it should be one from which the bully can feel that he has been treated fairly, understands why he has been spoken to, and is clear about what aspects of his behaviour he needs to improve.

The victim of bullying also needs to be confronted to examine why the incident occurred, confirm to him that he did the right thing by telling staff, and look at ways in which he can avoid a repetition of this form of incident. It may be that assertiveness training will help. It could be that by giving him knowledge, or by identifying and changing certain behaviours, the risks of him being subject to further bullying could be dramatically reduced.

Results

As a result of the anti-bullying initiatives we have implemented, prisoners believe that they are unlikely to come to any harm. In a recent survey which questioned 50 per cent of the prisoners at Lancaster Farms, 18 per cent said they had been bullied, but the bullying generally took the form of name calling, threats and spreading rumours; 83 per cent of respondents said there was less bullying at this prison than at others they had been in and 92 per cent said they felt safe.

Staff morale is high, and relationships based on trust and respect between prisoners and officers are the norm. Of the 27 prisoners who reported having been bullied, 20 said they had spoken to an Officer about it. The working environment is positive and one that is conducive to job fulfilment and innovation.

From the prison management's perspective, anti-bullying assists in ensuring that operation costs are reduced, sickness rates are low, damage and vandalism to property is minimal, and as a consequence of the strategy there is no requirement to regularly segregate prisoners.

Conclusion

Anti-bullying has proved at Lancaster Farms, to be a very effective tool in creating an establishment which offers a safe and positive environment for both staff and prisoners and one which provides the opportunity to use to the maximum the resources that are available. Although our policy is still far from perfect, the experience to date suggests that the implementation and operation of a focused and structured anti-bullying strategy can have a significant effect on the well-being and operational success of a prison establishment ■

CHRONIC VICTIMS

HOW MANY AND HOW TO HELP

Sylvia Chenery
Ken Pease
University of Manchester

Crime victimisation is massively concentrated on particular individuals in particular places. 44 per cent of property crime is suffered by 3 per cent of households, and 70 per cent of violent crime is suffered by 2 per cent of people (Ellingworth et al., forthcoming). The major contributing factors to one's crime risks are the area in which one lives, the lifestyle that one adopts, and one's recent victimisation experience.

No-one will need much persuading about the area and lifestyle contributions to crime risks, although their relative importance is politically contentious. Area differences in rates of crime are huge. For instance, Trickett et al. (1992) showed that the 10 per cent of British Crime Survey sampling points which suffered the most crime suffered over thirty times the level of crime as the 10 per cent least victimised areas. More recent work (Osborn et al. 1993, Trickett et al. in press) has clarified how lifestyle and area interact. The complex statistical work reported by the Trickett team invites scepticism from the uninitiated. However, the conclusions make such good sense with hindsight that perhaps the

scepticism can be dispensed with. For instance, the highest risks of property crime against dwellings is suffered by better stocked houses in the worst areas! This neatly illustrates the way in which lifestyle and area factors interact to generate an individual's crime risks.

A Victim is a Victim

Area and lifestyle are enough to produce huge differences between individuals in their likelihood of repeatedly falling victim to crime. The third factor is perhaps the most overlooked. That is the way in which victimisation feeds upon victimisation. Most of the work on this topic has been funded by the Police Research Group of the Home Office, because of its obvious crime prevention implications (see National Board for Crime Prevention 1994).

The 1992 British Crime Survey showed how many people were repeatedly victimised - far more than one would expect if crimes were independent events. Other work (Polvi et al. 1991, Farrell and Pease 1993) show that the risk of victimisation is greatest immediately after being victimised. We must therefore put the fact of falling victim to crime alongside area and lifestyle as a determinant of future victimisation. For some offences, the reasons for this are obvious. Domestic violence will recur during the days or weeks when the violent person's state of mind persists, or for the days or weeks when he presumes there is a justification. For other offences, the reasons are less transparent. Burglary may repeat itself when the burglar can't carry everything he wants to take, when he needs to establish a market for some items left in the place burgled, or when he forgets something (for instance the remote control unit for a television, in one recent instance we encountered). The burglar's second and third visits to a house will be easier in that exit points and house layout are known. There is a risk 'bulge' four months after a domestic burglary, which has been observed as far apart as Saskatoon and Huddersfield. We think it is the canny burglar waiting for even the tardiest insurer to have paid out for replacement goods to steal.

The Implications

What are the implications of all this? The key is that, if you want to know to whom and when a crime is going to occur, look at where, when and to whom it happened last. The future victim is the person who shares the area of residence, lifestyle and victimisation experience of the past victim. A common future victim is the past victim! There are many practical reasons why the truth of this has not been recognised. First, many crimes do not come to official notice. Even in victimisation surveys which overcome this obstacle, there are subtle biases against recognising the extent of repeat victimisation (see Farrell and Pease 1993). That said, the team responsible for the 1992 British Crime Survey has taken enormous strides towards the recognition of the scale of multiple victimisation (see Mayhew et al. 1993). Even when crimes are reported to the police, the particular officers responding differ. Because of shift work, holidays, special training, illness, policing soccer matches and the like, officers do not enjoy the continuity of practice which they need to recognise the extent of repeat victimisation. Can their computer systems not help them to do this? In principle, they can. However it has been our experience that the present generation of police crime information systems are particularly bad at the identification of repeats. We have spent enough time having to resort to manual records to say that with feeling. One of the problems is misspelling. A burglary at the Belle Vue Pub will not be recognised as a repeat of one at the Belle Vue Arms, the Belle Vue Hotel, the Bellevue Pub, the Belevue Pub, the Belle View or any other variation on the spelling of the hostelry in question.

If we knew which crimes were repeats, we would have a defensible police performance indicator. It is not fair to assess the police on the rate of crime or of crime clearance. The rate of **repeats** would have the virtue of focussing on prevention of crime in the places and to the people most likely to fall victim, and with whom the police already have potential crime preventive dealings as a result of prior victimisation. We already know that the higher an area's crime rate, the higher the proportion of crime which are repeats. Trying to prevent repeats would **automatically** direct attention to the most crime prone areas. There are many other virtues of the prevention of repeats as a general crime prevention strategy. For example, it brings together crime prevention and victim support, which are revealed as two sides of the same coin once we realise

that those who need support as victims are also those most in need of crime prevention help. To support victims without offering crime prevention help is to set them up for an experience which is the more devastating for coming after reassurance.

Where's the Chronic Victim in Criminal Statistics?

Apart from its virtues as a strategy for crime prevention generally, the phenomenon makes it evident just how offender centred is routine statistical information about crime and justice. One could look through all four volumes of each year's Criminal Statistics without finding any indication about how victimisation is distributed among victims. In contrast, huge swathes of tables describe the progress of offenders through and out of criminal justice. Yet the distribution of victimisation is arguably the most fundamental thing one should want to know about crime. It tells you who is at risk, who should be afraid, who should take precautions. At present, national or force averages provide grossly misleading information for the vast majority of the citizens likely to become aware of them.

What Might Prisons Contribute?

All the above is really information for people generally. What can prisons contribute? We know that the bulk of offences are committed by a smallish minority of offenders. We know that the bulk of offences are committed against a smallish minority of victims. We do not know how these facts interact. It is clear that the same offender is responsible for much repeat victimisation. Domestic violence is an obvious case in point. There is a strong evidence-based suggestion that the same is true for burglary but apparently not for armed robbery. Only when we know how many repeat victims are the prey of the most active offenders will we know how heavy the detection component of a programme to prevent repeats should be. Natalie Polvi, a Canadian colleague and Psychologist in Warkworth Institution, Ontario, was taken hostage while doing the interviews to advance this aspect of our knowledge. Fortunately, she was released unharmed. However, the research has not advanced. The scope is substantial for important prison-based research on which offenders repeatedly target the same victims, how and why.

The other reason why the work is relevant to prisons is that bullying shows the same pattern of repeats as crimes, with a minority of victims chronically suffering. Victimisation in prisons and YOIs will assuredly exhibit the same patterns, with the same need for timely and effective action to prevent the repeats that will form the bulk of the entire problem. The prison is thus potentially a location for crucial research on the linkage between victim and criminal careers and for implementing a strategy of crime prevention through the prevention of repeats ■

References

Ellingworth D., G.Farrell and K.Pease (forthcoming) "A Victim is a Victim is a Victim? Chronic Victimisation in Four Sweeps of the British Crime Survey" submitted to *British Journal of Criminology*

Farrell G. and K. Pease 1993 *Once Bitten. Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimisation and its Implications for Crime Prevention* Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46. London: Home Office.

Mayhew P., N. Aye Maung and C. Mirrlees-Black 1993 *British Crime Survey 1992* Home Office Research Study 132. London: HMSO.

National Board for Crime Prevention 1994 *Wise After the Event: Tackling Repeat Victimisation* London: Home Office.

Osborn D.R., A.Trickett and R.Elder 1992 "Area Characteristics and Regional Variates as Determinants of Area Property Crime Levels". *Journal of Quantitative Criminology 8*, 265-285.

Polvi N., T.Looman, C.Humphries and K.Pease 1990 "Repeat Breakand-Enter Victimisation: Time Course and Crime Prevention Opportunity". *Journal of Police Science and Administration 17*, 8-11.

Trickett A., D.K.Osborn, J.Seymour and K.Pease 1992 "What Is Different about High Crime Areas?" *British Journal of Criminology 32*, 81-90.

Trickett A., D.R.Osborn and D.Ellingworth 1994 "*Property Crime Victimisation: the Roles of Individual and Area Influences*". International Review of Victimology in press.