

Article

R-E-S-P-E-C-T, FIND OUT WHAT IT MEANS TO ME: THE CONNECTION BETWEEN RESPECT AND YOUTH CRIME¹

Peter McCarthy and Janet Walker

Newcastle Centre for Family Studies, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Correspondence: Peter McCarthy, Newcastle Centre for Family Studies, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK

E-mail: ncfs@ncl.ac.uk

Abstract

There is a long tradition of linking antisocial behaviour on the part of young people with a breakdown in respect, and the present government's pronouncements about the causes of youth crime and antisocial behaviour are continuing this tradition. This paper, however, argues that respect is a complex commodity, which is not easy to generate. Young people tend to accept that some of their number are disrespectful of their elders, but argue that they are more likely to show respect if they are accorded it themselves. Self-respect is also crucial. Government strategies are premised on a limited definition of respect and an inadequate understanding of how it is generated. They confuse respect with obedience towards authority and propose to generate respect by asserting control, but there is no evidence that this will lead to those being controlled respecting either the controllers or themselves.

Keywords

respect; antisocial behaviour; young people; adultism; government

Crime Prevention and Community Safety (2006) 8, 17–29.

doi:10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8150007

Respect

There is a long tradition of linking antisocial behaviour on the part of young people with a breakdown in respect. Socrates, for instance, is reputed to have said:



The children now love luxury; they have bad manners, contempt for authority; they show disrespect for elders and love chatter in place of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of their households. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up dainties at the table, cross their legs, and tyrannise their teachers.²

It seems that little has changed. An emphasis on the importance of respect has been prominent in the current UK government's pronouncements about the causes of antisocial behaviour and crime. When he was Home Secretary, David Blunkett MP (2003a) told the House of Commons:

At the heart of antisocial behaviour is a lack of respect for others – the simple belief that one can get away with whatever one can get away with.

Similarly, when he was Secretary of State for Education, the current Home Secretary, Charles Clarke MP, expressed similar concerns about a “lack of respect” in the classroom:

Forty-five per cent of teachers leaving the profession cited behaviour as one of the main reasons for doing so. They are highlighting a lack of respect in too many of our schools. It is time to restore respect for authority to its rightful place (Clarke, 2002).

In focusing on respect in this way, the Labour government was returning to explanations of crime and antisocial behaviour that had been aired by the previous Conservative administration. During a debate in the House of Commons, in 1994, a Conservative MP asserted:

Much of the crime can be traced to the breakdown of respect, which I, and I am sure most hon. Members present, saw happening throughout the 1960s. I noticed a breakdown of respect between men and women and between parents and children, a breakdown of respect for religion, for the elderly and for all forms of authority. Sadly, Western society has abandoned all the traditional constraints upon human behaviour, and we are left only with the criminal law (Stephen, 1994).

One cannot, however, be certain whether there is such a link between respect and crime. Moreover, respect is a complex concept which may imply “a mode of action, a form of treatment, a motive, an attitude, a feeling, a mode of valuing, a way of attending to things, a moral principle, a duty, an entitlement, a moral virtue or an epistemic virtue” (Dillon, 2003). Nevertheless, the Prime Minister has suggested it is a “simple notion”:

We know instinctively what it means. Respect for others – their opinions, values and way of life. Respect for neighbours; respect for the community that means caring about others. Respect for property which means not tolerating mindless vandalism, theft and graffiti (Blair, 2002).

Such a definition, however, focuses on respect for others without reference to how one's sense of identity depends on one being accorded respect by others. Following an in-depth attempt at understanding the significance of respect in human relationships, Sennett (2003, p 59) concluded that its meaning is “both socially and psychologically complex”, and that a consequence of this is that “the acts which convey respect – the acts of acknowledging others – are demanding and obscure”.

It might be argued that the pronouncements of Ministers provide a peculiarly one-dimensional view of respect, emphasising how young people ought to have respect for parents, schoolteachers, the police, the law, etc., without reference to how they might be accorded respect. Sennett (2003, p 263) argues that “the nub of the problem we face is how the strong can practice respect towards those destined to remain weak”, indicating that it is difficult to see how young people can be expected to give respect to those in authority unless there is an element of reciprocity. For instance, young people attending a youth summit in Scotland (Scottish Executive, 2000) agreed that some of their peers are disrespectful of the police, but pointed out that respect works two ways, and that if the police respected young people young people would respect the police. Grayling (2000) takes this position further by introducing the concept of self-respect. In his view,

one cannot hope to be respected by others unless one respects oneself ... if one lacks self-respect one cannot properly respect others ... because respecting others matters, and because one's respect is worth little to them unless it is based on self-respect.

Bell (1995), however, has argued that it is difficult for young people to develop such self-respect in a culture dominated by “adulthood”, the essence of which is “disrespect for the young”:

Our society, for the most part, considers young people to be less important than and inferior to adults. It does not take young people seriously and does not include them as decision makers in the broader life of their communities (p. 1).

The campaigning group Advocacy for Youth is attempting to address this issue, and has argued:

Youth deserve respect. Today, young people are largely perceived as part of the problem. Valuing young people means they are part of the solution and are included in developing programs and policies that affect their well-being (Advocacy for Youth, 2004).

Young people are often disrespected, mistreated, distrusted or ignored simply because they are not adults. Although most of them grow up without causing problems and become law-abiding adults, considerable effort goes into observing and auditing their behaviour, identifying those who are most likely to offend, and “naming and shaming” those accused of antisocial behaviour. This is apt to make young people feel that they are regarded as dangerous simply because of their youth. Indeed, it seems that the police receive thousands of 999 calls about young people who are doing nothing wrong at all, leading the Association of Chief Police Officers to describe the “demonization of young people” as a “national problem”.³ A discussion forum set up on the BBC website in response to this assertion drew responses from young people such as the following:

Too often people are willing to put the blame onto youths. There are youths who are trouble makers, who indeed drink and take drugs and generally cause trouble. But then there are young, middle aged and older adults who do this too. Being a 17-year-old, I often find it quite discomfoting the looks you get when walking down the road for example, because many people do think you're up to no good. I suppose it's just a stereotype people have of teenagers, but it's not really fair at all.

Respect and social exclusion

Sennett (2003, p 261) suggests that there are three important codes of respect in modern society – “make something of yourself, take care of yourself and help others” – but contends that these codes are tarnished by the existence of social inequalities. The Government has attempted to address such inequalities by providing various initiatives in geographic areas, which social indicators suggest are deprived. Some of these, such as Sure Start, Neighbourhood Nurseries, Early Excellence Centres and the Children’s Fund, have specifically aimed to influence the positive development of children. In November 2002, the Government made it clear that this meant addressing concerns about negative behaviours by ordaining that each local authority should dedicate 25 per cent of its Children’s Fund allocation to crime reduction activities carried out in collaboration with Youth Offending Teams (Children and Young People’s Unit and the Youth Justice Board, 2002). This has led to initiatives such as Youth Inclusion and Support Panels and Junior Youth Inclusion Programmes, which aim to reduce youth crime through early interventions in the lives of young

people identified as being at risk of becoming young offenders. Decisions concerning which children and families to target are made through identifying the presence of factors that research has indicated are related to the risk of offending behaviour (Communities That Care, 2005). This approach, which has been contested (Armstrong, 2004), stands the idea of welfare provision on its head. Whereas welfare support is normally allocated to people and families seeking help, early intervention programmes require the people operating them to identify need via some form of risk assessment. Thus, help is not sought but given, because someone outside the family decides it is needed, not necessarily for the benefit of the targeted young person or their family, but for the protection of others – although it is possible that children and families will benefit from the resulting interventions. In this context, it seems appropriate to ask two key questions:

1. How do young people and their families feel when they are informed that they are in some way deficient and subjected to such procedures?
2. How can they feel respect for themselves in such circumstances?

It is important to acknowledge that social exclusion affects the dynamics of respect within and towards communities. As Young (2001) suggests, marginality was once viewed as “a problem of isolated individuals”, but emphasis on social exclusion makes it a “collective phenomenon”, which relates more to the “dangerous classes of Victorian times” than to the “dysfunctional families of the Welfare State of the fifties and sixties”. In the UK, many communities are excluded because of rapid changes in the labour market, the decline of manufacturing industries and the creation of structural unemployment. These events constitute a history experienced and remembered by people living in excluded communities, which inevitably affects the degree to which they feel respect for the system. The former coal-mining communities are a good example of this. As Kevan Jones MP told the House of Commons (Jones, 2003), these communities are crippled by “drugs, antisocial behaviour, crime and physical deterioration” owing to pit closures, which a year-long miners’ strike failed to prevent. Local memories of the long and uneven struggle against the state, and heavy-handed policing, render it virtually impossible to engender respect for state institutions, particularly the police.

Sennett (2003, pp 172–173) observes how people seeking state help are apt to “complain of being treated with a lack of respect” even when they “prove themselves truly in need and worthy of help”:

Screening interviews or diagnostic profiles try to get behind the pretences or silences which constitute people’s public masks in order to know, if they really need help, what help they need. In my generation, the emphasis was on finding people in need, but soon this gave way to a more adversarial relationship; as the country became richer, suspicion of those who remained poor increased.

The idea of an “adversarial relationship” is particularly important in the realm of youth justice, which is currently dominated by a risk and resilience paradigm. Early intervention programmes currently make extensive use of the ONSET instrument (Youth Justice Board, 2005), which assists practitioners to identify those factors in a young person’s life that put them at risk of becoming an offender. Risk assessment that has moved beyond *health-related* concerns about which children are most likely to be harmed to *crime-related* concerns about which children are most likely to do harm to others is clearly adversarial. Moreover, dealing with community problems through the provision of services, and an associated influx of professional problem solvers, may have negative connotations and lead to the further disempowerment of and diminishing self-respect among people living in these communities.

When he was Home Secretary, David Blunkett acknowledged the need to empower residents:

We must aim to build strong, empowered and active communities, in which people increasingly do things for themselves and the state acts to facilitate, support and enable citizens to lead self-determined, fulfilled lives (Blunkett, 2003b).

The rhetoric is admirable, yet it is rarely translated into policy and practice, which truly empowers vulnerable families. Crawford (1999) has suggested that local people tend to be deliberately excluded from decision-making processes because they are not considered to have sufficient expertise and ability to grasp the technical language in which debate is couched. He relates how a member of one crime reduction project described professionals as “people with the capacity to do things”, and the community as being “there to have things done for them” (*ibid.*, p 173). McKnight (1995) argued that weak communities are made ever more impotent by strong service systems that create dependency, inevitably destroy feelings of community and remove the self-respect that people achieve when they do things for themselves:

Services that are heavily focused on deficiency tend to be pathways out of community and into the exclusion of serviced life. We need a rigorous examination of public investments so that we can distinguish between services that lead people out of community and into dependency and those activities that support people in community life (*ibid.*, p 123).

This is an important issue, given that a Neighbourhood Renewal Unit study (Stewart *et al*, 2002, p 77) found a widespread perception within the community and voluntary sector agencies that the “proliferation of initiatives or zones” was “driven by narrow departmental concerns” and that they were “controlled by professionals”, leading to the “fragmentation of community

involvement” and obstruction of “the development of a holistic vision for the neighbourhoods involved”. A citizenship survey commissioned by the Home Office (2004) found that the proportion of people who felt they could influence decisions in their local community fell from 43 per cent to 38 per cent between 2001 and 2003.

Respect and the family

The Government has recently indicated its intention of developing a “culture of respect” by targeting parents who are deemed inadequate. The Prime Minister (Blair, 2005b) has suggested that rowdy and disrespectful behaviour is often caused by “the way that parents regard their responsibility to their children ... the way that some kids grow up generation to generation without proper parenting, without a proper sense of discipline within the family”. The solution to this will apparently involve referring some parents to Parenting Support programmes, although there is little evidence that such programmes lead to lasting improvement in the quality of parenting or to young people becoming more respectful of parental authority. Ghate and Ramella’s (2002) evaluation of the Parenting Support programme indicated positive change in parental attitudes, but, as the authors pointed out, there were no observations of parent–child interactions and parents were not followed up after completing the programme. There was, therefore, no way of knowing whether improvements had been maintained or whether changed attitudes to parenting had actually led to better parenting, and it was unclear “whether the Programme had a positive impact on young people” (*ibid.*, p 78).

The relationship between what parents do and what children do was one of the elements we attempted to understand in a study of prisoners and their families. In that research, which was part of an ESRC network entitled *Pathways Into and Out of Crime: Risk, Resilience and Diversity*,⁴ we were attempting to understand how having a parent who has served a prison sentence affects the prospects of a young person becoming involved in criminal or antisocial activities. The research involved a survey held in eight prison establishments, along with pre- and post-release interviews with 21 prisoners. At the time of the post-release interviews, we also interviewed 38 children aged 8–17 and 23 people who had cared for them during their parent’s prison sentence. We had not given much attention to the issue of respect when we embarked on our research, but it proved to be an important dimension in the relationships between released prisoners and their families. The comments of interviewees demonstrated how respect needs to be earned, and how it can be easily lost, even when the ties between people are close. Vicki,⁵ a 22-year-old who had been addicted to heroin since the age of fifteen, felt that lack of respect for parents was the main cause of young people becoming involved in criminal behaviour. She recalled:

Years ago, you used to do as your parents told you. Now you don't, do you? Everything has changed, hasn't it? There's no, like, respect no more. If you respect someone you're not going to behave badly towards them, are you? You respected your elders, didn't you? You don't now. And people go around mugging old women and that. There's no respect there, is there?

The issue of respect for parents was also of particular concern to Simon (aged 14) and his mother Norah, a self-confessed drug addict who had spent time in prison. Simon told us how he had lost respect for his mother because of her behaviour:

... the stuff that I've had to go through with her ... I ran away when I was eight—came and lived up here [with his grandmother] – because she just couldn't bring me up properly. She was doing my head in, and because of that, she still hasn't earned my respect. So I don't have enough love for her to be bothered with her properly. As soon as she earns my respect back, then it will be fine, but she doesn't look as though she's making a very good effort ... I love her, but it's just the respect which I think I'm more bothered about.

Simon's mother, who had lived a crime-free life before starting heroin use in her late 20s, also suggested that respect is important, despite not seeming to recognise that her behaviour had led to her son losing respect for her. She told us that “peer pressure” is the most significant cause of young people getting into trouble and explained this as follows:

They just want somebody to look up to and, I don't know, the more somebody respects them and likes them and whatever, the more they ... because the kids these days, there's no respect for their elders with a lot of them, which really pisses me off, it really does. I mean that's something I've always – we've always – tried to drum into Simon, respect for his elders. It's something that I've always believed in and always been brought up to. It doesn't matter whether they're a year older or whether they're ninety years older than you, at the end of the day. And I think that's what a lot of it is with Simon, is just wanting respect off his elders, but he doesn't always give it. And he will do anything that he thinks right to get that.

Whereas Simon made it clear that he no longer respected his mother because of the way she had behaved, his mother suggested that his withholding of respect towards her was due to him not being respected himself. Norah recognized Simon's need for “someone to look up to” – a need she clearly has not fulfilled – but suggested that he did not command the respect of older people because he did not respect them. She wanted to command Simon's respect, and identified a connection between offering respect and receiving

it, but was attempting to gain Simon's respect by exercising control over him – "telling Simon the right from the wrong". However, Simon's unwillingness to accord respect to his mother related to his perception that she was failing to exercise control over herself. His withholding of respect was apparently further entrenched following his own experiments with drug use. Although he felt his mother had ruined her life and his through drugs, he had "tried cannabis, ecstasy, alcohol and speed" because, as he told us, "I thought that if my mum can do it, I can do it". The experience, however, had taught him that "it is just stupid":

It made me realise how much of a mess my mum is making of her life. That is why I am more annoyed after trying it myself and knowing the effects and stuff, and not liking the effects. But my mum taking drugs ... it's just going to wreck her life, which has annoyed me so much. And she doesn't, like, have any willpower to stop, she doesn't. Well, the way things are going it looks like she doesn't look like she can be bothered to stop. I mean, I know it is the hardest-thing to try and get off, but I've seen people do it before. I've seen her do it before. That's when she really wanted to. And I've told her that if she wants to earn my respect back, she will really have to [stop taking drugs].

The observations of our interviewees demonstrate how the generation of respect requires it to flow freely to and from individuals, and that respect is something that has to be earned. Its continuance requires it to be felt, given and received. If all the channels along which respect travels are operating freely, the individual will have self-respect and enjoy shared respect with their family, peer group, community and the wider society. In such circumstances, resilience is likely to be strong. However, as Sennett (2003) argues, respect is a fragile commodity. If any of the channels along which it travels are blocked, each of the other channels is likely to be unable to transmit respect, leading to a diminution of self-respect, and withdrawal of respect from others, which in turn leads to a withholding of respect and to increased risk. None of this, of course, necessarily affects levels of crime, since respect can be gained through illicit activities. The partner of an offender told us that, while she had been brought up to respect her elders, to "know manners" and to "say please and thank you", it had been different for her partner. She suggested that "where he is from, respect means a completely different sort of thing", where "the badder [*sic*] you are, the more you're respected":

I think it is just how things have changed, and times have changed. Like this "respect" thing – it means something completely different ... Respect when we were younger meant you didn't cheek your elders, and you said "please" and "thank you". Whereas now everybody, even teenagers, youngsters, they're all banging for this respect from people round them. And I think it's just life

now, and how things have changed. I think it's just the world in general, to be honest.

Such remarks indicate that there are different ways of linking respect and crime from those that figure in government discourse. For instance, Anderson (2005) suggests that achieving respect, which he defines as being “treated right” or “granted the “props” one deserves”, is central to a young person’s sense of identity. Where respect cannot be acquired through legitimate means, it becomes more problematic and uncertain, and subject to “intense interpersonal negotiation”. In deprived inner-city environments, where legitimate routes to respect may be blocked, it remains essential to demonstrate that one can take care of oneself and of one’s family. Those who achieve this through illicit activities may gain as much respect as those who achieve it through legal means. Moreover, there is no evidence that increases in crime or antisocial behaviour are caused by a breakdown of respect. Indeed, if respect is breaking down, it may be because people believe that levels of crime and antisocial behaviour are unacceptably high and are perturbed about the inability of state institutions, and of adults living in crime-ridden communities, to do anything about it.

Generating respect

Although the meaning of the term “respect” is somewhat elusive, it relates to a mode of experiencing and acknowledging the intrinsic value or significance of something or somebody. To have respect for someone implies appreciating their intrinsic value or significance, and feeling that one ought to treat them as one would expect to be treated by them. It is an essential element of co-operative relationships. The comments of the prisoners, and their children, who we interviewed indicated the importance of mutual appreciation for the parent–child relationship. Respect of this kind is the foundation of parental authority, but it has to be earned. This seems likely to apply to other kinds of authority – that claimed by schoolteachers and the police, for instance. Young people are willing to accord respect to others – in the sense of recognizing their authority or caring about their feelings – but these others, including state institutions, have to demonstrate that they deserve it.

When we asked prisoners, children and carers about the causes of young people getting into trouble, the most common responses, in each of the categories, related to drugs and peer group influences. Only three interviewees (two prisoners and one carer) suggested that a deficit of respect was a major factor. Nevertheless, it is clear that respect is an important commodity that binds people into productive family, peer group and community relationships. Consequently, government rhetoric concerned with giving “particular priority” to bringing back “a proper sense of respect in our schools, in our communities, in our towns, in our villages” (Blair, 2005a) is likely to have popular appeal.

There are, however, those who see it as a “further attempt to promote the new conformism, where everything from what we eat and drink to what we say and think is subject to official scrutiny” (Bristow, 2005). Others point to inconsistencies in the Prime Minister’s message:

Tony Blair says he wants to restore a culture of respect. Yet in the next breath he implies that respect has disappeared because of deep-seated cultural changes over which he has no control (Phillips, 2005).

It is also evident that the concept of respect is being used narrowly. As the Prime Minister stated in 2003, it refers to the following:

Respect for the law. Respect for property. Respect for the elderly. Respect for the community (Blair, 2003).

Even in this limited sense, it is questionable whether a culture of respect can be developed through coercive measures such as “zero tolerance” towards “low-level disruption in schools” (Kelly, 2005) or through attempts to educate recalcitrant parents through the imposition of Parenting Orders. In practice, it seems that a culture of respect is to be generated by increasing controls, but there is no guarantee that this will result in those being controlled respecting their controllers. It may have the opposite effect, leading to challenges to the legitimacy of the authority being exercised and to disrespect for those attempting to exercise it.

The focus on respect seems a continuation of a pre-delinquency discourse which “pre-empts discussions about unfair social structures, about exploitative adult-child relationships and about irrelevant and unworkable institutions” and restricts the way in which we are able to discuss issues of child and youth welfare, leading to a “risk of engaging in ideological discussions that have, at best, short-term therapeutic benefits and potential long-term disadvantages” (Wotherspoon and Schissel, 2000, p 5). Associating crime and anti-social behaviour with a supposed breakdown in respect moves debate away from issues of social exclusion and, in particular, the extent to which crime rates are particularly high in areas characterized by social and economic deprivation (Smith, 1999). It is also worth recalling that ministers began raising the issue of respect at a time when concerns were being expressed about lack of trust in government. An opinion poll conducted in 2004 found that 69 per cent of UK citizens did not trust the national government – the highest level of distrust in the European Union (Eurobarometer, 2004). Indeed, the chair of the Committee on Standards in Public Life has “accused the Government of being preoccupied with control freakery and blamed it for marginalising ethical standards” (Woolf, 2005). If there has been a breakdown in respect, the fact that levels of trust in government are so low may be a contributory factor.

The challenge facing the Government is how to generate positive energies within communities beset by problems of unemployment, poverty, fragmentation and high levels of crime that will lead to the people living in them developing mutual respect by respecting themselves and each other. The lyrics to the song alluded to in the title of this paper discuss the benefits that would be likely to accrue if only the singer were given respect. According to Werner (2002, p 116), Aretha Franklin's recording of the song "sent an unambiguous message to white America" that "from now on black folk would take care of business in their own way" and "defined the energy of the freedom movement". The message was that black people were moving forward by being positive about themselves, which conveys an important message regarding how respect needs to come from within people rather than being imposed on them from above.

Notes

- 1 From the song *Respect*, written by Otis Redding and recorded by Aretha Franklin.
- 2 Attributed by Plato to Socrates, according to Patty and Johnson (1953, p 277).
- 3 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4067805.stm>
- 4 The interviews were conducted by Graham Williams. For more information about the research and the network, see <http://www.sheff.ac.uk/pathways-into-and-out-of-crime>
- 5 The names of interviewees have been changed in an attempt to prevent identification.

References

- Advocacy for Youth** (2004). *Rights, Respect, Responsibility Campaign* <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/about/campaign.htm>.
- Anderson, E.** (2005). Code of the street is keeping crime alive. *Philadelphia Enquirer* <http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/editorial/11354557.htm>.
- Armstrong, D.** (2004). A Risky Business? Research, Policy, Governmentality and Youth Offending. *Youth Justice* 4 (2), pp 100–115.
- Bell, J.** (1995). *Understanding Adulthood: A Key to Developing Positive Youth–Adult Relationships* <http://www.youthbuild.org/pdfs/adulthood.pdf>.
- Blair, T.** (2002). My vision for Britain. *The Observer*, 10 November.
- Blair, T.** (2003). Speech at the Labour Party's Local Government Conference, Glasgow, 15 February, <http://www.scottishlabour.org.uk/tbiraq>.
- Blair, T.** (2005a). Speech made after returning to Downing Street from Buckingham Palace to start a third term as head of the Labour Government, 2 September, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/vote_2005/frontpage/4522185.stm.
- Blair, T.** (2005b). Speech at the Meridian Community Centre, Watford, <http://www.number10.gov.uk/output/Page8123.asp>.
- Blunkett, D.** (2003a). *Hansard*, 12 March, column 291.
- Blunkett, D.** (2003b). *Civil Renewal: A New Agenda*, the CSV Edith Kahn Memorial Lecture, 11 June. London: Home Office.
- Bristow, J.** (2005). Respect for what? *Spiked*, 19 May, <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CAB4C.htm>.

- Children and Young People's Unit and the Youth Justice Board** (2002). *Use of Children's Fund Partnership Funding for Crime Prevention Activities Jointly Agreed with Youth Offending Teams: Guidance*, November.
- Clarke, C.** (2002). *Discipline in Schools* <http://education.guardian.co.uk/classroom/violence/story/0,12388,858909,00.html>.
- Communities That Care** (2005). *Risk and Protective Factors*. London: Youth Justice Board.
- Crawford, A.** (1999). *The Local Governance of Crime: Appeals to Community and Partnerships*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dillon, R.S.** (2003). Respect In *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/respect>.
- Eurobarometer** (2004). *Public Opinion in the European Union, Spring 2004: National Report, United Kingdom*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Ghate, D. and Ramella, M.** (2002). *Positive Parenting: The National Evaluation of the Youth Justice Board's Parenting Programme*. London: Youth Justice Board.
- Grayling, A.C.** (2000). The last word on respect. *Guardian*, 9 December.
- Home Office** (2004). *2003 Home Office Citizenship Survey: People, Families and Communities*, Home Office Research Study No. 289. London: Home Office.
- Jones, K.** (2003). House of Commons debate. *Hansard*, 26 March, column 101WH.
- Kelly, R.** (2005). *Interview on Breakfast with Frost*, BBC1, 23 January, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4199535.stm.
- McKnight, J.** (1995). *The Careless Society: Community and its Counterfeits*. New York: Basic Books.
- Patty, W.L. and Johnson, L.S.** (1953). *Personality and Adjustment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Phillips, M.** (2005). Respect in the age of degradation. *Daily Mail*, 19 May, <http://www.melaniephillips.com/articles/archives/001211.html>.
- Scottish Executive** (2000). *Report on the Scottish Youth Summit* <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/education/rsys-07.asp>.
- Sennett, R.** (2003). *Respect: The Formation of Character in an Age of Inequality*. London: Allen Lane.
- Smith, G.R.** (1999). *Area Based Initiatives: The Rationale and Options for Area Targeting*, Case Report 25. London: London School of Economics.
- Stephen, M.** (1994). House of Commons debate. *Hansard*, 11 January, column 101.
- Stewart, M. et al.** (2002). *Collaboration and Co-ordination in Area-based Initiatives*. London: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions.
- Werner, C.** (2002). *A Change is Gonna Come: Music, Race and the Soul of AMERICA*. Edinburgh: Canongate.
- Woolf, M.** (2005). Blair accused of failing to restore the public's trust in Government. *The Independent*, 31 August.
- Wotherspoon, T. and Schissel, B.** (2000). *Risky Business? 'At-risk' Designations and Culturally Diverse Schooling*, Paper submitted to the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, <http://www.cmec.ca/stats/pcera/symposium2000/schissel.en.pdf>.
- Young, J.** (2001). *Crime and Social Exclusion* <http://www.malcolmread.co.uk/JockYoung/crime&socialexclusion.htm>.
- Youth Justice Board** (2005). *ONSET* <http://www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk/PractitionersPortal/Assessment/ONSET.htm>.