

CHAPTER 2 CURRENT KNOWLEDGE AND FINDINGS ABOUT JOYRIDING, MOTOR PROJECTS AND MASCULINITIES

In this chapter the small but growing literature on joyriding and on projects designed to deal with joyriding is set out and evaluated. Reference will be made to studies in the US but the main aim is to examine critically the British literature as the 'specificity' of British car culture means that findings from other cultures cannot necessarily reliably inform discussion.¹ For simplicity, it is intended to examine these in a broadly chronological way. As the literature on joyriding is so sparse some of the literature on juvenile crime that touches on joyriding is also examined. Throughout, attention is paid to the normative assumptions about cars, crime and masculinity that inform many of these texts. For this reason theories of crime and masculinity are also introduced before drawing some conclusions. The material on joyriding that exists is discussed at length because of its paucity but the amount of material that this generates means that the literature is discussed rather compartmentally in this chapter. In the next chapter themes are drawn out and literature grouped more thematically.

The overwhelming theme of the literature on car crime is a concern with situational measures. This is particularly true of the research carried out for the Home Office but also informs the work of others. Much of this work uses market research type questions to advise policy makers on situational measures. It is not intended to review this literature except where it illustrates a point.

As might be expected from the centre of criminology and the car industry, most of the early studies of joyriding, autotheft or car crime were carried out in the United States of America. A common theme of much of this work is a concern with the 'class' differences between joyriders and other delinquents. Wattenberg and Balistreri (1952) writing about their 1948 study, noted that the 230 white youths charged with Auto Theft that they studied in Detroit differed from the 2,544 youths charged with other types of offence in that they came from relatively favoured neighbourhoods. This finding was echoed by Gibbens (1958) in Britain but his own version of the 'favoured group' relied on psycho-analytical evaluations. The 'favoured group' theory has been influential in America where Cavan and Ferdinand (1975) found that teenage car thieves fell into a distinctive pattern, generally better adjusted in school, in their families, and with their peers than other types of delinquents. They also noted they are likely to be white, and to come from a higher economic stratum than other delinquents. Similarly Sanders (1976) held that automobile theft is generally committed by white middle class youths in groups of two, or more, largely for kicks. In the same vein Gibbons found:

Juvenile joyriders are usually from middle class, comfortable economic backgrounds. They live in single-family dwellings in middle income areas. Their parents are usually white-collar or other types of workers. (1977:310)

1. Differences in traffic density and road layout - for instance, roundabouts are very rare in USA - and the age for legal driving.

Whilst McCaghy *et al* (1977) specifically set out to question the 'favoured group' theories of the writers mentioned above they share some continuities, implicit and explicit. Explicit is a concern with the social status of car thieves. Also explicit in many of the American studies is the race element. What remains implicit is the meaning of racial differences. For the 'favoured group' theorists - and for McCaghy *et al* - being black in America is to have a non-favoured group status.

McCaghy *et al* review the work of Wattenberg and Balistreri, Cavan and Ferdinand, Sanders, Gibbons and Gibbens. They note the economic and cultural (i.e. bad) influence of the car, quoting from the Lynd's (1929) *Middletown* judge for whom the car is "...a house of prostitution on wheels."² Wattenberg and Balistreri had found 88% of those arrested were white and came from "above average" neighbourhoods. However, McCaghy *et al* found that of 103 arrests in Toledo they studied in 1975/6 55.9% were white and 42.2% black but the population was only 13.8% black. Moreover, whilst the median income level for the area was \$10,500 50% of arrested auto thieves came from areas with income levels less than \$8,000. 43% of cars were recovered in areas with more than 25% black residents. Furthermore in their study records of 14,815 juveniles before the courts of Virginia 1966 to mid 1973 1,239 juveniles were charged with auto theft 46.2% were black and 53.7% white against 13,184 with no auto offences 48.6% black and 51.3% white. These findings lead them to reject the 'favoured group' hypothesis.

In their work they propose a fivefold typology of auto theft: joyriding; short-term transportation; long-term transportation; profit and commission of other crime. They apply this to the Toledo data giving different ages for each classification. Using quotes from earlier work they establish that joyriding is stealing cars "to have a good time" (Schepes, 1961), "striving for status and recognition" (Short and Strodbeck, 1965), "to prove his masculinity" (Gibbens 1958) or to deal with 'oral deprivation' (Noshpitz, 1975). None of this seems surprising given the significance of the car in America, dating customs and popular cinematic representations of the car and adolescent sexuality. The category of joyriding then is: "essentially recreational, non-utilitarian, short-term use of cars", "The car is stolen not for what it does, but for what it *means*" (McCaghy *et al* 1977:378 emphasis added) Fifteen was the average age for joyriding. It was also found that joyriders stole older cars and relied more on the carelessness of drivers than breaking in. They offended in company

McCaghy *et al* had little information on auto-theft as short-term transportation but their police informants suggested that the numbers involved were probably similar to joyriding. The average age for short-term transportation use was 17.4. Like joyriding, short-term use relied on opportunity but they often acted alone and usually did not steal from the car.

Theft for long-term transportation involves the car being retained for personal use. This is unlikely for young people as they would be unable to explain how they came by a car. The average age for this was 23.2. Theft of cars for profit ie the sale of parts or the whole car (retail or wholesale) had the oldest average age at 31.5. Cars were also stolen in connection with other

2. The Lynd's (1929) mention car theft in Muncie, Indiana amongst other things: 154 cars were stolen in 1923.

crimes such as getaway, sexual assault, transport of stolen or illegal goods.

It is clear that there may be some overlap in these categories in theory and in practice. The original intention of auto-thieves may have been just to get home (short term transportation) but picking friends up on the way might have led to some showing off in the car (joyriding). The quality of the stereo might make its theft obvious (profit) and the unexpected availability of a garage might mean the car is kept longer (long-term transportation). It is also clear that fitting known offenders into the scheme is difficult without asking them (or examining full arrest or probation records) as the legal definitions differ markedly from this or any other criminological one.

Some time has been spent on McGaghy *et al* because it sums up much of the early American literature, takes issue with the, then, prevailing hypothesis of middle class or favoured status for car thieves and introduces many of the themes to be found in the British Literature.

Most of the British literature falls into the 'modern era' except Gibbens (1958), mentioned briefly above. There is a growing literature on the particular problems faced in Belfast, N. Ireland. Light *et al* (1993) take the view that "the particular political situation obtaining in W Belfast makes cross-over comparisons difficult" but that "much of the Extern data coincides with that produced by mainland research" (Light *et al* 1993:5).³ This may be so but the Belfast studies are left out of the summaries below for ease of handling the amount of material. They will be examined in discussion of the research problem. It should also be noted that Light *et al* found differences approaching statistical significance for the North East which might put Brigg's (1991) work (Newcastle) and Spencer's (1992) work (Sunderland) in a different light. These differences might be taken to show differences between the car culture of Britain and Northern Ireland, and even within Britain.

It is important to look at Gibbens' (1958) work as it appears to be the earliest British study. It can be placed in the 'favoured status' group of studies that were superseded by the modern era but its undercurrent of Freudian psycho-sexual explanations for car crime reconnect it with a more contemporary concern for other discourses, such as gender.

Like the various Commissioners of the Metropolitan Police quoted in Chapter 1, Gibbens could be speaking today:

The theft of cars, and especially 'taking and driving away without the owner's consent' for the sake of joy-riding, is a crime of the times and perhaps destined to be one of the most important forms of nuisance. (1958:257)

In London at that time 2,474 vehicles were stolen, 1919 recovered and 5,805 taken without consent. The total for England and Wales was 4,414 thefts. He notes though that in 1954 Stockholm had 741.9 'takings' of motor vehicles per 100,000 against London's 85.4 though both

3. The Extern Organisation is a voluntary and charitable organisation based in Northern Ireland concerned with the prevention of crime and the development of community initiatives.

had similar vehicle densities. Again this suggests differences between car cultures but he offers no explanation. Gibbens was more concerned with observable clinical differences between those that took cars and those that did not. In 1953 and 1955 every other 'lad' sentenced to Borstal training from the London area was interviewed, tested and visited at home by a psychiatric social worker. One hundred were seen in each year. In 1953 14% had car convictions but by 1955 25% had. No explanation is attempted for the rise but Briggs (1991) conjectures, and the MPD Commissioner appears to agree that increasing car density might be responsible.

The 39 car thieves were seen to be distinctive in personality and social background. They were more neurotic but no less delinquent.⁴ They came from intact homes, were later members of large families and came to Borstal after previous convictions for which they had received probation, possibly because they came from 'good' homes. He found it "uncommon for severely deprived youths to commit this offence because they tend to establish a pattern of stealing money etc, before puberty gives them the urge to joy-ride." (Gibbens,1958:261) This is the nearest he comes to considerations of class.

Like many others Gibbens attempts a classification; thus of the thirty nine borstal boys he studied: twenty were 'joy-riders'; six were 'joyrider/thieves'; three took cars to abscond and three apparently wanted to learn to drive. In general he concludes that boys from 'good' homes need to prove to their mothers that they are 'bad'. He cites, with approval, Cohen (1955) and his contention that car-stealing is middle-class and related to a revolt against the mother - the giver of discipline in middle-class families. However, Gibbens revisited his study 25 years later and noted that "this quasi-legitimate form of protest against an over-protective mother [...] probably applies more rarely today" (1984: 57)

The late '80s and early '90s were marked by a resurgence of interest in car crime, due to actual increases in car crime but also the increased prominence given to car crime. The substantial contributions of Briggs (1991), Webb and Laycock (1992) Light *et al* (1993) and Spencer (1993) all date from the early 90s as do a growing number of smaller studies, such as Gow and Peggrem (1991), Davies (1993) and Cooper (1989). There are also dissenting voices such as Jefferson (1992) and Jackson (1992).

Briggs aimed to look at joyriding from 'the perspective of the joyriders' and to evaluate the use of motor projects but he does not disguise his concern over their driving and, in presentations of his work his own obsession with cars. His thoughts on joyriding are discussed here; those on motor projects are discussed later. He makes a distinction between 'joyriding' where middle and upper class adolescents may 'borrow' their parents or friends cars, or even use their own, and 'twocking' a working class phenomenon where cars are stolen or 'twocked'. However, throughout his work he uses 'joyriding' and 'twocking' synonymously.

Working in Newcastle Upon Tyne as a social worker Briggs studied 200 males under 17 with a

4. However, their Mannheim and Wilkins prediction scores at 25.76 were not significantly different to the remainder's 26.51.

TWOC history. He mainly asks 'market research' questions - how, why, where, when and who with - that might be used to prevent or deter crime. So we discover the majority (117) used a scaffold bar as the means of entry. They gave 'for excitement' and 'to impress my friends' as the most common reasons for taking cars. Seventy nine percent had planned to steal a car but 63% said they were more interested in the car stereo than the car. Eighty three percent reckoned curbside was easiest place to take cars or goods in cars from and 75% said car parks. Eighty three percent claimed that a car alarm would deter them. They started young: 8.5% started aged 8-12; 28% started at 13; 30% at 14 and 23.5% at 15.

He adapts the typology in McGaghy *et al* (1977) by adding theft from and using the term 'twocking' instead of joyriding or theft. He concludes,

Motor cars are an omnipresent, inescapable feature of contemporary life...they are attractive, available and furthermore, present little problem for the experienced joyrider to obtain and for whom the chances of detection are extremely low" (Briggs 1991:49).

The question then should be why aren't more cars stolen? Similarly the background and antecedents of his sample appear little different from those who chose not commit crime or different crimes.

Webb and Laycock (1992) are mostly concerned with situational measures such as greater perimeter security for cars, the dispersal of the parts of the stereo about the car, immobilising devices and better surveillance of garaging and car parking. They make the intriguing suggestion that in London traffic congestion deters the thief with pleasure rather than profit in mind and that an increased proportion of cars are stolen rather than taken without consent.

Spencer's (1992) work on the Pennywell Estate in Sunderland is particularly interesting as it does not just rely on research solely with known car thieves. The self-report survey of 86 schoolboys showed 24% had been present at a theft of a motor vehicle and 14% admitted theft of. Money was said by respondents to be the major reason for car theft, 80% against 19% for 'excitement' or to 'impress friends' (18%). Interviews at a local youth club with nine 10-15 year olds confirmed these results but revealed fewer willing to admit offending. She concludes that autocrime is, as Downes (1966) identified, a collective 'solution' for the boredom felt by young men.

Spencer is agnostic on whether joyriding leads to other crime and pessimistic about the extent to which diversion from or immersion in the criminal justice system appeared to deter them. This leads to uncontroversial suggestions for: target hardening; increased surveillance; improved leisure facilities; Duke of Edinburgh type schemes; motor projects; and targeting the young. Eight of her respondents suggested providing cars as the answer to car crime. Two suggested blowing up the Estate. A survey showed 69% of the Estate had no access to motor transport.

Light *et al* (1993) aimed to look at car crime 'careers'; to assess offenders perceptions of

sanctions and to examine some situational factors. Many had extensive criminal careers, often without coming to the notice of the police. Many were involved in other crime including other car crimes such as ramraiding, which has much of the thrill of joyriding and a potentially profitable payoff. Initial involvement is acting as look-outs but soon the move is made to driving themselves for the thrill of it. Many quickly realize the potential of stealing from cars. Some also move on to professional theft.

A half considered themselves to be 'specialists'. They had a passion for cars, started taking cars earlier, continued longer and concentrated on car crime. On the other hand 35% had been involved in burglary, 20% ramraiding and 11% 'other thefts'. 60% were currently desisting - a third of them for more than six months - from car crime citing increased maturity not the threat of custodial sentences as the reason. The Aggravated Vehicle Taking Act seemed more likely to have its effect by changing perceptions of the seriousness of joyriding rather than it deterring by the possible penalties. Accidents were no deterrent either.

A distinction is made between joyriding and performance driving - 'hotting' to the media, 'frisking' in the North East - noting that performance driving was more an activity of the young not the 'specialist'. Some, particularly those who saw themselves as professionals criticised joyriders as "making it harder for people like me who make a living out of it". Specialists were no more likely to become professionals.

There is a growing number of smaller studies but these are consonant with the larger studies. Gow and Peggrem (1991) looked at a Barnardos project in Wales whereas Cooper's (1989) concern was with managing juvenile crime, including car theft. Cooper (1989) in a self-report study of juvenile crime in Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire and Essex during 1985-87 found in Manchester that many adolescents had already become involved in burglary at 11-12 years old before becoming involved later in car theft. This appears to contradict the idea of specialism mentioned by other researchers. Cooper (1989) recommends a 'Car Crime Education Group' formed by a casualty nurse, police sergeant and a driving instructor. Overcoming the advertised virtues of cars is recognised to be difficult but a campaign is proposed:

The pervading message in all publicity should be that stealing cars is unfashionable, *unmanly* and unacceptable in their community, particularly to peers." (1989:31 emphasis added)

Gow and Peggrem located young people in Gwent and W and S Glamorgan already on, or recently at, juvenile justice programmes for car theft. Fifty were administered a questionnaire which showed that cars were stolen from car parks between midnight and 6:00 am, mostly on impulse. 'Hot' Escorts, Fiestas and Astras are favoured. Performance of car and ease of theft were criteria used to select the car. They check for alarms but only half are deterred. They break a window or force a door. They learn techniques from friends but about a quarter learnt in custody or care. Asked how they started the car 62% said 'scaffing'.⁵ They steal them for joyriding (70%) but 80% stole valuables or the radio/cassette player from cars they stole or rode in, mostly for

5. Actually a way of getting in and breaking the steering lock rather than starting the car.

resale. Only 34% thought of death and injury as possible consequences of their actions and only 20% thought of the victim. Two thirds had been involved in an accident.

A study of women motor offenders showed West Midlands Probation Service had 95 on their books in 1991 (Davies 1993). Race was not always recorded but where it was 4 were black (4.2%). Thirteen percent of male motor offenders were recorded as black. In total 14 (15%) of the women had been convicted of Taking and Driving Away. This was very similar to the proportion of male offenders (16%). This equality may be the result of taking motor offending as the denominator rather than all recorded offending.

Jackson seeks to "move beneath the official voices mouthing 'Death riders!', 'Young hooligans!', 'evil and wicked people' to investigate the root causes." (1992:18) Jefferson defies:

any (car driving) man reading this to deny he has never got a 'buzz' out of his high-speed driving, undertaking tricky driving manoeuvres involving a high degree of hand-eye co-ordination, overtaking etc (1992:11).

Jackson seeks to try and make sense of joyriding in terms of identity politics and a gendered perspective on men and masculinities and Jefferson finally questions "is criminology 'man' enough to face up to these difficulties?" (1992:12). It is an aim of this thesis to face those difficulties.

Jackson makes a broad sweep of theories associating the 'feminisation' of working class labour and, perhaps idealistically, seeing joyriding as young men seizing symbols of power and authority concluding in an updated version of Gibbens' 'mummy's boy' hypothesis:

In order to become masculine, boys have to wrench themselves away from the merging closeness of the early mother/son contact so that they can build a gender identity as a boy/man." (Jackson 1992:38)

Despite Gibbens' (1958) contention that joyriding was destined to become a most 'important nuisance' studies of it remain rare, though 'classic' studies of juvenile delinquency do mention taking and driving away *en passant*. No consideration is given to joyriding in its own right. It is seen as indexical of delinquency. It is not possible, nor appropriate here, to summarize all the literature on juvenile crime but some classics of the literature are examined in respect of the light they can throw on joyriding. Additionally other related literature on adolescence is set out to the extent that it may offer clues about joyriding.

Two classics of the literature are Cohen's (1955) *Delinquent Boys* and Cloward and Ohlin's (1961) *Delinquency and Opportunity* but both are based upon the specific problems of the United States; for a UK treatment of the same issue Downes' (1966) *The Delinquent Solution* still retains its place as the classic. Finally Parkers' (1974a) *View From the Boys* covers some of the same ground but from an appreciative stance.

The only specific comment that Cohen makes about 'automobile theft' is in a section on middle-class delinquency that Gibbens (1958) expands upon. He accepts the conclusion of Wattenberg and Balistreri (1952) that it is a 'favoured-group' activity, which unusually involved auto-thieves in gang-like activity. On this basis Cohen concludes, "automobile theft was part of a well established subculture" (1955:161).

Cloward and Ohlin, like Cohen, concentrate on working class delinquency but make it clear - but only in a footnote:

We do not wish to suggest that delinquent subcultures never arise in the middle class. Evidence is accumulating that they do exist but that they are organised principally for relatively petty delinquencies such as the illicit consumption of alcohol or marijuana, sexual experiences, petty larceny and auto-theft for joy-riding (1961:12)

Their typology of delinquent gangs as: criminal; conflict or retreatist might be seen to be typified by acquisitive crime, violence and drugs. The aim of a criminal sub-culture may be to conspicuously consume, " 'big cars', flashy clothes' and 'swell dames' " (1961:96) so auto-theft for profit or for personal use could be incorporated within their scheme but not joyriding.

Thereafter there is no discussion of auto-theft or joyriding - middle-class or otherwise - but it does arise in the quotes they use to discuss the work of other theorists. Interestingly not all relate auto-theft to middle-class delinquency and often assign it to more serious crime, for example: "...middle-class adolescents, singly or in groups, participate in a variety of delinquent episodes, including such illegal activities as auto theft, operating a motor vehicle without a license" (Bloch and Niederhoffer, 1958:17); " The older guys did big jobs like stick ups, burglary and stealing autos" (Shaw, 1930:54) and "The customary set of activities of the adolescent street-corner group includes activities which are in violation of laws and ordinances of the legal code. Most of these center around assault and theft of various types (the gang fight; auto theft..)" (Miller, 1958:17). The reasons for these disparities may, of course, derive from differences in the perceived seriousness of auto-theft. Ideological and material aspects of class may also be apparent - middle-class auto-theft played down by parents and law enforcers as merely joyriding.

Downes (1966) specifically set himself the task of critically examining the work of Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin, amongst others, and testing their concepts against English data. He found little or no evidence for delinquent sub-cultures. Joyriding and auto-theft are incidental to his concerns but do appear in discussions of the work of Matza and Sykes, for instance Downes notes "(b) denial of injury...eg vandalism for 'fun'; auto-theft for 'joyrides'..."(1966:76) and describes the 'manufacture' of excitement which is "The distinctive content of such behaviour as 'joy-riding', 'doing a ton'.." (1966:82-83).⁶ He also notes Spergel's (1961) division of criminal sub-cultures into 'theft' and 'racket' with car theft, particularly for joyriding, much more prominent in 'theft' areas.

6. There is no doubting the biological and psychological basis for the attraction of speed but the attention given to 'doing a ton' is socially constructed. The metric equivalent would be 161 kph. What speed to European motorists aspire to, 100 kph or 200 kph (124 mph)?

Downes own empirical study compared Stepney and Poplar in 1960. Car crime rates were fairly evenly spread between and within the boroughs except larceny from vehicles was higher in Stepney. There were concentrations of taking and driving away around obvious sites such as Mile End Odeon and the London Hospital (1966:141-146). For 8-12 year olds taking and driving away was quite rare at 1.74% of offences but for 13-16 year olds it had become the first-rank offence with 29.55% and remained the first ranked offence for 17-21 years olds, at 18.55%, by 22-25 it had lapsed to eleventh rank with larceny simple, violence against the person and even illegal gambling ranked first, second and third. No female offenders were noted for this crime. Downes comments, "it is obvious that take-and-drive-away is an offence peculiar to the teenage male group in both boroughs" (1966:163). He also notes differences between the boroughs and within the different car crime categories but only uses this and other information to develop a three-stage chronology of delinquency in which taking and driving away is but one indicator of the stage that has been reached. Taking and driving away characterises the second stage and car theft the third.

He also found that 28.5% of multiple offenders committed, amongst other things, taking and driving away, second only to breaking in at 53.3% and concludes that, "It must not be assumed too readily that the break-in offender and the take-and-drive offender are two different species, when in a fifth of the latter cases they are same offender"(1966:177). His data on accomplices is based on very small numbers (6) but shows fewer (1.23) than break ins (2.155), noting that it is only possible to get a certain number in a car (1966:179-180).

Downes also supplemented his statistical work with informal observation:

'Pete told me Bill and the boys were out "joy-riding" and the police would probably be in after them tonight.' He dangled a car-key and said it was Ford Consul, brand-new. 'The bloke just left it lying around (at work). Well that's just asking for it, ain't it'. They had been joy-riding 'only just lately. They just got the craze. We do it for enjoyment, you know. There's nothing else to do round here. [...]' They had this particular craze for only three days, then stopped.

Moving on a few years to 1974 and getting away from Gibben's psycho-analytic and Downes' statistic-rich consideration of sub-cultural theory Parker (1974a & 1974b) opts for participant observation which does not emphasize joyriding but makes some telling points about it nonetheless. Like Downes he is interested in Miller's description of the focal concerns of young men (trouble, toughness, smartness, excitement, fate and autonomy). 'The Boys' with whom he is hanging out, whose 'view' he seeks to give go through a period of stealing car radios.

Parker must have been in Liverpool at just the moment when joy-riding was being discovered by a new generation. The Boys are at the time aged 16-18 and are only involved in stealing car radios but the 'Tiddlers' aged 12 are already taking cars, apparently inspired by a TV documentary about joyriding in the neighbouring estate of 'Everomer'. The Boys hold conventional views of this activity "The way they drive 'dannies' (cars) around like that they'll kill someone." (p35) In the area Parker (1974a) was examining he found only 3% car ownership.

Parker concludes (Parker 1974b) "While joyriding is a delinquent action, it is motivated by respectable and conventional desires." Car use continues to be respectable and conventional but its taken-for-granted nature is now being contested.

the literature specifically on motor projects

As can be seen from Chapter 1, the National Association of Motor Projects employs a very broad definition of motor project. The Driver Retraining Scheme described by Harraway (1986) which persuaded the local Magistrates' Court not to disqualify or make attendance a condition of a probation order if the young men prosecuted for TDA paid for and took their driving test might qualify as a motor project. Similarly the 'Car Crime Education Group' described by Cooper (1989) could also be called a motor project. However, the archetype of the motor project is the 'banger' project. It is this sort of project Jackson has in mind when he says "Go-kart racing schemes or police invitations to young men to handle fast performance cars in controlled situations are like inviting alcoholics to a brewery." (Jackson 1992:37) Since Jackson concludes that the need is to work on young men's damaging and narrow models of being masculine it is to be presumed he does not favour custody but work on that masculinity without resort to cars. His demand for abstention sounds reactionary and ignores the growth of 'harm minimisation' methods in many areas of community sentences, 'alternatives' and community safety schemes.

A key difference between motor projects is the extent to which they might subscribe to statements such as: car thieves need to be provided with a "comparable degree of excitement and interest" (Light *et al* 1993:ix) and that programmes to divert joyriders must provide an equal, if not higher, level of stimulation, status, recognition and prestige (Briggs, 1991). As will be seen in the discussion below of motor project evaluations many projects do not subscribe to these views of how to work with joyriders.

Even projects which appear to be straightforward banger projects are now much more likely to address offending behaviour and even examine issues around masculinity than their 'banger' heritage or orientation might suggest. Ilderton Motor Project, the longest running motor project, is a classic banger project but was also had a hand in the establishment of Theatre Adad's 'Vicious Wheels' crime prevention drama about joyriding addressed to 10 and 11 year olds described in Chapter 1.

Many projects might now agree with Tarling, in his introduction to Light *et al* (1993), that

understanding and appreciation of legal sanctions as deterrents suggests that challenging non-custodial programmes may be more appropriate for those apprehended than either cautioning or custody.

Or the Home Office Working Group (1988:20):

We feel that the development of many of the motor projects which cater for offenders referred from the courts as a condition of a probation order has in part reflected the concern and desire of the courts to have sentencing disposals which are not just an alternative to custody, but which also seek to engage actively

with offenders and attempt to channel their misdirected energies from illegal motoring activities.

One respondent to Groombridge (1994) suggested that motor projects may work symbolically. Whether motor projects, however defined, work is more difficult. Webb and Laycock (1992) take the view that as 'lack of legitimate driving opportunities' is given by few as a reason for joyriding motor projects may not work. But the best motor projects would seek to work on the peer pressure and excitement reasons for joyriding. Also contrary to the expectations of the supporters of motor projects, Gibbens noted that of his joyriders "few... took up work in a garage" and that motor mechanics courses in Swedish borstals were poorly attended. However, four out of ten respondents at TRAX wanted to be mechanics (Groombridge 1994). It is clear from Light *et al* (1993) that motor projects are more likely to work with 'specialists' and McCorry and Morrissey (1989) see motor projects as more appropriate to those who stole for expressive reasons rather than instrumental reasons which suggests intervention early in the car crime career.

It is neither clear whether motor projects 'work' nor what is to count as working. Given that some of the respondents of Light *et al* (1993) claimed to have stolen over 500 cars and that the average number each of their respondents had stolen was 70 cars each just one less car would be a considerable improvement. Driving more safely whilst continuing to offend might also be worth considering as a laudable road safety outcome.

Extern's Belfast Motor Project was found by Chamberlain (1985) to have "a high degree of success in preventing or reducing the involvement of those young people in such activities" and periodically good results are claimed for other projects. Briggs (1991) supports motor projects but gives no evidence of their success. Sheldon found - citing Stafford (1983) - that the 'Birmingham Wheels Project' had successfully addressed how to find something for energetic youngsters to do that was not anti-social. "The answer was by thinking about what would be as exciting as stealing other people's cars and racing them." (1994:223) Discussing the poor quality of many evaluation studies he uses a car metaphor, saying, " 'Motivation, or the apparent lack of it, is not a condition or capacity that can be dipped and measured like engine oil.'" (1994:223).

The work of Martin and Webster (1994) is the most comprehensive account of motor projects to date it is limited by the terms of its reference - probation projects - and diluted by the breadth of projects examined - from banger projects to car offending groups. As the author's acknowledge many motor projects are not run by or with the probation service to deal with convicted offenders but by voluntary organisations, social services or youth services as crime prevention or work with youth 'at risk'. The narrow focus on probation projects arose from the demands of the Home Office Division that commissioned the work.⁷ The breadth of projects examined comes from the broad definition that the National Association of Motor Projects (NAMP) employs. It is therefore ironic that of the 60 projects identified by Martin and Webster at the end of 1992 only twenty were listed as members of NAMP in February 1994 when NAMP

7. As a member of the Probation Service Division at the time I attended the commissioning meeting with Professor Martin.

claimed 95 members. They also precluded consideration of projects even if probation was involved where the purpose was preventative or the project only temporary.

After a telephone census a number of projects were selected for case studies that represented some of the variety of projects revealed in the census. Criteria included: whether the projects raced or not; whether they challenged offending behaviour; whether they provided training towards legal driving, whether they had a 'shared' management structure and the size of group and throughput. These criteria and Home Office pressure towards those projects in receipt of Home Office grants produced a list of eight projects: Bordesley - 'On the Right Road'; Bradford Motor Education Project - 'Crime Challenge Programme'; Ilderton Motor Project; Newcastle Motor Project; Oxford TRAX; Salford GEARS; South Glamorgan Driver Retraining Project and; Telford DRIVE.

Each of these was visited and an attempt made to gauge the extent to which the projects performed against the following criteria: the cost of disposal; diversion from custody; the satisfaction of sentencers; the satisfaction of victims/public; attendance at the project; completion of probation order; reconviction at two years and; what they call 'moral improvement'. The census resulted in a number of quantitative and qualitative findings which are set out below with a discussion of the issues that they felt the case studies revealed. Their discussion of the case studies is necessarily more tentative as factual evidence of some aspects was missing, incompatible between projects or still awaited (a Home Office reconviction study underway). The discussion below not only draws on the work of Martin and Webster but on fieldwork.⁸ The main points arising from the census were the variety of projects, their growth but frequent demise (only 14 were older than five years), the divide between those who race (15) and those who don't (45), their concentration in a number of areas (no projects in 23 probation areas), the difficulties caused to reforming joyriders by disqualifications and insurance costs, the stimulating challenge provided by working with joyriders and the extent of inter-agency co-operation with the police.

The apparent minority position of racing projects is probably an artefact of the low numbers of NAMP members surveyed and the inclusion of office-based offending behaviour groups. Moreover, those areas without probation projects may well have non-probation projects which may be more inclined to racing.

The issues raised by the case studies are: who attends motor projects (and by implication what sort of project might work with what sort of offender); whether projects are for offenders or crime prevention; whether projects should have workshops; management issues; numbers attending (throughput); finance; evaluation; incentives; the fit with probation practice and; public relations.

⁸ I have visited four of the same projects in the course of fieldwork and have documentary knowledge of two others. Whilst not deliberate it is no coincidence as the same considerations plus ease of access lead the author separately to these projects. This offers some cross validation for the choice of projects for fieldwork. Only the work of South Glamorgan Driver Retraining Project and Newcastle Motor Project are not known to me.

With the discussion of who attends motor projects their work comes closest to the work on joyriders discussed above. As they say:

Motor project staff broadly agree that, despite their cocky exteriors, most twockers come pretty far down the social and criminal scales. It is a crime of the inadequate, deprived, and illiterate.(1994:114)

This accords with the most recent research on joyriders and is not contradicted by the fieldwork. They go on to say, “Family disruptions are common, as is failure at school.”, which is too crude a diagnostic tool to separate joyriders from other convicted criminals or many of the general population. An implicit neo-Mertonian aetiology is offered, “Their offences are snatches at the realms of power and luxury they know they can never really inhabit. They also offer a broad two category typology - younger offenders involved in twocking who may move on to other offences and an older group who may have given up or reduced their twocking but now face difficulty in legal driving because of disqualifications from the earlier period, if they do twoc the more serious offence of driving whilst disqualified is recorded.

These differences have real effects on the purpose of motor projects. Under 17s cannot drive on the roads legally and the effect of any ban only begins to bite when they are older and have given up or reduced their twocking. For these reasons motor projects aimed at the under 17s are often oriented towards prevention or diversion from the criminal justice system - hence workshops and racing - whereas over 17s are more interested in working towards legal driving. Work with younger more active twockers forms the basis for what Martin and Webster call the ‘Ilderton model’, named after the longest established project. Many projects have been set up along these lines but local differences have meant that none actually replicate Ilderton with its mixture of age groups and offenders and non-offenders. Some have followed the ‘Ilderton model’ of workshop and racing but strictly separated age groups and catered only, or mainly, for offenders with racing reserved for non-offenders or those who have finished the requirement of their probation or supervision order (for example, TRAX). Others have tackled the younger group through preventative work (such as Salford - GEARS) and still others deal with the older group completely without resort to the hands-on use of cars in office-based, ‘tackling offending’ groups, for example the South Glamorgan Driver Retraining Project that they discuss or the Merseyside project discussed below. They pick out the Bradford Motor Education Project as a remarkable blend of these approaches.

Whether a project has a workshop is a crucial distinction between projects, it adds an element of training and education not available to office-based projects as well as a focus for the project. That focus will often be around racing or off-road vehicle use. However, it also adds a complexity that some projects find difficult to prioritise and manage. This is often because the project’s aims are insufficiently clear.

Workshops require more staff and represent a significant financial input which, in turn, require greater management. In contrast, office-based projects like other probation programmes

can be managed in-house by staff whose cost has already been found. Even where the project is wholly funded by the Probation Service - as with Ilderton - a widely-based management committee is involved. TRAX, for instance, has representatives from all youth and Criminal Justice System and senior managers and directors of several local businesses including Rover Cars and Unipart.

The numbers attending workshop groups are necessarily limited by space and further by Health and Safety considerations. This, in turn, reduces throughput. Office-based groups are generally no larger because of group dynamics but the numbers dealt with can be kept up more easily. They make the point that workshops are both capital and labour intensive so a good throughput is important to keep unit costs down. More extensive fieldwork would have revealed that whatever size workshop and whatever size group working in it will have problems of keeping a flow of work. That is projects not only face organisational problems similar to other social work settings they require production management skills. Cars have to be acquired, stripped out, modified, painted and tested before racing. The numbers of cars have to be matched up with numbers of potential racers (not necessarily a car each). However, the supply of cars may dry up, good behaviour in the project may lead to more potential drivers and in the winter the numbers of races are less. Martin and Webster are sceptical of the throughput figures claimed by projects which are seeking to meet targets set when bidding for funding and in the face of an ever changing sentencing climate. Fieldwork observation and past experience as a grant-giver to projects suggests they are right to be sceptical.

The spirit of the Criminal Justice Act 1991 was encouraging to motor projects and other community penalties and magistrates were supportive of TRAX (Groombridge, 1994) However, the about turn six months after the Act's implementation (May, 1993) and Magistrates' Association Guidelines have undermined the ethos of probation-based motor projects - and, perhaps, increased the need - but not the funding - for crime prevention projects. Ilderton have always taken non-probationers and even accepted local children on the project as part of a policy of keeping good relations with neighbours. Other projects take non-offenders but under some other scheme name. For instance, TRAX offer a workshop component to a probation order but also offer prevention and diversion work on different nights. They also deliver inputs into probation-run office-based schemes.

There may be financial reasons why some projects avoid workshops or make arrangements with local colleges as Bradford Motor Education Project have.⁹ The financial constraints lead projects to be entrepreneurial in obtaining funds or equipment even:

...to develop facets of what, at one period, criminologists called the 'hidden economy', that world of favours and deals where goods change hands and services are rendered, but nothing appears in the accounts [...] It may be unavoidable in a time of cash limits and restraint in public expenditure, but it is a distraction from the main task." (Martin and Webster, 1994:118)

9. This arrangement is in part due to the refusal of the Home Office Probation Service Division to grant the full amount requested. Made for financial reasons the arrangement has proved educationally useful in linking the project and college to the benefit of both.

Fieldwork observation supports the view that a certain amount of ‘ducking and diving’ is required by projects but this is not necessarily a distraction from the main task but may in fact hold one of the keys to the successful operation of projects as it makes the project more like a real job with all its perks and privileges.

Few projects had been evaluated. Evaluation would require better record keeping. Martin and Webster (1994) call for Chief Probation Officers and the Home Office to undertake this work. The study of TRAX discussed below is by the Oxfordshire Probation Service and therefore more concerned with whether they are referring the right clients and making the right recommendations to magistrates in Pre Sentence Reports.¹⁰ Most projects wanted to be evaluated, and in the contract culture that now prevails with probation services paying grants out of the 5% of their budget set aside for independent sector/partnership projects will need to keep and present their own figures for success or failure.

The evaluation of the crime prevention effects of motor projects is even more problematic. Most projects ‘knew’ that offending ceased or reduced during attendance at the project but even if car crime reduced in an area served by the project it was not possible to tie the two together. Indeed, taking a scientific realist perspective it is difficult to see how a weekly attendance at a project could achieve such a result yet most researchers in this field would agree with Martin and Webster that those attending,

are being kept out of trouble. However, this cannot be proved with scientific certainty because of taking other factors into account, such as the effects of self-selection and the level of unemployment among young men. (1994:118)

They go on to say “The problem remains that the potentially most valuable aspect of projects is the most difficult to evaluate” (1994:118). Moreover, even if motor projects could be shown to work it is even more difficult to establish what it is about motor projects that work. Is it something about workshops, the commitment of the workers or something else or a combination of these or other elements? The implicit assumption of many proponents of motor projects, in the absence of more explicit aims and objectives, amounts almost to a magical belief in the homeopathic power of the car to cure its own iatrogenic ills.

It is for these sort of reasons that Martin and Webster raise the issue of incentives, questioning whether totally office-based schemes - without the incentive of racing or driving - will be able to hold the attention of offenders whilst challenging their offending behaviour. Incentives can also bring problems in the shape of public condemnation of ‘goodies for baddies’; as can be seen in the *Carweek* article discussed in Chapter 1. The very element of a project which might attract and keep offenders or potential offenders interested is attacked as being a reward for bad behaviour. Many projects have faced this accusation and the most common way of

10. Part of my fieldwork was done whilst attempting to evaluate the TRAX project’s work with non-offenders. In statistical terms this proved impossible. The project kept none of note and failed during the course of the year to introduce any suggested. The youth justice figures were kept only on an individual basis and the probation figures whilst well kept were limited to their own concerns within the limits of their database.

answering it is through segregation of offenders from non-offenders with only non-offenders allowed to drive or race. This, of course, conveniently ignores the fact that many projects know that many of their 'non-offenders' are or have been offenders even if not caught and processed as such.

In an increasingly punitive climate it is not easy to simply state motor projects work and therefore should be supported. However, Martin and Webster do suggest that this argument has implicitly been working with sentencers if only because,

there was probably more scepticism about the value of custodial sentences than about motor projects. The six month custodial sentences which magistrates might be able to impose were thought to be largely ineffective as the offenders would reappear before the court soon after release. (1994:118-119)

Whether motor projects, or even the group work used in office-based schemes fit with the tradition of casework face to face- probation practice is raised by Martin and Webster but, perhaps, underestimates the extent of innovative work already undertaken by probation services (see Hutchins, 1993 for examples of group work; and The Howard League, 1994 and Martin, 1997 for a variety of projects). A more telling finding is their "view based on a lot of looking at projects, is that preventative work is the core activity, from which can be drawn facilities and skills to help offenders" and that there are financial reasons why they might take offenders, "Naturally they accept money to run programmes for offenders" (Martin and Webster, 1994:119).

They conclude that whilst "there is much to be said for motor projects as a constructive way of dealing with car offenders only a very small minority get sent to them." (1994:120) If this small minority were congruent with the small minority disproportionately involved in car theft and taking and driving away then this would matter little and provide a cost effective remedy. As it is not possible to be certain of this from the anecdotes of offenders, project workers and probation officers they recommend "a small study of their criminal careers and impact on victims" (1994:120).

Broadly they conclude there is no reason to end support for motor projects but that proposals for new ones need to be examined properly and that the closer, devolved, probation service might improve this. Any scheme needs to be properly managed and that management committees should contain a mix of business and those with a knowledge of offenders. Despite being tasked to examine probation-oriented schemes they conclude that preventative schemes are more likely to gain local support and "make a contribution to civil society" (1994:120).

Finally they address some of the more serious problems that motor projects face. The sheer ease of entry to joyriding and the pleasure gained from it are difficult enough for motor projects to deal with in addition to the barriers that society erects to prevent a return to 'normality', to 'civil society'. The two major barriers are disqualification and insurance. Many years after they have given up joyriding the accumulated disqualifications mean that they cannot drive legally or afford the necessary insurance because of this. Additionally the possibility of becoming a professional car thief also provides a temptation for some. They offer no policy

proposals on these matters.

Discussion of the following evaluations of individual motor projects allows some of the issues raised above to be seen in context. Davies (1993) is chosen because of the spread of projects covered, those on TRAX and Ilderton are chosen as they correspond to sites of participant observation. Other evaluations are also referred to where important issues arise.

The evaluation of West Midlands Probation Service Motor Offenders Projects (Davies, 1993) includes a number of different schemes, most are Safe/Responsible driving courses and the remainder 'Banger Racing' projects - though the descriptions given do not make it possible to distinguish. She found that of 41 people followed up two years after attending a motor offending project 46% were not reconvicted. Moreover, onset of offending was delayed. Given the self-reported offending rate of car offenders this might be seen to be good. The trouble is that the definitions of 'motor offenders' and 'motor projects' used are very broad. 'Motor offences' include Taking and Driving Away but also Driving Whilst Disqualified, Reckless Driving and Causing Death or Injury by Dangerous Driving. Occasionally figures are given for the narrower 'Motor theft-related offences' but this is still a wide category comprising TDA, interfering with a motor vehicle and allowing oneself to be carried.

In October 1992 there were (or were planned) 19 projects/programmes dealing with motor offending though only two could be seen to be projects that used cars though some of the programmes had access to motor projects or workshops. West Midlands Probation Service evaluated the existing projects by describing the 3,985 motor offenders they dealt with in 1991 (which then constituted 20% of their work and 34% of the work of the West Midlands Police) and following up 67 motor offenders who had attended three of the projects/programmes - Bordesley Activity Centre, Sandwell Responsible Road Use Course and Walsall Motoring Offenders Course. The evaluation was carried out not only to enable West Midlands to assess its needs and the effectiveness of the projects but specifically to add to the scant literature on motor projects.

Overall, 98% of the offenders were men. Only 95 women were motor offenders. Where 'race' was recorded 13% were black. Those under 21 constituted 31% of the whole sample but this rose to 64% if only motor-theft related cases were considered. The different parts of the probation area had different profiles for age, 'race' and types of crime, for instance in Wolverhampton only 4% were TDA whereas in Dudley they constituted 24% of the motoring offences. Overall the most common offences for men were Driving Whilst Disqualified (38%) and driving with Excess Alcohol (27%) with TDA 16%.

Male motor theft offenders were slightly less likely to have been in custody (18%) than the total sample (22%) but this may be as they were generally younger. In descending order the most common disposals for male motor theft offenders were: 'Other - Conditional Discharges and unrecorded outcomes' (20%); Community Service (19%); Fine (17%); and Probation (15%). Only 2% received Probation with conditions. Of the 67 male offenders followed up over a two

year period 55% were under 21 and 76% recorded as white; 27% were convicted of Driving Whilst Disqualified; 18% of TDA and about one third of theft - mostly likely a car and over 44% had received a custodial or suspended sentence in the two years prior to attendance at the project.

The programmes they attended were similar to the TRAX Car Crime Programme described in Chapter 1 but also involved some driving/racing. Completion of the programme was managed by 61% (dragged down by a 10% completion rate at one project). Factors increasing the chances of success in completing the course were: being over 21; not having a custodial sentence in the preceding two years; and having a motor related offence.

Reconvictions are often taken to be the measure of the success of non-custodial sentences and two years is the usual time over which to measure. As is rightly pointed out two years is a long time for young people and particularly in the case of offenders as prolific as car offenders. These caveats notwithstanding they found that for those who completed the course 54% were reconvicted within two years of starting the project, whereas 100% were reconvicted amongst those who failed to complete the project; only 12% were reconvicted three or more times. None of the first reconvictions were for a motor theft related offence but 24% were for Driving Whilst Disqualified and only 10% committed offences that were so serious that they resulted in custody. Unlike successful completion, age appeared not to be a factor but previous custody did have a significant effect on the likelihood of reconviction.

The sample is too small to conclude that motor projects work but suggests they can and the factors which appear to assist. They appear to be ideal for 21 year old motor offenders who are serious enough to risk custody but have not been so serious as to have already had custody. Completion of the programme is clearly essential but what is it that works? Is it the groupwork in the style of McGuire and Priestley (1985), visits from traffic police, car mechanics or the driving/racing? Only experimental variation or a massive meta analysis is likely to suggest which of the elements is most effective or whether it is the whole. Is the car the key or is it peripheral? Moore and Lloyd (1992) conclude that for some people motor projects can provide activities that can retain their interest and offer opportunities and relationships which can increase their self-esteem.

This would certainly seem to be part of the reported and observed success of motor projects with young men. How well served are women? Of the 95 women dealt with by West Midlands Probation Service in the period only 25% were for motor-theft offences with a lower proportion (56%) being under 21. Fourteen were convicted of TDA, a very similar proportion to that for male motor theft offences. Women were more likely to be convicted of drink driving and less likely to be convicted of Driving Whilst Disqualified. None of the motor theft offenders had previous experience of custody and none received custody for their motor theft offences, 72% received Conditional Discharges - or their disposal was not recorded - none were sent to any of the projects. Even though the proportion of women convicted for offences - which might be seen as a proxy for joyriding - is similar to that for men it is not possible to say that the women identified are 'joyriders' in the sense that Jones (1993) or the media would recognize. They may

have been passengers in stolen cars - as, of course, will some young men.

In its first year (up to September 1993) TRAX ran 5 Car Crime Programmes (TCCP) for a total of 30 offenders (Procter and Townsend, 1994). Bar one Asian all were white, the average age was 19. Completion rates were high at 90% for those who commenced the course (five were returned to court before starting). An important question for the probation service is whether their officers are targeting serious car offenders. Only 7% of the Service's Pre Sentence Reports (PSRs) were on Taking a Motor Vehicle without Consent, Being Carried, or Reckless or Dangerous Driving as the principal offence. It is not possible to pick out those who committed a more serious non-car related offence at the same time as one of those picked out as suitable for TCCP. Moreover, it is not possible to pick out vehicle thefts from others on the Oxfordshire Probation Service computer. This seriously hampers the search for suitable individuals who might have been missed. The most common sentencing proposal in PSRs was Community Service (34%); next was a Probation Order with no conditions (24%) followed by Probation with a condition to attend TCCP (20%). Two young women who had allowed themselves to be carried were proposed for Community Service and Probation. Only those who had committed TWOC and Aggravated TWOC were proposed for TCCP.

At that time Oxfordshire Probation used a twenty point offence seriousness scale which, for motor-related offences, runs from 4 for allowing oneself to be carried without damage to 16 for causing death by reckless or dangerous driving. TCCP's mean seriousness score was highest of all the community sentences at 12.4. This is taken to show that, "there is little doubt that PSR writers are being very effective in their targeting of serious car offenders for the TCCP". This, however, is not the same as saying that every offender who might be suitable for TRAX is considered for it. That would require both Oxfordshire Probation Service and Youth Justice Teams to identify all serious car offenders, even if their current principal offence was not car-related. It would also require comprehensive monitoring by the managers/colleagues of potential referrers. The present gate-keeping measures ensure that those who are not suitable are kept out of the project but cannot guarantee that all who would be suitable are referred. Police and Court figures should identify the numbers of potential referrals against which the programme can measure its success in attracting and securing attendance.

Looking at acceptance onto the programme should reveal any differences between the referrers and the project, failures to persuade sentencers to accept the proposal or a failure to persuade the young person to accept the programme. This is not covered by the evaluation report. The report jumps to considering those that TRAX worked with. Since its opening - in September 1992 - TCCP had dealt with 35 car offenders (21 from the Magistrates Court, 8 from the Crown Court and 6 from the Youth Court). Aggravated TWOC was the most common main offence (43%) for those TRAX worked with followed by simple TWOC (29%) and theft of a car (14%). The mean seriousness score of those accepted was 10.5; only immediate custody was higher with 12.7.

The previous history of car offending for those on TCCP was available for 30 offenders.

At least one previous conviction for car offending was very common (83%). Five had more than 7 or more previous convictions. Whilst some would only admit to those on their records others admitted to up to 400 separate offences. Yet once started on TCCP only 3 were returned to court for breaching the conditions of the order during the programme. Only eight had completed their probation order, five successfully and three unsuccessfully following a further offence.

Ten of the twenty seven - who completed TCCP successfully - were reconvicted of a car offence within six months, but six of these were less serious offences. The failure rate over two years is likely to be higher as the effect of the programme wanes. Indeed it is difficult to see how an eight week course could even be expected to have the good results it does given the ease and attractions of car offending. What needs to be considered is how the effectiveness of the course can be extended.

The Ilderton project is particularly important as it has been established longest, served as a model for many other projects and a caution to others. It is the stereotypical 'banger' project. Given its pre-eminent position it could expect to have been evaluated extensively. This is not the case, however it has still been the subject or the site of a number of investigations. Discussed below in chronological order are Pearce and Thornton (1980) *The Ilderton Motor Project (A Model Experiment in the Treatment of Autocrime Offenders)* and Wilkinson and Morgan (1995) *The Impact of Ilderton Motor Project on motor vehicle crime and offending* with reference to Broad (1982) and undated reports from the project itself.

The Ilderton Motor Project was founded in 1975, five years after the Advisory Council on the Penal System recommended such centres. Five years later the Chief Probation Officer for Inner London and the Commander of the Community Relations Branch turned their attention to the project (Pearce and Thornton, 1980). The paper is not so much an evaluation but a description of the motor project and the juvenile bureaux that supplied many of its customers with appendices showing the extent of the problem. That said they make some points that are still pertinent.

In the opening page they go straight to the problem that Martin and Webster (1994) save for their final page, the matter of disqualification. They ask, "whether it is worth tolerating a system that is inefficient and ineffective for actual offenders because it is believed to be effective for in deterring potential ones" going on to say, "There is an urgent need for sentencing practices and attitudes to be reviewed and hopefully changed if we are not to persist in wastefully reinforcing failure in these auto-crime cases." (Pearce and Thornton, 1980:1) Quite.

They add a historical dimension by asserting, "It is perhaps the use of 'disqualification to drive' that the courts reflect most clearly some outdated assumptions about motoring offenders. Car owners originally came from mainly wealthy people whose social attitudes, in general, recognised legal authority and who were seen to be different from 'ordinary' anti-authority criminals" (1980:1-2) As some of the historical material in Chapter 1 shows car drivers, whatever their social class, have sought to avoid the controls imposed by authority on their car

use.

Drawing on, but not citing, Sykes and Matza (1957) Pearce and Thornton note, “the delinquent adopts defensive attitudes towards authority [...] claims that authority figures are hypocritical, unfair or incompetent.” (1980:4). For this reason ‘conventional methods of treatment’ are not appropriate for auto-offenders but that a strategy of using “cars as an indirect approach to resocialisation rather than ignoring their significance” (1980:6). Moreover, “It was thought important to have a mixed rather than an all delinquent group so that as far as possible the pro-social attitudes of the volunteers might begin imperceptibly to rub off on the offender.” (1980:7)

Perhaps, mindful of the ‘goodies for baddies’ argument they also note, “Surprisingly perhaps, the amount of time spent by each youth behind the wheel of a car on the race track each year does not amount to more than 10 minutes in total”, suggesting that, “the motivation in this respect concerns the ‘taking part in a race’ and not necessarily the driving” (1980:12). More explicitly addressing this issue they recommend that, “such facilities need to be more generally available, and perhaps should be part of the modern education process as it is in America” (1980:14)

More controversially, though they do not follow through on the observation, they argue that, “Cars are an integral status symbol in all classes of society and car manufacturers invest millions to ensure that they remain so. The desire to possess a car is *knowingly implanted* in people’s minds at a very early age, but must be frustrated until the legal age for driving, (seventeen) is reached.” (1980:12 emphasis added). Thus a potentially radical critique of car culture becomes Mertonian strain. Rather than attempt a reform, far less a revolution, of car culture they seek to relieve the symptom of frustration by, “the radical approach of trying to give them what they sought to obtain by committing offences” (1980:13). They feel unable to make comparisons between districts to see whether the project has impacted on car crime in the area but note that, “of some 140 offenders who have attended the Centre, further conviction rates for offences involving cars has varied between 18-23% over the last three years” (1980:13)

Broad (1982) was carrying out his fieldwork around this time and refers to the report of Pearce and Thornton (1980). The descriptions he gives of the project (and those of Pearce and Thornton, 1980) are largely accurate today. He was attempting to examine the activity beyond that offered by the banger racing. At that time casework was the standard Probation Service model. He notes that alternatives to this struggled to survive and often emerged as ‘specialist units’ with an experimental brief. Whilst groupwork is more common within the probation service now and many specialisms have been added to the menu of probation practice these comments still have resonance today as Martin and Webster (1994) also found.

During a three week period Broad compiled sociograms of interaction between members and staff in both the workshop and clubroom, asked open-ended questions of staff and participated in the life of the project, including being interviewed for a prospective TV

programme about the project. Whilst Broad coded as positive most behaviour in the workshop the elected team leaders were more concerned about what they saw as their car and in clubroom discussions took no responsibility for their team. In the clubroom, interactions were between individuals and the group with staff provoking necessary discussion on “group cohesiveness, responsibility and accountability” (1982:80). Particularly noticeable from his participant observation was that, “All the volunteers are chosen for their particular, some might say fanatical interest in motor cars” (1982:81).

Broad mentions an incident where a particularly successful racer admits that the reason why he is reluctant to enter a race which would reflect well on the project is that he is scared. He had witnessed a clubmate roll his car in a previous race. Whilst some “displayed a somewhat ‘macho’ attitude towards the more dangerous aspects of racing, by far the majority of the group adopted a more understanding and tolerable (tolerant?) attitude” (1982:85). In these and other sessions skills of listening and talking are developed. The interviews with staff revealed a tendency to see ‘societal’ rather than ‘personal’ reasons for their ‘clients’ offending; examples were ‘lack of education’, ‘no money’ and ‘under the legal driving age’ (1982:90).

Only very basic information was available about those attending (29) but from March 1981 to March 1982 the average period of attendance was six months, average age was 17 and the majority were attending voluntarily. Exacerbating the sketchy information kept by the project is the difficulty of following up whether or not the clients re-offended. However, of the 29 who attended during the year only 3 were asked to leave for committing an auto-crime and 8 were known to have re-offended within 3 months. This is not enough to say that the project stops car theft but Broad concludes, “it is reasonable to suggest that, whatever else the motor project achieves in practical terms, it does more good than harm in terms of personal and social developments” (1982:98). Regular attendance was associated with a slight improvement in behaviour as assessed by project leader and referring agencies.

Broad concludes that the relationships the project has established, particularly with the local community, contribute to the atmosphere. Earning the right to race puts them in competition with each other and at races in competition “Felons and non-felons mix freely” (1982:101) yet collective responsibility is emphasised. He found that whilst the project aimed for behaviour modification through informal processes it did little to test whether it had achieved those goals or seek feedback from referring agencies.

At that time the project took no one on probation conditions but the 1989 Annual Report indicated that the project was an ‘alternative to custody’ and 4 places were held for those on Community Service Orders (but they could not race). The report contains many pictures of the work of the project the Chairman’s report, project leaders report, accounts, some statistics, a call for more research and the heartwarming tales of ‘Dave’, ‘Fergus’ and ‘Mark R’. For the year 1 April 1988 to 31 March 1989 a total of 52 attended the project, nearly double the figures given to Broad 7 years earlier. The figures for reconviction relate only to whilst attending the project rather than after and therefore do not relate directly to those at the project then, but in that period

14 were reconvicted, mostly the under 16 age group (11). A further report, undated but probably 1993, foresees statistics and concentrates on pictures, laudatory articles and two more 'life histories'.

However, the most recent and comprehensive evaluation by Wilkinson and Morgan (1995) comes complete with press release claiming, "New research indicates that the pioneering Ilderton Motor Project in Lewisham has a significant impact in reducing the scale and seriousness of offending of those who attend it." Some time will be spent discussing their findings because they tie in a number of issues about motor projects and joyriding, particularly the issue of specialisation. Thirty five offenders who had been supervised by the Inner London Probation Service at Ilderton between January 1987 and March 1994 were selected. A matching group of 40 were selected to represent what might have happened to the Ilderton group had there been no intervention.

A number of methodological issues arise here. It is a commonplace that attempts to measure re-offending have to rely on the less accurate reconviction rate. They chose to use arrest figures, (excluding those where acquittal but not discontinuance occurred). They recognize that this would be unacceptable on civil liberties grounds for making decisions about those involved but argue it provides a better measure of true offending as it overcomes the problem of one incident leading to a number of charges or a number of incidents being dealt with at one hearing. It also deals with the problem of time lags in conviction and sentencing which produce 'pseudo reconvictions' - offences committed before the sentence but after the committing of the offence for which that sentence is given.

The comparison group was selected 'blind' from the Inner London Probation Service (ILPS) database to match the Ilderton group by offending career and a reference offence that could have brought them to Ilderton. To test the specific impact of a motor project on car-crime they grouped, what they call, taking and driving away, allowing to be carried, motor vehicle interference, theft from a motor vehicle, going equipped for motor vehicle interference, reckless driving and other traffic violations. Whilst these are obviously related the inclusion of 'theft from' and the traffic offences might have an effect but this is not discussed. They give comparisons between the two groups. A selection of this material is set out in the table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Comparing the Ilderton and comparison group adapted from Wilkinson and Morgan (1995)

	n	Male %	Black/ 'other' %	Job/ education	Ave age at ref. Offence	Offences before ref offence	'TDAs' before ref Offence	Proportion of offences TDA	proportion in custody 2 years before ref Offence	ave time at Ilderton	ave follow up
Ilderton	35	100	17	1	19.4	6.6	4.9	74%	26%	14 months	47 months
Comparison	40	100	15	1	18.4	5.4	2.5	46%	25%	n/a	48 months

They provide additional comparative information and discuss some of the matters arising. These and other matters are discussed below. It is also necessary to compare both these groups with those supervised by ILPS more generally, this will be done as discussion proceeds. The numbers examined are small. It would have been useful to have had an estimate of the proportion of Ilderton attenders that the numbers represent. Elsewhere they accept the estimate of Martin and Webster (1994) that throughput is 15 a year. Therefore between January 1987 and March 1994 we might have expected 100 offenders passing through the project, however, some of those would attend for so short a time that no effect could be expected.

All of those studied were male but this passes without comment. They note that the numbers of 'black and other' at 17% and 15% is low compared to 30% for the rest of ILPS client group. They make no comment on this either (such issues are taken up in Chapter 3). At 19.4 and 18.4 years of age those who attend are younger than the average for those whom ILPS prepared a pre sentence report by ten years and six years younger than ILPS 'TDA' clients. Only one each of the two samples was in employment or education. Again no comment is made on this. It is indicative of the state of offender employment that this is not worthy of comment.

The numbers of offences before the reference offence and the proportion of those who had been in custody within the past two years are indicative of the seriousness of the offending behaviour being dealt with. This is further reinforced by the PSR prediction - for both groups - that three quarters would be reconvicted within two years. The average follow up period for both groups at nearly 4 years is good for such an evaluation and represents a long period in the career of a car criminal. However, the upper range of the follow up may explain the high average. The range for the Ilderton group was 10 to 106 months and 14 to 97 months for the comparison group.

The issue of the age of the sample is important for a number of reasons. First it has an impact on the numbers of offences that have been committed. Were the comparison group less criminal as the numbers of previous offences suggest or, because younger, had they not hit their criminal peak? Wilkinson and Morgan are sensitive to this and explore some possibilities. They rightly note that "TDA is regarded as an offence usually committed by relatively young offenders" (1995:8) but because both the Ilderton and comparison group are substantially

younger than the average for which ILPS prepares PSRs and the long follow up period they conclude that, “the Ilderton group is not significantly closer than the comparison group to “growing out of crime” (1995:8) and “none of the age and attendance based differences in offending attain statistical significance” (1995:9). Two interesting observations can be made; first “Ilderton seems to bring about the largest reduction in all types of crime with older offenders” and secondly that, “The largest reductions in TDA offending occur with younger offenders.”(1995:9). Here they are talking about a comparison made between the ‘young’ group - all those below 18 years 6 months (the median age of the groups combined) - and the ‘old’ group - all those above.

It is true that the Ilderton group and the comparison group are younger than the average of ILPS TDA clients group but they are still old for what might be called the classical joyriders studied by (Light *et al*, 1993) and are at or above the peak age for male offending. This leads to consideration of their definition of TDA. As was mentioned earlier the traffic violations are not exclusive to those who drive other people’s cars so a different picture might emerge if those offences and theft from a motor vehicle were stripped out. However, even if TDA alone were the subject of the analysis then other problems arise. Motor projects in their widest definition may be dealing with motor crime - that is taking of cars as well as bad driving of owned ones - but the stereotypical motor project, the banger project - and Ilderton is the banger project par excellence - is set up to deal with joyriding. Now as Chapter 1 sketched out there is no one definition of joyriding and both the practice and the label have changed over time. It would have been useful if some attempt had been made to operationalise a concept of the joyrider and seen whether the project worked for joyriders, car thieves or offenders more generally. Of course, ILPS, as funders, are more interested in whether the project works for those they send there. Within the data they gathered the nearest proxy for joyriding over car theft is age. An analysis of those under 17 would certainly have been useful.

Specialisation, or ‘offence specificity’ as they call it, is one of the issues arising from the literature on joyriding. In trying to establish whether Ilderton could be said to work they discovered evidence of specialisation. As the discussion above shows the specialisation they have shown is for a bundle of offences that they call TDA. They discuss that explicitly but do not ask whether joyriding may be a minority activity within that bundle which results in the same offences but may have different motivations, patterns and outcomes. However, what they do discover about specialisation is worth examining.

They cite Harraway as describing a type of offender that probation officers identify, the “TDA merchant” and the “car freak” (1986:55). Fieldwork confirms the widespread acceptance amongst probation officers and youth workers of this type of offender. However, most of the literature on criminal careers (for instance Farrington 1992) contradicts this except for sex offenders and long term fraudsters. Home Office research from 1985 cited by Tarling (1994) showed that of 43,400 convicted of motoring offences - including TDA - only 22% were reconvicted of an offence in the same category. This work might be criticised that the offence categories are too broad to reveal true specialism in offending, let alone behaviour such as

joyriding which is hard to define and detect.

What they discovered was that 74% and 46% of the Ilderton and comparison group respectively had convictions for TDA. Whilst this adds fuel to the debate about whether there are offence specialists the most pressing point for them is put succinctly, "If specialist TDA offenders can not be shown to exist, then in terms of 'treating' offenders at least, the thinking behind motor projects is generally flawed." (1995:3) This echoes Jones (1993) concern that motor projects had not thought through their *raison d'être*. However, they do not ask the question the other way round. That question might be formulated thus, 'Is car-crime/TDA/joyriding so specialist that the specialist treatment- motor project - will not work for less specialist offenders?' They don't ask this question but their age findings suggests that Ilderton may work better with 'young' TDA offenders and 'older' general offenders, which raises the question of whether Ilderton is specialist enough or whether motor projects could be used for the generality of offenders.

The final question then, 'does it work?' Broadly yes, as 75% were predicted to reoffend within two years. As it was 91% of the comparison group reoffended but only 65% of the Ilderton group (which was statistically significant at the .01 level). Moreover, at the same point the Ilderton group had committed 2.3 offences against the comparison groups 3.7. The reduction in numbers offending and numbers of offences comes through in sentencing too. Again at the two year point 15% of the Ilderton group as opposed to 46% of the comparison group had been sent to custody (again statistically significant). The effect is even more pronounced at the three year point where only 10% of the Ilderton group had gone to custody against 57% of the comparison group.

Ilderton also appears to work specifically on TDA. Within one year 29% of Ilderton group had committed TDA whereas 53% of the comparison group had. By the end of three years 43% of the Ilderton group and 80% of the comparison group had committed TDA offences. This enables the claim to be made, "that the reduction in offending amongst the Ilderton group is disproportionately the result of a decrease in TDA offending" (Wilkinson and Morgan, 1995:8).

These effects can be seen in the two age groups they examine. Thus at two years the 'young' group 71% of the Ilderton group had reoffended against 86% of the comparison group but the figures for TDA are 36% and 76% respectively. For the 'old' group the reoffending figures at the same point are 62% and 100% but with the TDA figures almost inseparable at 54% and 57%. The custody figures given are not differentiated by age.

Wilkinson and Morgan calculate that the effect size of the reduction in offending is $r=0.26$. This compares very favourably with Lipsey's (1992) meta-analysis of 397 projects for treating juveniles of $r=0.013$. Having shown that Ilderton 'works' they conclude: "How Ilderton Motor Project achieves reduced re-offending, and with which offenders Ilderton is most likely to succeed remains a subject for further research" (1995:10)

The Merseyside Probation Service Car Offender Project (COP) is a programme of work with serious car offenders is entirely within the probation service but involves other agencies both statutory and voluntary.¹¹ They sought to develop a programme that was a) victim centred; b) involved other agencies; c) dealt with serious offenders and d) emphasised safe driving. There is also a motor project in Merseyside which COP use.

The programme, initially for 10-12 people, has now grown to one for 20-24. It involves 18 two hour sessions to including inputs from: Police; the local Accident and & Emergency Department; Road Safety Officers; Anfield Women's Group and the Association of British Insurers.¹² It involves some mechanics and right at the end of the course they do allow some driving at the Motor Project and encourage graduation to the Motor Project where they can do City and Guilds courses in mechanics.

From October 1992-93 there were 346 referrals to COP which lead to 165 orders with a condition to attend the Project, 113 received custody, 30 were fined or received CSO, 14 were deemed unsuitable for the project as not sufficiently serious offenders and 24 were still outstanding. Of the 165 orders, 70 started and completed, 3 started and were breached, 92 were awaiting a place. At the Crown Court 64 proposals lead to 26 being sent to project. Their monitoring revealed that of 22 black men (6.3% of the sample), 18 were recommended as suitable for the project but 11 went to custody and only 7 to the project, 2 were deemed unsuitable and 2 remained outstanding. They recognize that though the percentage is about right for case load and local demographics it may be too high for relative involvement. Of six white women (1.7% of the total) 4 were recommended for the project 3 went, 1 received custody and 1 is outstanding. There were no black women.

From March '93 to August '93 49 people completed the programme, most were under 21, only 12 (25%) were reconvicted 12-17 months later. The researchers now plan a more qualitative evaluation where those completing the course, judges, POs, police, and all involved with the project are interviewed in depth. They also intend looking at drivers who Drive Whilst Disqualified as they see that to be a growing problem.

the literature on masculinities and crime

P J O'Rourke may be being ironic when he says in his essay 'How to Drive Fast on Drugs While Getting Your Wing-Wang Squeezed and Not Spill Your Drink' that he favours:

.. a *rented* car. Nothing handles better than a rented car. You can go faster, turn corners sharper, and put the transmission into reverse while going forward [...] You can park without looking. (1987:130)

11. The figures and discussion are based on a workshop presentation at the 'What Works - Making It Happen' Conference 7-9 September 1994 University of Salford by Barry Goldson Dept of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, University of Liverpool and Steve Pimblett, Probation Officer, Merseyside Probation Service.

12. The Anfield Women's Group is a prisoners' wives and family support group. It can be seen as representing the interests of the families of joyriders, an often ignored group of victims - there had been attacks on the homes of joyriders.

O'Rourke's quote perfectly describes the joys of a stolen car (as revealed in the literature and through fieldwork). His style and subject matter is unashamed - he revels in being a man. However, over the last twenty years, starting in the United States of America men influenced by feminism and sometimes by gay explorations have started to question the costs and benefits of being a man. This 'self-help' literature has grown and is now joined by sociological and psycho-analytic studies. Whilst crime and deviance may be mentioned few books specifically address the issue of crime and masculinities. Influenced by radical feminism some male writers have taken on the issue of men's violence and use of pornography (Funk, 1993 and Stoltenberg, 1989). However, the guilt that men are invited to feel about their behaviour towards women can lead to paralysis (Groombridge, 1995d). Others suggest that women have feminised men and propose a return of the 'Wild' man (Bly, 1990) or that women are no longer prepared to kiss enough frogs to create fairytale princes (Dench, 1994).

The terrain continues to be contested between what might be called 'real men' and 'pro-feminist' factions. There is a theoretical gain to be made by not talking about masculinity - something that 'real men' possess and all others aspire to - but masculinities - something all men (and some women) can possess, achieve or continuously 'do'. Where criminology, usually under the influence of feminism or by feminists, has addressed gender it has been to note its poor treatment of women. These issues are taken up more fully in chapter 7.

Forty years ago sub-cultural theorists like Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1961) specifically addressed the issue of men and crime. That they did so in highly traditional ways - that have rightly been criticised by feminists - is not doubted. For twenty years the assumptions they made, if not the precise content of the theories, remained uncontested until second wave feminism eventually turned its attention to criminology and the sociology of deviance.

Feminism may have silenced the most obvious sexism of male criminologists and lead some women to depart the field (Smart, 1990) but it has prompted others to examine the gender issues from the perspective of men and masculinity. The foremost examples are the collection edited by Newburn and Stanko (1994) and the theoretical advances made by Messerschmidt (1993) which are referred to extensively in Chapter 7.

Campbell's (1993) work directly engages with the problem of men and crime from a feminist perspective without relying on sex-role theory or resorting to simple men-blaming. Though written by a journalist it stands comparison with the 'classic' sub-cultural theorists. Her work has already been referred to in earlier in respect of joyriding. Therefore the work of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin and Campbell is discussed below.

In *Delinquent Boys: the Culture of Gangs* Cohen introduces the book with an imagined folksy discussion of a mother's concern for her "Johnny" who is a "good boy but got to running around with the wrong bunch and got into trouble" (1955:11). He patronisingly imagines her and her neighbours various common-sense theories of delinquency and renders them into 'sociologese'. He accepts the mothers version of cultural transmission/differential association -

“the wrong bunch” - but directs his attention to what he calls “an Unsolved Problem in Juvenile Delinquency”, “why is there such a subculture?” (1955:18) He specifically rejects “psychogenic” explanations that suggest children are born or can be made delinquent.

In brief he theorises that some working class boys - and he is clear he is talking about boys - cannot hope to succeed in an America that values middle-class male norms of success. They therefore collectively solve their failure within a subculture that reacts against the success instrumentality of the middle class male by engaging in expressive delinquency. It can therefore be seen as a sort of strain theory. However, for middle class boys the strain is not fear of economic failure but what might be called masculinity strain - though as we shall see these are related. The working class boy might be frustrated in his attempts to achieve middle class norms, typically represented by the demands of school, but he is likely to move more quickly into a job and therefore take up the full responsibilities of the working class adult male. Whereas the middle class boy has to delay this gratification in longer schooling and professional education before more smoothly occupying his economic place in the world, and therefore relieving his ‘masculine strain’. These two differing strains on boys may lead to delinquency. It is this ‘masculine strain’ that explains joyriding for Gibbens (1958) amongst, otherwise less ‘delinquent’ boys. The delinquency of girls - of either class - is less because the same strains are not seen in girls roles - which are seen as essentially relational - and neither is the ‘solution’ of delinquency appropriate. If girls do offend it is “overwhelmingly of sexual delinquency” (Cohen, 1955:144) in the cause of getting a boy. It is the getting of a partner that is the strain for girls. Most commentators concentrate on Cohen’s ideas about working class boys or his sexism so fail to note the emphasis that he gives to masculinity. Where Miller’s work on gangs suggested working class boys exaggerated the masculine virtues of working class “focal concerns” Cohen has them reacting to middle class norms.

Where Cohen acknowledges his intellectual debts to Sutherland and Parsons, Cloward and Ohlin’s *Delinquency and Opportunity: a Theory of Delinquent Gangs* is dedicated to Merton and Sutherland. The book’s purpose is to answer two questions “(1) Why do delinquent ‘norms’ or rules of conduct, develop? (2) What are the conditions which account for the distinctive content of various systems of delinquent norms - such as those prescribing violence or theft or drug use?” (1961:ix). As we shall see in Chapter 7 they do - unlike others - consider but eventually reject Cohen’s ‘masculine identification crisis’ theory but, following Sutherland accept the cultural transmission of the gang’s norms. They elaborate on Merton’s strain theory by suggesting not only that legitimate opportunities are blocked which might lead to deviant innovation, ritualism, retreatism or rebellion but that illegitimate opportunities may be blocked too and rather than seek individual solutions a subcultural one is chosen. Therefore different patterns of illegal opportunity would lead the delinquent to join ‘conflict’, ‘criminal’ or ‘retreatist’ subcultures, with the ‘retreatist’ one being seen as a more individual solution.

Taylor, Walton and Young note the improvement that Cloward and Ohlin make on Merton but criticize the adherence to the “one all-embracing goal, monetary success” (1973:134) which would have caused them difficulty assimilating “Black Panthers” or “hippies” within their

scheme. Cohen is implicitly criticised for assuming a similarly pre-eminent position for middle-class values and explicitly for misreading Merton in believing that only one goal was possible.

Writing over thirty years later in *Goliath: Britain's dangerous places* Campbell deploys her journalistic talents and commitment to feminism to sustain an argument about men and crime which is polemical but also alive to academic concerns and policy issues.¹³ Its immediate provenance were the 'riots' of 1991 in Cardiff, Oxford and Newcastle (her home town) but Walklate (1995) correctly places it within a concern with what the, then, Prime Minister, John Major, called 'job culture'. He and the media recognised the maleness of this culture but spent as much time blaming the mothers. What most commentators were unwilling to articulate was that it might be the maleness of the culture that was problematic. Others did recognize the issue of masculinity but posed it in these terms - masculine identity requires a job therefore unemployment causes a 'crisis of masculinity' which leads to crime.

Whilst the most controversial aspects of what she says have concerned the issue of masculinity her discussion of it is located within an account that recognises the high unemployment, housing tenure patterns and the reality of single motherhood and the role of state policy in these areas. That is it is not a theory of crime as understood by traditional mainstream criminology. Crime is treated as part of the landscape she describes but one which actively forms - sometimes very actively in the shape of burnt out cars - that landscape but is formed by it too.

Only within these structural, cultural and locality based terms can the assertion that "Crime and coercion are sustained by men. Solidarity and self-help are sustained by women" (1993:319) be seen as more than just blaming for men. Men are held responsible for the crime and the State's coercive response to it, both of which impact on the lives of the women - who emerge as the heroes of her book. Women and communities suffer as police and joyriders fight for the right to use the streets as they see fit. So crime is not caused by a 'crisis of masculinity' related to a loss of employment but that employment, leisure and crime always offered men a way to be both breadwinner and have fun outside of the home. Unemployment has therefore reduced the opportunities for men to be masculine, by their own lights. Those men with employment, such as police officers, state officials, journalists and so on, can continue to affirm their masculinity through work, leisure and condemnation of the jobs and their mothers. Women's opportunities continue to be constrained by the economy and men.¹⁴

Where Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin accept uncritically gender - in fact, sex - differences that play through into crime Campbell takes on board class, race, gender and sexuality but still finds it is young men who are committing the crime that attracts headlines. The arguments may have got more sophisticated but the problem appears to be the same. No wonder criminology prefers to ignore issues of masculinity.

13. This book has now been brought to the stage by Bryony Lavery (The Bush Theatre August 1997).

14 . Harman (1993) puts this more positively by arguing that women have already entered the twenty first century whereas men remain stuck in the twentieth.

conclusion

As can be seen the literature specifically on joyriding is sparse and reaches broadly common-sense conclusions about the ease of stealing cars and fun to be obtained from doing so. The only unexpected element is the early literature suggesting that joyriding might be carried out by the less delinquent. This runs contrary to the contemporary perception of joyriding as the epitome of dangerous delinquency promoted by the media and politicians. Most of the criminological literature on juvenile delinquency more generally makes no mention of joyriding or does so in ways that suggest it was not much of a problem or was simply symptomatic of a more generalised delinquency.

Given the paucity of work on joyriders the greatest repository of knowledge about it resides in the notes and memories of probation officers and social workers involved with joyriders. However, in the absence of an academic input about joyriding their individual casework responses and more particularly the collective (groupwork) solution of motor projects represents a practical knowledge of joyriding. The demands of funders for evaluation and of projects for publicity is bringing about a growing literature on whether individual projects work but there is still little theoretical input into considering what might work and why.

Of all the work that is reviewed only Campbell looks at both joyriding and masculinity, and then only in passing. Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 seek to incorporate such insights about masculinity and relate them to joyriding and to the projects that are aimed at preventing, diverting or rehabilitating joyriders. The next chapter leads directly from this discussion of what the literature says to an analysis of the themes that arise.