less punitive stance but that this form of social engineering would be unacceptable. This does not disprove media influence, it may suggest the influence is strong even in quite low exposures. It might also be explained by the fact that the media

feed on what they see as public opinion to sell their goods so they reinforce rather than alter prejudices in order to make money.

Furthermore, this research is somewhat at odds with the work of Simmons (2002) and Fletcher and Allen (2003) who suggest links between types of papers read and understanding of the crime rate. Chadee (2001) in a discussion of the synthesis of three extensive studies concluded that the media, especially television and newspaper reports are a major source of information on crime and influence the readers'/viewers' perceptions of crime.

This suggests that the media affect perceptions of crime and beliefs about what should be done to solve the 'problem'. Therefore it would be helpful to understand how the press affects public opinion. Equally clearly this is an elusive goal, but some guidance can be obtained from the attempts that have been made. For example, Susan Smith (1984) studied the effects of media reportage of crime on the inhabitants of a small area in Birmingham. Her survey suggested that those who had gleaned most of their information from the media were more likely to believe that local crime consisted mainly of personal violence or vice, and more likely when considering crime generally to think of it in terms of personal or violent incidents. The study therefore lent some support to the view that there was a clear link between the public's opinion of crime and the media reporting of crime. It also suggested another possible relationship—that between hearsay and public opinion. It may be that information gained from hearsay provides more balanced information than the press and so allows the public to fill in the gaps left by press reporting. Schlesinger *et al.* (1995), in a limited study, found a relationship between the types of media to which individuals were exposed and their level of fear of victimisation; those reading tabloid papers and watching a large amount of television were more fearful. The link was particularly marked so far as fear of violent attacks was concerned. The researchers suggest that the media may be reinforcing personal fears and insecurities and may build on life experiences. Hough (2002) would support this claim but, perhaps optimistically, suggests that the cycle of fear and punitive views might be broken by a more factually sound presentation of information and a more balanced political presentation based on information from practitioners and academics rather than the 'spin' presently used by the media. All this is highly conjectural, but at least the studies establish reasonably firmly that press reporting of crime creates a broad public awareness of crime which is substantially different from any contained in the official statistics and, as will become apparent in Chapter Four, is different again from actual criminal activity.

A related problem (Sparks, 1992) is that the fictional representation of crime depicts ordinary citizens as victims or helpless onlookers, unable to enforce the criminal law or counter crime. Stopping criminality and corruption is left to heroes or heroines. The images hugely simplify the complex social reality, if this affects our understanding of crime it could be problematic: heroes and heroines do not exist to save us.

While much in this area is conjectural, there is some positive support for the initial hypothesis. The media does distort crime reporting and the public do, to some extent, rely upon that information to form their picture of crime and criminals, and of the possibility of either affecting themselves.

Perception of crime, whether moulded by media or other means, has a number of undesirable side effects such as increasing moral indignation, causing public

panic, or individual fear of crime. All of which may cause people to modify their lives so as to take account of these, for example by staying in at night, which may be sensible if the perceptions are true but not if perception exaggerates the crime problem or if the real dangers are from people in their own homes. Whether sensible or not withdrawal is a loss of freedom which affect people's lives and social interactions and reduces the 'eyes on the street' so may actually make criminal activity more likely as there is no witness. Therefore the media, if they affect perception, may be increasing fear and decreasing feelings of citizenship, safety and social community so adding to a social problem. Such perceptions may also impact negatively on the criminal justice system by encouraging public support for severe sentences, so making reforms more difficult even if these may in fact improve the situation. Newspapers often bemoan or are outraged by what they consider to be lenient sentences, they rarely complain of sentences being too punitive. In this way they portray our criminal justice system as over-sympathetic to the criminal, and render the introduction of less punitive sentences or alternative sentences very difficult, if not impossible.

The perception the public seems to have of the sentencing structure, and certainly that portrayed by most popular newspapers, is that sentencing is too lenient. Information from successive British Crime Surveys since 1995 have discovered that a large proportion of the public believe that sentencing is too lenient, they frequently and consistently underestimate the severity of sentences and yet believe that they are getting accurate information about the criminal justice system (see, eg, Mirrlees-Black, 2001). This is particularly galling when studies stretching back as far as the early 1980s have consistently contradicted this. Moreover, when individuals are themselves asked to choose appropriate sentences they pick ones which are the same, or more lenient, than those which the judges actually pass. The public believe the courts are more lenient than they actually are.

Despite these findings the media continue to affect the law, penal sanctions and the criminal justice system. This is well documented in many sources. For example, Koch (1998) after extensive access to government departments and politicians concluded that Home Office decisions and policies were based not on detailed research and reasoned discussion but on what the politicians believed the readers of the tabloid press would support. She portrayed these decisions as irrational and highly politicised, designed as vote winners rather than genuine solutions to the problem of crime. Here press coverage which may influence public opinion is being used by politicians to assess what the public are thinking. Similar types of analysis can be seen in Williams's (2003) consideration of the passing of the laws against child pornography.

It seems reasonable to conclude that the media seem, on occasions at least, to affect perceptions of crime: but equally it needs to be noted that the way this occurs is complex. Motivation is also difficult. Many theorists believe that crime depiction is deliberately skewed. Fictional representations are likely to be especially misleading; and some would argue that their effects are more powerful because they are deliberately imbued with morals and sentiments intended to engage the reader's (or viewer's) feelings, reactions and understanding.

Briefly, before moving on, the possible effect of the media on criminal behaviour will be considered. The preceding sections suggest that the media may build on fears leading to exclusion of certain groups, modification of behaviour so as

to avoid crime and calls for certain behaviours to be criminalised or punished more severely. Does this mean that the media also encourages or teaches criminal behaviour? An immediate reaction may be in the affirmative—if people learn to fear crime and how best to avoid crime then they might equally learn to offend and discover the means by which they might offend. Whilst many accept that, for the person who is already willing to offend or commit violence the media may show them the means by which they might achieve this: they may therefore learn new techniques (Jewkes, 2004), new ways to offend; learn new ways of evading justice; and, how to offend without leaving evidence. However, this is not to claim that the media will initiate a willingness to offend, give rise to an alteration in moral attitudes or standards of behaviour nor that viewing desensitises people to the horrors of violence and thereby releases them to harm others or awakens in them violent, sexual or acquisitive desires such that they are willing to offend whereas previously they were not. This is a much larger claim, a claim for a total change in attitude, morals and often lifestyle. This is discussed in detail in Chapter Ten. Here it will only be noted that there is no clear proof of causal links of these sorts though many politicians and the media itself often reports such claims as clear and proven; they certainly feel true but that does not mean that they are. Violent people may choose to watch violence, they may already be desensitised to the suffering of others and both enjoy watching and conducting violence. Others may enjoy the vicarious thrill of violence whilst safe in the knowledge that no one is really hurt; far from releasing them to violence it reinforces their values that violence, if real, is abhorrent. People and their learning is complex, the media and its impact cannot be simply assessed especially where attitudinal, moral or lifestyle changes are involved.

3.4 Two less visible areas of crime

3.4.1 Introduction

Two areas of crime which, to date, have had little media coverage and which are not topics that most people think of when they consider what is crime, are white-collar and corporate crime. Today both have a well-established place in criminology textbooks (see, eg, Croall, 2001; Slapper and Tombs, 1999; Punch, 1996) but until the late 1980s the former was not something generally recognised or readily perceived by the general public to be criminal in the United Kingdom. Corporate crime remains relatively unrecognised as crime even today, despite many national and international events that should have altered the general public perceptions. In brief, both types of crime are given relatively little media coverage, and corporate crime (because of its magnitude, possibly because of powerful lobbying factions and for other legal reasons) is still rarely, if ever, dealt with in the media as crime. This may well be set to change, especially in relation to the environment and food safety where there is now a heightened public awareness.

Both categories of crime, therefore, fit very appropriately into a discussion of the relation between the public perception of crime and the ways in which crime is

reported in the media. Clearly, strong grounds exist to support the view that there is a connection, but equally it is clear that proving this in an unequivocal manner is difficult. The media treatment of white-collar and corporate crime lends further evidence, albeit circumstantial, to the case for a connection.

Why is reporting of white and corporate crime so different?

- They are both associated with work so tend to take place in private and be committed by people who are legitimately at the crime scene so difficult to follow.
- The victims are often unaware of the crime until much later and, where they are corporations, they often do not want their weaknesses publicised so will deal with the offenders outside the criminal justice system, through dismissal or similar practices. The media are then unaware of the offences.
- They do not give rise to fear, nor are they generally lurid, exciting or visual so they are less newsworthy.
- Despite the fact that they may involve serious harm either to people or to the economy they are less public and there is less political or social interest in these types of activities.
- The activities may be complex and not lend themselves to headline-grabbing news stories or dramas.

News stories, when they appear, tend to be short, non-sensational and factual reports. They rarely appear as front page headlines and are often only found in the business sections of newspapers. Where crimes are headlined they are often reported as tragic accidents, mistakes or possible breaches of due care and attention, rarely clearly as crimes, reflecting both the complexity of the legal position and the probability of papers being sued for damaging, possibly untrue stories. All in all this means that these crimes or harmful activities are rarely fully reported.

What follows will open up these areas for discussion and look more closely at their occurrence and their secrecy and how this may impact on their control.

3.4.2 White-collar crime

What is white-collar crime? Edwin H. Sutherland was the first to bring this topic to the forefront of criminological study. He did this in works such as *White-Collar Criminality* (1940) and *White-Collar Crime* (1949). His work in this area is still the best known and continues to be both highly regarded and controversial. Most introductions to this subject begin with Sutherland's study (see, eg, Coleman and Moynihan, 1996: 8–10).

Carson (1970) broadly summed up Sutherland's thesis as follows:

the behaviour of persons of respectability and upper socio-economic class frequently exhibits all the essential attributes of crime but it is only very rarely dealt with as such. This situation emerges (Sutherland claims), from a tendency for systems of criminal justice in societies such as our own to favour certain economically and politically powerful groups and to disfavour others, notably the poor and the unskilled who comprise the bulk of the visible criminal population. (p 384)

Sutherland's definition of white-collar crime consists of four criteria, namely

- (a) A crime—this is an obvious element but is often forgotten. These crimes are often committed but no criminal sanction is incurred because of its white-collar nature. It may escape prosecution and harsh sentencing because there has been no general public perception of such behaviour as criminal, nor have the media generally treated it as such and so the politicians have no interest in it: indeed, many of those administering the criminal justice system act as if these were 'not really criminal offences'. Many commentators include discussion of activities which are harmful, though not yet criminalised.
- (b) Committed by a person of respectability—someone with no convictions for non white-collar crimes; and
- (c) Of high social status—Sutherland included this to call attention to a vast area of criminal behaviour which is generally overlooked, and to prove his theory of 'Differential Association' (see 10.2.3). However, this element is not essential and white-collar crimes can include any offence committed at work, although this is often labelled 'occupational crime'.
- (d) In the course of his/her occupation—If white collar workers or those of higher class commit murder, burglary or other 'ordinary crimes' they are not included here. Typical of the types of crime usual to this category are: overcharging, charging for unnecessary work, pilfering, misuse of the employer's computer, telephone etc, avoiding work by arriving late, taking long breaks, having unauthorised time off, false accounting, time fiddling, false allowance claims, bribery, the use of fictitious or over-valued collateral, embezzlement and insider dealing. Certain crimes, however, are commonly included in this category, for example tax evasion, fraud (Levi, 2010; Mackenzie, 2010b), identity fraud (Semmens, 2010), some cybercrimes and the making and passing off of fakes (Mackenzie, 2010a) which are not authentic white-collar crime, at least not in terms of Sutherland's definition. These activities, although associated with work, are not committed in the course of an occupation, but are included by many commentators.

Many writers have included a fifth element, namely:

- (e) A violation of trust—a more useful distinction can be made between job-related crimes committed for the corporation, and those committed against it. The easiest way to do this is to remove the former category (ie, where employees commit crimes for the benefit of the company or corporation) and label it 'corporate crime'. Then white-collar or occupational crime may be used to describe the remainder; where the employer does not gain. It is difficult to fit into this distinction some recent research (eg Nelken, 2002) which examines the links between white-collar crime and organised crime. Here the focus will be on work-related offences where the employer does not gain and financial and dishonest actions where the victim may not realise they have been targeted.

3.4.2.1 White-collar crime and its enforcement

In legal terms the social class of the offender is irrelevant, it is the nature of the offence and the mental intention which are of importance. Most white-collar

offences are financial offences and involve frauds such as identity theft, cheque or credit card frauds, embezzlements from companies (very often those for whom the offender works), insider dealing (which can be committed by the directors or the secretarial and other staff) and deceptions to obtain money by false pretences which could be committed by a person in work or by others (collecting money from senior citizens whilst claiming to be from the gas board). Most frauds are for fairly small amounts and committed by offenders who are not rich and famous. These frauds are dealt with by local police and Crown Prosecution Service, but their complexity makes them expensive to investigate and prosecute both in terms of finance and labour. A police force which focused on fraud would be seen to have poor overall performance in terms of cost and efficiency. Furthermore the general invisibility of fraud means that there is less political, and popular or media pressure on chief constables to deal with it. For these reasons fraud tends to have a low priority and low profile in most forces outside London.

Beyond these common frauds there is a smaller number of very different white-collar offences where the sums involved are very high, where the victims may not know of their victimisation, and where clever and calculated investments or deals are used to line the pockets of a few individuals. Such cases are dealt with by the Serious Fraud Office (set up under the Criminal Justice Act 1987). It deals with cases where there is at least £1 million at risk and where the fraud is complex, requires specialist knowledge and is international or of public concern. It enjoys extended powers in order to carry out investigations and bring cases to trial. For example under s 2 of the Criminal Justice Act 1987, the Director of the Serious Fraud Office was given powers to require a person under investigation, or any other person whom he or she has reason to believe has relevant information, to produce documents and to provide an explanation of them even where the information may be incriminating to that person or to another person. These powers were necessary partly to protect employees who might be willing but frightened to give evidence, but were also intended, and have been used, to force information to be provided to help with investigations, though there is protection against self-incrimination. This clearly marked an intention to deal with these kinds of offences and possibly suggested that they were at last being treated seriously by the authorities. Even so the success rate in terms of convictions in cases brought to trial has been very low.

Despite the extended powers bringing these cases to trial is very expensive. The complexity of the cases means that trials tend to be very lengthy (three to 18 months) and the information is very complex for jurors to understand. On three occasions the Government has tried to dispense with trial by jury in complex fraud cases, claiming that juries do not understand the complexities and that they are ill-suited to long trials. Julian (2007) discovered from interviewing UK judges who had been involved in fraud trials that they support the use of juries in such cases.

There are problems: there have been a number of acquittals, and even on conviction there seems to be little possibility of imprisonment; where imprisonment does ensue it has in practice been for a short period. The lenient sentences are especially unfortunate because they can plausibly be interpreted as a reluctance by judges to send their own kind to prison even when they have let the side down. All the enforcement problems make it very difficult for there to be any bargaining for guilty pleas. The accused has nothing to lose from a full case as he or she is unlikely

to be convicted and if convicted unlikely to be severely sentenced. Change seems dubious because, apart from any social discrimination, these crimes do not induce fear in the community and the media condemnation—though growing—is still muted. Indeed, some argue that the issue of high-level fraud should not be pressed very hard because a strong economy needs to encourage enterprise: but whether a strong society can be built by tolerating injustice is a wider issue (for a more detailed discussion see Nelken, 2002).

3.4.2.2 Media coverage of white-collar crime

As noted above much media coverage of crime is largely drawn from official sources and they do not always include areas of white-collar crime in the main official statistics and data from other organisations such as banking regulators and financial services tribunals is rarely used. Having said that, the broadsheets, especially the *Financial Times*, carry a large number of stories concerning problems which may affect the 'City' or the stock market. Few of these reach the more popular press though instances of cybercrime, some of which are also white-collar offences, abound as do stories concerning 'identity theft'. As with other crimes many reports tend to try to isolate a bad and greedy villain and locate a good, innocent victim. For this reason they often home in on the individual who might have been central to the crime but ignore both the individuals higher up the company who may also gain (in some instances it may, indeed, have been their idea), and the employers and regulators whose lax supervision let it happen. Frequently, however, the newspapers, television companies and reporters lack the drive, understanding and resources necessary for the more investigative journalism required to uncover many of these stories. Even where these are present they often have to take account of how such news will be received by their advertisers and whether their readership and viewers will be sufficiently interested or able to follow the often intricate information, especially as these stories may lack moral clarity or the clear message of pain and damage present in most media reporting of crimes.

This lack of media interest or censure does influence the public and politicians to see this as less serious and possibly as one of the prices of capitalism. Indeed one of the factors considered by the Serious Fraud Office in deciding whether to take a case is whether it is 'likely to be of widespread public concern'. In consequence resources for enforcement and regulation remain fairly low.

3.4.3 Corporate crime or organisational crime

Corporate crime is difficult to define partly because it covers such a wide range of offences (see Slapper and Tombs, 1999; Croall, 2010; Minkes, 2010; Tombs, 2010), and is complicated by a problem of terminology being variously called corporate, business or organisational crime. Here it will be defined as: an illegal act of omission or commission, punishable by a criminal sanction, which is committed by an individual or group of individuals in the course of their work as owners or employees of a legitimate organisation, and which is intended to contribute to the achievement, goals or other objectives thought to be important to the organisation as a whole or some sub-unit within it, and which has a serious physical or economic impact on employees, the general public, consumers, corporations, organisations or governments.

The first part of this definition makes it clear that the concern is with criminal acts rather than just unlawful acts. An activity may be harmful and even unlawful in civil or administrative law without being criminal or illegal. 'Illegal' only includes acts or omissions declared by the law to be criminal in that society.

The definition covers omissions as well as commissions, and may include both intentional and unintentional harms. The mere fact that machinery in a factory is dangerous may be sufficient to prove a crime even if those in charge of the factory did not intend to injure anyone, or even did not know it was dangerous. They ought to know, and have a duty to ensure it is safe. Similarly, if a drug company distributes a product before adequately testing it, if that product is harmful they may be liable to criminal prosecution even if they neither intended harm nor knew of the danger: they are liable as long as in distributing it they break a criminal regulation. In each case a prosecution could occur even though no one is actually hurt but merely because the criminal law is breached. Some theorists have argued that such crimes are actually worse than intentional crimes, as they show a general disregard for humanity and could lead to the injury of numerous victims, whereas an intentional crime is usually directed towards particular victims (Box, 1983).

The definition does not concentrate on economic goals but allows a wider understanding of organisational goals. It also recognises that the impact of such crime upon victims may well be, and often is, physical rather than economic (eg environmental dumping), and that the victims may be corporations, organisations and even governments. Such victims may result from tax evasion, bribing governmental officials, industrial espionage, illegal mergers and takeovers, trademark or patent violations, insider dealing, fraudulent advertising, and so on. Their inclusion is therefore necessary.

Is corporate crime important? It causes extensive harm and yet there is a lack of public concern possibly because little information is available to the public in a readily accessible and digestible form. Corporate crime receives very little exposure in the media or, if it is covered, it is often confined to the 'City' pages or portrayed as a disaster or accident rather than a crime.

Corporate crime can be a cause of injury, or even death. Death does occur in the course of, and as a result of, legitimate corporate activities. Sometimes, however, the corporate activities which resulted in deaths or serious injuries are illegitimate in that the corporation has shown wanton disregard for, or been reckless or negligent of, the health and safety of its employees or its customers. Corporations often disregard the interests of society as a whole in pursuit of their corporate goals, so they may dump toxic waste, emit dangerous fumes into the atmosphere, fit faulty equipment to products such as cars, sell contaminated food and expose employees or others to dangers.

The problem is substantial. Officially the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) reports about 240–50 deaths at work each year but Tombs (2010) calculated that this is under-reported and there should be at least 1,400. Added to this there may be as many as 6,000 deaths each year due to cancer induced through work and probably more than 11,000 deaths each year due to work-related diseases. Much of the work on enforcement of corporate safety standards is carried out by regulatory bodies such as the Health and Safety Commission, the HSE, Local Authorities, Environmental Health Departments and the Marine and Coastguard Agency. These tend to focus on accidents; on-the-spot visits are viewed as important but

relatively rare, most premises that have no accidents are visited only once every 10–15 years. They also have little time to research or counter work-related disease. Impact on work-related disease would be a long-term strategy, effort now would only reap benefits in the distant future; with Government-set targets to meet, no public outcry and few staff it is difficult to focus on this necessary area. Furthermore, with targets and low staffing levels these regulatory bodies primarily need to encourage and aid organisations to achieve high safety standards, prosecutions may therefore be secondary. They might therefore place enforcement notices on companies (requiring them to come up to safety standards within a particular period) rather than prosecute. These regulatory agencies may bring prosecutions under regulatory provisions such as those in the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 but do not generally act in traditional crime areas such as manslaughter. They often lack the training necessary to investigate such criminal transgressions and are severely under-resourced making such work difficult to carry out. The police also lack the expertise to carry out investigations of workplace deaths. Historically it was almost impossible to gain a conviction for corporate manslaughter but the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007 alters that. The Act makes it possible for companies, partnerships and (in some instances) government departments to be tried for manslaughter. However the prosecution still needs to prove death resulted from a gross failure of their responsibility and a significant connection between that gross failure and senior management, so a 'substantial' element of the failure must be at senior management level. This will render some prosecutions more likely to succeed but proof of senior management involvement will still be very difficult and will prevent a number of cases where death arises because of some breach by a corporation. What is lacking is any duty on the part of directors to ensure safety. This allows them to escape prosecution but also makes it less likely that they will take safety seriously as they are not likely to be called to account, it falls short of what the Government promised in 2000 (accountability would have arisen out of the failed Company Directors (Health and Safety) Bill 2003 which required one director to be appointed as health and safety director so guaranteeing a clear chain of command for these issues right up to the boardroom; the Bill never became law). There is therefore still a need to alter the law to make directors responsible for health and safety issues. Furthermore, the new legislation permits only restricted new sentences: there is a remedy order requiring the corporation to put right any shortfalls in safety but the HSE has a similar power which it should already have used; there is also a publicity order which requires the organisation to pay for its conviction to be publicised. This is to be welcomed and has proved to be useful in other jurisdictions; it is only a pity that there are no other innovative sentencing options made available. Having a corporate manslaughter offence is very important, it recognises that despite the fact that individuals within an organisation may be partially responsible, real, or at least partial, responsibility lies with the organisation which often provides the motive, opportunity and means; it may even pressurise employees to cut corners. So whilst the new law does not go far enough it recognises this responsibility. Unfortunately, the 2008 code for the regulators of health and safety issues does not require investigation of deaths and injuries but does insist that in their decision-making they take account of the need to encourage economic progress and in deciding what action to take they only have to consider prevention, there is no call on them to

consider accountability, justice or deterrence and enforcement action should only be taken against those who deliberately or persistently break the law (negligent and reckless conduct would then escape prosecution). This was a missed opportunity to call companies to account and may partially arise out of our lack of knowledge and understanding of the extent and seriousness of these offences which, in part, arises out of both the public and media obsession with street crime to the exclusion of other forms of crimes.

There are economic losses as well. Fraud on the grand scale can go as far as raising the possibility of destabilising the economic framework. This is certainly a possibility in the particular cases of international banking or State manipulation. At a less grandiose level some of the economic losses are suffered by other companies, for example through industrial espionage, price-fixing and patent violation. Others are suffered by the public, for example through corporate tax evasion. In the end it is generally the public who are the final losers, and most authors would agree that the losses suffered as a result of corporate crime (which Doig, 2006 estimates at between £4,431.2 million and £7,838.1 million) far outweigh those suffered as a result of economic street crimes such as robbery, theft, larceny and motor vehicle theft yet they are rarely discovered because of lower resourcing of the policing of these areas (Doig, 2006; Doig and Levi, 2009).

Lastly, there is the possibility of almost unquantifiable environmental damage even when, as it should be for this purpose, consideration is limited to corporate acts which are criminal, that is, the illegal cleaning of oil tanks at sea or the dumping of toxic pollutants in rivers (Walters, 2010). Slapper and Tombs (1999) and Tombs and Whyte (2003) present clear evidence that the economic, physical and social impact of corporate crimes far outweighs that of other criminal activities.

Again in relation to economic and other non-safety areas of corporate crime the enforcement is often conducted by regulatory bodies such as the Department of Trade and the Serious Fraud Office who work as much in the areas of prevention and proactive enforcement of standards as in the prosecution of offences. This approach is partly due to a lack of finances and the excessive costs of such prosecutions. When prosecutions succeed the fines are insufficient to dissuade perpetrators and anyway give out the message that everything can be bought, prison sentences are rarely used, so the deterrence element is not strong. Some commentators such as Slapper and Tombs (1999) and Tombs and Whyte (2003) question the effectiveness of this approach and see its ever widening use as part of the globalisation, decentralisation and reduction of accountability discussed in Chapter Twenty. Others such as Braithwaite (1995) see open self-regulation where large firms set their own standards and are then held to them as the only way forward. Still others (Bauman, 2001; Box, 1983) view the lack of morality on the part of businesses as normal and see it as inevitable that employees will be socialised into this, accepting it as part of their job. In order to counter this it is essential to: regulate companies and to enforce these regulations; remind companies and their senior employees of their accountability for unacceptable breaches; make the public aware of breaches, and companies and employees ashamed of their criminal actions; set out clear moral standards for employees; clarify that the moral accountability of employees is first to their community and fellow employees and only secondly to the company; and ensure employees have a means of whistle-blowing without jeopardising their career. Media publicity would be essential to this change: does society want it?

3.4.3.1 Perceptions of corporate crime

Corporate crime is therefore a real social problem and represents a definite danger to society. Yet corporate crime, like white-collar crime, is not usually among the first to spring to mind when crime is being considered. Why not? They are no less morally reprehensible, and in terms of suffering inflicted or damage caused they are as bad, and often because of their magnitude, worse than conventional, run-of-the-mill crimes committed by individuals.

The media are at least partially responsible for this situation. When a murder is committed and reported in the papers, it is clearly reported as a life criminally taken by another. But when life is lost as the result of a corporate crime, it is often reported as a disaster rather than as the result of human culpability. In this way, these activities are not perceived to be the result of criminal acts or omissions but as unfortunate accidents. Of course, this perception is not simply due to the media. Corporate crime does not often have an immediate and obvious direct impact on individuals so there is no real and general fear of it, and thus no clamour for its control. Fictional entertainment, in books and on the screen, is full of classic criminal activities but few feature corporate crime, the same is true of films. In the non-fiction area there are some documentaries where these issues are aired but such coverage is far less than for other criminal activities. A similar picture is found in most newspapers. Tombs and Whyte (2001) analysed crime stories in five daily newspapers and four Sunday papers over a six-week period, they discovered that although conventional crime was heavily reported (911 stories) corporate crime was not (237 stories). In tabloid papers the difference was about 20 conventional crime stories to one corporate crime; general broadsheets had a ratio of 4:1 whereas the liberal broadsheets had a 2:1 ratio. The only paper to have more corporate crime was the *Financial Times* which had four such stories to each conventional crime story. Corporate crime stories tended to be hidden well inside the paper, in financial or business sections and not on the front page. Most important was the fact that many corporate crime stories were not presented as crime stories but more as financial or business reports.

This probably helps to shape our views of these offences and offenders. This situation is particularly lamentable as publicity, by providing information, can discourage corporate crime. Certainly, publicising the breaches of particular companies would have a powerful enforcing effect. The corporations rely on consumers for their well-being; consumers can take legal action in civil courts for damage done to themselves; or can boycott goods which offend regulations. The corporations involved are usually basically legal and responsible, wish to retain a positive corporate image and profile, and will wish to avoid a bad press or possible boycott. To be effective the consumer pressure needs to be well organised. Braithwaite (1993) gives examples of the power of such action in altering the behaviour of major pharmaceutical companies. This can be illustrated from a non-criminal field where publicity has largely persuaded drugs companies to provide cheaper HIV-Aids drugs to poor countries (see Stewart, 2003). Corporations are interested in their public image and the media could, by drawing attention to problems, do much to persuade companies to work within the regulations or persuade reluctant governments to do something, for example the moves to tighten controls on banks following their part in the financial problems from 2008 onwards.

Interestingly, where perceptions of crime could do most for enforcement they have a low media profile; where their most effective result is to increase fear of victimisation by reporting of street crime, often in a distorted and startling way, they proliferate.

3.5 Media hype and folk devils

In stark contrast to the previous section there are areas of criminal activity which are over-emphasised and focused upon in the media, possibly leading to distorted perceptions, illogical fears and to laws which may not deliver safety. The two areas that best illustrate this are reporting on paedophilia and on terrorism. First it is necessary to consider the concept of 'folk devils'.

Press fascination or obsession with crime probably began to arise in the 1970s, Hall *et al.* (1978) noted that in 1970 the Prime Minister, Edward Heath, talked of the need to control classes of person (such as criminals, scroungers, the unions and marauding youths) by strict laws and heavy handed enforcement of order to deliver a crime free society. Hall *et al.* (1978) famously referred to this as the forming of 'folk devils'.

In order to obtain the political power to use strict law and order policies it was necessary to have popular backing for such a solution. In order to obtain this backing it was necessary not only to convince the public that these folk devils were bad but also to create a feeling of moral panic associated with them. Here politicians found the press willing conspirators; crimes (especially violent and sexual crimes) sell newspapers. The press could produce stories which fed on and are fed by fear and panic; they could also produce documentaries and dramas on the theme of crime and be sure of an interested audience. The level of press coverage of crime stories has increased from about 10 per cent of stories in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s to about 20 per cent or more in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s (Reiner, 2001) so the press did respond to the call for them to be involved in the dissemination of 'folk devils' and 'moral panics'. Over time new categories have been added and become feared: terrorists, paedophiles, 'subversives', single mothers, the homeless, sex offenders, child molesters, asylum seekers.

As well as this additional level of reporting the type of reporting changed dramatically. This is graphically illustrated by Reiner (2001). He compares reporting of crimes in 1945 with those in 1989. He reports that in the *Daily Mirror* on 19 January 1945 there is a two-page spread concerning a killing by a couple. The two-page spread carries many photographs and banner headlines but he is struck by what is absent: '... no account of the details of the murder itself, of the injuries suffered by the victim, or any fear he might have suffered'. On 27 February 1945 this paper reported on a case of child abuse. It carried her photo and detailed her injuries but in a very matter of fact way. The story then focused on the problems suffered by the offender and reasons for trying to understand him. Reiner then contrasts these against a story in *The Times* on 25 November 1989 where a girl was attacked and killed by her mother's boyfriend (there are pictures of all three). It details the girl's injuries and states that she '... died from a combination of pain, shock and exhaustion after a vengeful beating'. Reiner states that 'The story graphically details the

fear and suffering of the girl, and undermines any excuse of “bad temper” offered on behalf of the accused.’ He is made fully responsible for her death, the only other ‘baddies’ are the social services who failed to intervene. Reiner concludes:

These stories illustrate vividly the changes implied by the statistical data. Crime stories fifty years ago took for granted that crime was wrong independently of whether suffering was inflicted on sympathetic victims. The burden of the story was to make the perpetrator comprehensible, often thereby invoking a degree of compassion on their behalf. This fitted well with the rehabilitative conception of the purpose of punishment that was explicitly argued for in many stories... After the mid-1970s crime was increasingly presented as a widespread menace threatening everyone, and stories became increasingly victim-centred. Offenders became demonised as dangerous predators whose vicious actions called for harsh but justified retribution on behalf of the vulnerable innocents they savaged.

This clearly illustrates a very marked change in press coverage of crimes over time and illustrates the way in which the press willingly played their part in the creation of a moral panic over certain groups and over certain activities. The ‘spin’ in the media and for politicians changed dramatically. This use of the press has at times led to the press leading government and police on law and order. So there are aspects of law which have grown wholly out of media hype: press reports concerning dogs attacking humans, particularly the young and elderly culminated in the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991, following which reports of attacks subsided as if the law had solved the problem; reports on new age travellers and the problems and ills they caused was a large factor in the laws to control this way of life (in the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994); dislike of fines which really caused the middle classes to consider their behaviour were attacked so causing the unit fine system introduced in the Criminal Justice Act of 1991 to be withdrawn again in 1993 after just nine months in operation.

However, where it suits their political objectives, those in power have fed the media with constructions of ‘folk devils’ or ‘moral panics’ and so helped to lead public opinion. As Hall (1980) states:

By... first informing public opinion; then, disingenuously, consulting it, the tendency to ‘reach for the Law’, above, is complemented by a popular demand to be governed more strictly, from below. Thereby, the drift towards law and order, above, secures a degree of popular support and legitimacy amongst the powerless, who see no other alternative. (1980: 4)

Paedophilia and terrorism have seen both these scenarios. Importantly both are reported as wholly unacceptable and yet within each there is an element of sleight of hand. In the UK reporting on the activities of paedophiles can be dated from the 1970s which was in fact when the word ‘paedophile’ first began to be included in popular or standard dictionaries. It came to media interest because of the campaigning of some paedophiles fighting for their ‘right’ to enjoy sexual relations with children which encouraged a counter-campaign and brought the activity to the attention of the media. Here one can see the beginnings of both a ‘moral panic’ involving the attack on the innocence of the nation’s children and paedophiles as a ‘folk devil’—a separate group of people believed to be different

from 'normal' people and who posed grave dangers for children and for society in general. Since that time paedophiles have periodically been the centre of media reports (see Williams, 2003) but the present moral panic surrounding them began in 1996 with a major Belgian case involving Marc Dutroux who predated on numerous children. Following this were a number of revelations of paedophilia in children's homes and then the abduction, *rape and killing* of Sarah Payne in 2000. The *News of the World* (23 July 2000) used this event to launch a campaign calling for child sex offenders to be locked up for life. As part of their campaign they published photographs and information concerning 49 paedophiles and threatened to publish a list of 100,000 others, this led to vigilante action against many of those depicted and even to attacks on paediatricians as people were unsure of the difference between them and paedophiles. Many other papers and organisations such as the Association of Chief Police Officers attacked their campaign as being counter-productive. However, the government, in response to the clear public outrage, published proposals to toughen sentences for certain child sex offences. Later the *News of the World* (30 July 2000) began a second campaign calling for parents to be informed of a sex offender in their area and for life to mean life—this was dubbed the call for 'Sarah's Law' to mimic laws already available in most states in the US (called Megan's Laws). Paedophiles are now one of the most reviled and feared 'folk devils'. However, largely as a result of these media campaigns most people view paedophiles as predatory criminals whereas most sexual abuse of children is committed by members of the family or close friends.

Before moving to look at terrorism it is possibly instructive to look at the destructive side of our fascination with paedophilia, Adler (2001a) and (2001b) argues that having laws and a strong societal condemnation of an activity increases the desire to perform the act and so puts children at greater risk. She also argues (2001a) and (2001b) that having the law, and presumably the media focused on the sexualisation of children leads to children being socially constructed as sexual, more people see the sexual potential in the child and therefore more may be drawn to act. Certainly the vast increase in viewing of child pornography since it was made available via the web suggests there may be something in this—people desire children and feel released to enjoy that desire through the feeling of anonymity and safety of their own computer. Children as objects of sex are on the increase not just in law or in the discussion of paedophilia but also more generally in society. The viewing of children as possible sex objects can be seen from the banning of cameras in some school activities such as nativity plays and sports days (Silverman, 2002). But more worrying is the fact that the market economy is busy enticing ever younger children into more sexually explicit clothing. Young children, especially girls, are being enticed by advertisers to become sensation seekers, to dress in erotic and sexual ways. They are being used by advertisers to sell products, often in sensual and even sexual ways (see the Calvin Klein advertisements that were withdrawn in 1995). Society has a very schizophrenic approach to this whole area: on the one hand we are being encouraged to protect children from the potential abuse of others' erotic fantasies (the 'beasts' that are paedophiles); on the other, as a society we are encouraging our children to aspire to a sexual persona and to become sensation seekers from a very young age. Both sides having been promoted by the media.

A similar dichotomy is evident in the media approach to terrorism (the general topic of terrorism is more fully treated in Chapter Nineteen). In the UK terrorists have long been ‘folk devils’ but until recently terrorists were Irish or only operated outside the UK. Since 11 September 2001 this view has altered. In the US until 11 September 2001 paedophiles were the most reviled group in the US. The attacks in New York on 11 September 2001 and in London on 7 July 2005 led to media calls for the State to protect us more carefully and suggested that the State should have done more so governments launched a ‘war on terrorism’ and, particularly in the US, took powers to the State, removing rights from citizens, which would have been inconceivable before that date (see Chapter Nineteen). In particular the acceptance of the limbo for prisoners in Guantanamo Bay was aided by the muted condemnation of the total removal of their rights and unclear status. The press help to build a moral panic and fear such that rights can be eroded and some might say States move closer to tyrannical actions.

The natural outrage against the terrorist attacks should not obscure the likelihood that some of the perpetrators find their motivation in their reaction to what they perceive as Western oppression or injustice. If this does not justify the attacks it might help to explain them. It can also be plausibly argued that many Western States have backed tyrannical regimes or terrorist groups if it served their political interests. Yet the press fail to draw this to the attention of the public, the assumption is always that democratic regimes are clean and not associated with terrorism; ‘we’ are good and ‘they’ are bad.

More important in media terms is the fact that publicity is the lifeblood of terrorism. Terrorists want their message to be disseminated and their attacks may be designed to ensure that they receive maximum coverage. The media can, to some extent, determine who will be included in the category of terrorist. Thus in the USA the anti-abortion fighters who used terrorist tactics were until the early 1990s, generally condemned, but were not labelled as terrorists. Since the early 1990s their activities have been classed as terrorism. More generally the media can decide whether to treat particular acts of violence (by the State, by ‘freedom fighters’ etc) as examples of terrorism. Such decisions usually embody a value judgement and depend on which side of a conflict the media (or particular sectors of it) sympathises with—this can be seen clearly in relation to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict and in the media coverage of the activities during the Arab Spring of 2011.

These brief examples suggest that to debate and discuss crime or its solution in a setting of fear and moral panic is likely to have negative consequences and is unlikely to provide intelligent and well-balanced solutions. The media offers a disservice to society whenever it over-sensationalises its coverage of many common crimes and when it ignores or underplays the problems as is the case with white-collar and corporate crime. What is necessary to a healthy and safer society is more balanced reporting and dissemination of information and ideas about crime and its solutions.

SUGGESTED READING

- Beckett, K. and Sasson, T. (2000), *The Politics of Injustice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
Cohen, S. (2002), *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, 3rd edn, London: Routledge.

Is this continuous text with previous one?

- Criminal Justice Matters*, vol 43, 'Crime and the Media'.
- Croall, H. (2001), *Understanding White-Collar Crime*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Jewkes, Y. (2004), *Media and Crime*, London: Sage.
- Leishman, F. and Mason, P. (2003), *Policing and the Media: Facts, Fictions and Factions*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Mawby, R. C. (2002), *Policing Images: Policing, Communication and Legitimacy*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Reiner, R. (2007), 'Media-Made Criminality', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slapper, G. and Tombs, S. (1999), *Corporate Crime*, Harlow: Longman.
- Stensen, K. and Sullivan, R. (eds) (2000), *Crime, Risk and Justice*, Part III, Cullompton: Willan.

QUESTIONS

- 1 Are public perceptions of crime mostly derived from the media?
- 2 What are the main deficiencies of media coverage of crime?
- 3 What significant areas of crime are generally little covered by the media? Why and with what consequences?

USEFUL WEBSITES

General media site:

<http://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/>.

Sites for white-collar or corporate crime:

Government websites include the Serious Fraud Office <http://www.sfo.gov.uk/>.

The Health and Safety Executive and Commission share a website: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/>.

The official statistics for 2009–10 are at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/overall/hssh0910.pdf>.

The Corporate Accountability website is a good source of factual (including statistics) and other information concerning corporate crime; it is a human rights charity and is independent of government: <http://www.corporateaccountability.org/>.

Other good independent sites are: <http://www.corporatewatch.org>, <http://www.paulsjusticepage.com/elite-deviance.htm> and <http://www.ex.ac.uk/~RDavies/arian/scandals/fight.html>.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (2001a), 'The Perverse Law of Child Pornography', *Columbia Law Review*, 209.
- Adler, A. (2001b), 'Inverting the First Amendment', *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 149: 921.
- Allen, J., Livingstone, S. and Reiner, R. (1997), 'The Changing Generic Location of Crime in Film', *Journal of Communication*, 47(4): 1–13.
- Anderson, D. C. (1995), *Crime and the Politics of Hysteria. How the Willie Horton Case Changed American Justice*, New York: Times Books.
- Bauman, Z. (2001), *The Individualized Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beckett, K. and Sasson, T. (2000), *The Politics of Injustice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Box, S. (1983), *Power, Crime and Mystification*, London: Tavistock.

- Braithwaite, J. (1993), 'Transnational Regulation of the Pharmaceutical Industry', in G. Geis and P. Jesilow (eds), *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Periodicals Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (1995), 'Corporate Crime and Republican Criminological Praxis', in F. Pearce and L. Snider (eds), *Corporate Crime*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp 48–72.
- Chadee, D. (2001), 'Fear of Crime and the Media: From Perceptions to Reality', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 43: 10–11.
- Chibnall, S. (1977), *Law and Order News. An Analysis of Crime Reporting in the British Press*, London: Tavistock.
- Cohen, S. (1972), *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, St Albans: Paladin.
- Coleman, C. and Moynihan, J. (1996), *Understanding Crime Data*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Croall, H. (2001), *Understanding White Collar Crime*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Croall, H. (2010), 'Middle-Range Business Crime: Rogue and Respectable Businesses, Family Firms and Entrepreneurs', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Cumberbatch, C. and Beardsworth, A. (1976), 'Criminals, Victims and Mass Communications', in E. Viano (ed), *Crimes, Victims, and Society*, Lexington, KY: DC Heath.
- Doig, A. (2006), *Fraud*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Doig, A. and Levi, M. (2009), 'Inter-Agency Work and UK Public Sector Investigation of Fraud, 1996–2006: Joined Up Rhetoric and Disjointed Reality', *Policing and Society*, 19(3): 199–215.
- Ericson, R. V. (ed) (1995), *Crime and the Media*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Fletcher, G. and Allen, J. (2003), 'Perceptions of and Concern About Crime in England and Wales', in J. Simmons and T. Dodd (eds), *Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003*, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/03, London: Home Office. Available at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hosb703.pdf>.
- Garland, D. (2000), 'The Culture of High Crime Societies', *British Journal of Criminology*, 40: 347–75.
- Gillespie, M. and McLaughlin, E. (2002), 'Media and the Shaping of Public Attitudes', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 49: 8–9 and 23.
- Greer, C. (2003), *Sex, Crime and the Media*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Greer, C. (2007), 'News Media, Victims and Crime', in P. Francis Davies and C. Greer (eds), *Victims, Crime and Society*, London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1980), *Drifting into a Law and Order Society*, London: Cobden Trust.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B. (1978), *Policing the Crisis*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Harris, J. and Grace, S. (1999), *A Question of Evidence?: Investigating and Prosecuting Rape in the 1990s*, Home Office Research Study 196, A Research, Development and Statistics Directorate Report, London: Home Office. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/hors196.pdf>.
- Health and Safety Executive (1997a), *Health and Safety Commission Annual Report (1996/97)*, London: Health and Safety Executive.
- Health and Safety Executive (1997b), *Workplace Injuries in Small and Large Manufacturing Workplaces 1994/5–1995/96 Statistical Tables*, London: Health and Safety Executive.
- Health and Safety Offences and Penalties 2000–2001*, London: Health and Safety Executive.

- Home Office (2000), *Reforming the Law on Involuntary Manslaughter: the Government's Proposals*, London: Home Office.
- Hope T. and Sparks, R. (eds) (2000), *Crime, Risk and Insecurity*, London: Routledge.
- Hough, M. (2002), 'Populism and Punitive Penal Policy', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 49: 4–5.
- Jewkes, Y. (2004), *Media and Crime*, London: Sage.
- Julian, R. F. (2007), 'Judicial Perspectives on the Conduct of Serious Fraud Trials', *Criminal Law Review* (October): 751–68.
- Koch, B. (1998), *The Politics of Crime Prevention*, Aldershot; Ashgate.
- Law Commission (1996), No 237, 'Legislating the Criminal Code: Involuntary Manslaughter', Part V.
- Lawrence, R. G. (2000), *The Politics of Force: Mass Media and the Construction of Police Brutality*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Levi, M. (2010) 'Credit Fraud', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Mackenzie, S. (2010a), 'Fakes', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Mackenzie, S. (2010b), 'Scams', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Minkes, J. (2010), 'Corporate Financial Crimes', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Mirrlees-Black, C. (2001), *Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey*, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, Research Findings No 137, London: Home Office. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/r137.pdf>.
- Nelken, D. (ed) (1994), *White-collar Crime*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Nelken, D. (2002), 'White-Collar Crime', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 3rd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Occupational Safety and Health Report (1987), *Annual Statistical Report*, London: HMSO.
- Press Council Report (1977), London: Press Council.
- Prime, J., White, S., Liriano, S. and Patel, K. (2001), 'Criminal careers of those born between 1953 and 1978', Home Office Statistical Bulletin 04/01, London: Home Office. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/r137.pdf>.
- Punch, M. (1995), *Dirty Business: Exploring Corporate Misconduct*, London: Sage.
- Reiner, R. (2001), 'The Rise of Virtual Vigilantism: Crime Reporting Since World War II', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 43: 4–5.
- Reiner, R. (2007), 'Media-Made Criminality', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reiner, R., Livingstone, S. and Allen, J. (2001), 'Casino Culture: Media, and Crime in a Winner-loser Society', in K. Stenson and R. R. Sullivan (eds), *Crime, Risk and Justice*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Rochier, R. (1973), 'The Selection of Crime News by the Press', in S. Cohen and J. Young (eds), *The Manufacture of News*, London: Constable.
- Schlesinger, P. and Tumber, H. (1994), *Reporting Crime: The Media Politics of Criminal Justice*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schlesinger, P., Tumber, H. and Murdock, G. (1995), 'The Politics of Crime and Criminal Justice', in R. Ericson (ed), *Crime and the Media*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Semmens, N. (2010), 'Identity Theft and Fraud', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.

- Silverman, J. (2002), 'Is this a Pornographic Photograph?', *Guardian*, 18 December.
- Simmons, J. (2002), *Crime in England and Wales 2001/2002*, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/02, London: Home Office. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110220105210/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hosb702.pdf>.
- Slapper, G. and Tombs, S. (1999), *Corporate Crime*, London: Longman.
- Smith, S. (1984), 'Crime in the News', *British Journal of Criminology*, 24: 289.
- Soothill, K. and Walby, S. (1991), *Sex Crime in the News*, London: Routledge.
- Sparks, R. (1992), *Television and the Drama of Crime: Moral Tales and the Place of Crime in Public Life*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Stewart, H. (2003), 'Deal Reached over Cheap Drugs', *Guardian*, 1 September.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1940), 'White-Collar Criminality', *American Sociological Review*, 5: 1–12.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1949), *White Collar Crime*, New York: Dryden Press.
- Tombs, S. (2010), 'Corporate Violence and Harm', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2001), 'Reporting Corporate Crime Out of Existence', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 43: 22.
- Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2003), *Unmasking The Crimes of the Powerful*, London: Peter Lang.
- Walters, R. (2010), 'Eco-Crime and Air Pollution', in F. Brookman, M. Maguire, H. Pierpoint and T. Bennett (eds), *Handbook on Crime*, Cullompton: Willan.
- West Midlands Health and Safety Advice Centre (1994), see Bergman.
- Williams, K. S. (2003), 'Child Pornography and Regulation of the Internet in the United Kingdom: The Impact on Fundamental Rights and International Relations', *Brandeis Law Review*, 41: 463–505.
- Williams, K. S. (2004), 'Child Pornography: Does it Protect Children?', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 26(3): 245–61.
- Wooler, S. (2006), *Review of the Investigation and Criminal Proceedings relating to the Jubilee Line Case*, CPS, London: HMSO.
- Work Hazards Group (1987), *Death at work*, London: WEA.